

Academic Senate Draft Minutes March 13, 2023

Meeting called to order at 2:05 p.m.

Roll call

Voltaire Villanueva (President)	4006
Jordan Fong (Executive Vice President)	4006
Eric Kuehnl (Vice President of Curriculum)	online
Robert Cormia (Secretary/Treasurer)	online

APPR

Brian Murphy	absent
--------------	--------

BSS:

Mona Rawal	4006 (late)
------------	-------------

CNSL:

Luis Carrillo	4006
---------------	------

Tracee Cunningham	4006
-------------------	------

DRC/VRC:

Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera	online
-------------------------	--------

FA/Comm

Ché Meneses	online
-------------	--------

Kate Jordahl	4006
--------------	------

HSH:

Rachelle Campbell	4006
-------------------	------

vacant

KA:

Katy Ripp	online
-----------	--------

Kelly Edwards	online
---------------	--------

LA:

Stephanie Chan	4006
----------------	------

Rocio Giraldez Betron	online
-----------------------	--------

LRC:

Kimberly Escamilla	online
--------------------	--------

Mary Thomas	4006
-------------	------

STEM:

Sara Cooper	(late)
-------------	--------

Matthew Litrus	4006
----------------	------

PT Reps:

Ellen Judd 4006
Roxanne Cnudde online

Other Members:

ASFC:

Skye Bridges absent

Classified:

Janie Garcia online

FacAssoc:

John Fox online

Prof. Dev.:

Carolyn Holcroft online (on campus)

Chair of COOL:

Kerri Ryer online

Dean of Equity:

Ajani Byrd 4006

President's Cabinet:

Kurt Hweg 4006

Guests: Kathy Perino, Hilda Fernandez, Tiffany Rideaux, Karen Erickson, Steve Batham, Josh Pelletier, Ram Subramaniam, and Ulysses Acevedo

Adoption of the agenda (Stephanie Chan first, Ellen Judd second) approved by consensus.

Public comments (none)

Minutes from February 27, 2023 (Stephanie Chan first and Mary Thomas second) approved by consensus

Consent calendar Allison Meezan stepping in for Kerri Ryer Chair of COOL for Spring 2023

Consent calendar was approved by consensus (main motion, and seconder not captured)

Evaluation of J1 drafts

Karen Erickson - evaluation includes a lot of components, especially the (J1) tool, with lots of components involved in evaluation. Evaluations include inputs from so many places. Many people involved in brainstorming the new version of the J1, including tenure coordinator, and students. Because the J1 is negotiated with the administration, and didn't want to make too many changes. Made separate drafts for each "faculty type" and added more areas for narrative

comment. Wanted to make sure that all faculty were evaluated on the same things. Feedback brought to FA included “what’s up with the online section”? Kathy Perino commented there will be 7 different types of J1s that correspond to every potential type of instructional delivery. Included all “mixed modality, counselors and librarians. And for non-instructional positions. Two we don’t have are supplemental instruction and resource coordinator. This has been a two-year effort, and contract negotiation is on a three year cycle, and would like to get this going in use by fall, before starting into the next 3-year cycle. Kate asked a question about mixed modality. The J1 language agreed that synchronous instruction is 50 minutes, asynchronous is 100 minutes, etc. There was a comment about the length of an evaluation visit (normal duration) which is 50 minutes. Sam asked a question about the pre and post evaluation length of time, there were questions about student evaluations, and about bias in evaluation, sometimes related to the number of students involved. Ellen asked if there was any research done on bias in the administrative evaluations. Karen commented on a section of the J1 with many sections that might require training in how to interpret the statement being evaluated. Ellen commented that the written comments by students, especially in a higher frequency of evaluation, were very effective in helping her learn to be a better teacher.

Kathy Perino commented that the vague nature of questions asked for students to respond to in the J1 evaluation may not be helpful. Hilda commented on the importance of open-ended statements. Rachelle commented that for P/T faculty, evaluations are done (for P/T faculty) and then they go into a black hole. There should be steps for remediation for P/T faculty when concerns are raised during a P/T evaluation. Roxanne Cnudde added that increased input by students is important, as well as having room for reflection. Matthew commented that the numerical ranking isn’t always effective (informational) and before adding another column, trying to keep the tool simple. Kathy commented that once the tool is approved, the next step is to provide training for evaluators for “a significant lift” in providing a training platform. The new statement of “exceeds expectations” might prove challenging to understand and apply, and the importance of “meets expectations” as the norm, and “exceeds expectations” as the outlier. Kathy asked for faculty to bring any big concerns back to FA soon, so we can move forward with the administration to get the tool approved and in use (by fall 2023). The J1s have been out there for a few weeks, and getting comments from all faculty is important.

We’d like to get this process going, so PLEASE bring feedback forward so we can complete negotiations with the District.

Alternate and stacked course load

Voltaire asked if there were any questions about stacked classes, there was reference to issues if more than 20 people are in a combination of stacked classes, what happens next? Sam commented that it would be useful to have different class sizes for some of the listed classes, to entice interest by faculty. Kathy shared that stack classes were initially “created” during times of decreased enrollment to keep small classes from being canceled, and there was nervousness about the list of stacked classes getting too big, and this becoming the “norm”. Way back when, every spring, the list of classes is brought forward to the Senate, but that process seems to

have been disrupted. Sam mentioned that from the perspective of the honors institute, this is very popular for students, and to try to keep this going.

1320 budget update

Kurt Hueg gave a 1320 budget planning update, and reminded us that a while back we knew that we were coming in high on our 1320 budget. Kurt shared that initially the enrollment and productivity of spring 2023 is higher than spring 2022, and increased enrollment is exciting. But we're coming in about 2.2 million dollars too high, and this is primarily because of enrollment loss. Brung the 2021-22 (and over a 5 year period) we have lost 29% of our enrollment. Kurt asserted that we're still essentially the same college although we have lost many P/T faculty.

Kurt showed the 1320 budgets from 2019-20 and especially in 2022-23, our 1320 budgets is a few million dollars lower, and the State may soon be decreasing the funding and COLAs in future years. We need to be more efficient, and plan for lower numbers of dollars. The 1320 budget funds our P/T and overload assignments. 39% of 1320 has been FTEF. Kurt showed a slide with the total 1320 budget allocation. Big divisions: BSS, STEM, and Fine Arts, have the largest 1320 dollars, the highest productivity, and highest share of P/T faculty. Kurt commented that when we add a F/T faculty, the 1320 budget is (commensurately) decreased. Starting with summer, we're going to reduce it by 20%, because summer is all 1320. Wanted to start with a larger share of reduction in summer, so we have more funds (and budget opportunity) for fall, winter and spring. Because of that we may be down 120 FTES over summer.

Kurt discussed the hold harmless situation with the State, and our reference (base case) of 2017-18. Goal of the District is to get out of hold-harmless, how we can grow through dual-enrollment opportunities, and increase productivity. Hopefully we can earn back the lost (summer) FTES during fall, winter, and spring. But the economy is getting more challenging. We hope to be seeing more classes with 30 and 35 students. Sara commented that it's concerning to be making big cuts in summer, and is this the best strategy? As an example, cutting platform (required) courses for allied health programs, that if cut during summer, have serious impact during the rest of the year. An additional problem is that when we add classes at the last minute, it's a scramble to find high quality (adjunct) faculty to staff these classes. Sara suggested that this is an opportunity to strategize and plan, and make good long term decisions that support students and programs. Rachelle added further that 12 month programs are often hit hard by decisions (to cut entry courses) that can impact 12 month programs.

Kimberly Escamilla asked if Kurt could comment on a recent article appearing in Ed Source about misappropriation of funds. It was a result of a 7-month audit that didn't have major findings, but the auditors did assert that we didn't make full use of full-time faculty funding. Bret commented on two tranches of funding available for hiring full-time faculty, Bret claimed we funded 5 positions with one fund, but funding for unfilled F/T positions were (are) used for 1320 funding. Bret commented on a productivity number of 490, and if we have better productivity (with the FT faculty) the 1320 budget can go up and down. Kurt commented that we will be

reviving the scheduling taskforce, but it was hard to schedule those committee meetings this quarter with other activities going on.

TracDat resolution

A motion was made to discontinue TracDat, Sara first, Jordan second. There was a question about whether data from TracDat will be archived and available, to which Ram answered yes. The vote was unanimous to discontinue TracDat.

College mission statement

Josh Pelletier brought forward two very similar versions of the College missions statement. Josh showed the current vision, mission, and values statement, vision for equity, and value statements. Josh asked that the Academic Senate review the two statements, very similar, and time for the Academic Senate to weigh in on. Josh read the two statements. Josh shared that the students thought one version was slightly better. Sara supported David's comment that the assertion about unpredictable outcomes based on (marginalized) status was a negative comment. Janie commented that there was a desire to have a statement about equity, but not lose sight of other statuses, e.g. "demographic", etc. Kate made a suggestion about turning a somewhat negative statement into a strong positive statement. Carolyn made a comment that part of the second mission statement could be part of a values statement. Kerri also made a comment about who (whose voice) was driving part of the language, i.e., who it was serving. Voltaire commented that this was part of accreditation and we should be looking at it.

Campus safety

Cormia spoke about some consequential decisions that have been made where faculty may not have been as included in the decisions being made. A comment was made that the decision to close campus last Friday might have been made a little sooner, with faculty input, and a little better notices, as DID happened with the decision that was made today, which showed foresight, clear and timely messaging to staff and students, but could have included a faculty voice. Cormia shared that the relations between faculty and cabinet are valued, and this is more about process. David Marasco spoke about the license plate reader discussion and decisions.

Voltaire shared that organizations have challenges with decisions. John Fox clarified about an "active shooter event" at West Valley College, and Cormia reminded faculty that we have roles as authority figures to remind our students to be careful and prepared during life threatening storms, as we will experience tomorrow. Sara Cooper mentioned that we haven't actually made a decision as a senate about what our position is for vaccination. Kimberley asked about the data policy on the license plate reader. David shared he will ask about that policy at the next police meeting.

Janie made a comment about a policy that can affect marginalized students, and that this vaccination policy may be impacting some enrollment. Janie comments further that policies

affecting COVID healthcare go beyond vaccination. John Fox shared that FA will ask the board not to approve the vaccination policy as it hasn't been completely brought through all our governance policies. Sara again commented that the policy as written here is outdated, and while there's debate on preventing transmission, if we're going to have a policy, we should have a current policy.

There appear to be two issues here, one on the basis of the policy, and the other that we haven't really vetted this policy through established processes. Kurt asked the group to reflect on what we're asking the registration folks to provide, and that it might be discouraging students from registration.

Election committee update

Mary Thomas shared that there are three open positions, and exactly three candidates. Michael Chang for P/T rep, Benjamin Kaupp for Vice President of Curriculum, and Patrick Morriss for Executive VP. These candidates will be elected by acclamation at the first Senate meeting in spring. The Senate thanked Mary and the election committee for their hard work and effort.

The meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m. Next (and final) meeting for the winter quarter will be next Monday, March 20th.

DRAFT