



Academic Senate Council MINUTES - DRAFT
February 28, 2020: 1:30-3:30 p.m.
SLO Room 3134 (PDC) | NCC Room 3213 (Polycom)

x	Roland Finger President	x	Wesley Sims Vice-President	x	Alexandra Kahane Curriculum Chair		Debra Stakes CCFT President
x	Galadriel Bree Highhouse N. County At-large	x	Benjamin Arrona Part-time At-large	x	Regina Voge Student Development and Success	x	Erich Tucker Lang. & Communication
x	Silvio Favoreto Biology		Dean Harrell Business	x	Heidi Webber Counseling	x	Kelli Gottlieb Physical Sciences
	Dave Fernandez Engineering & Tech.	x	Matt Fleming English		Canguo Liu Fine Arts	x	Kevin Bontenbal Learning Resources
x	Allison Merzon Head John Marsh Kinesiology, Health Science, and Athletics	x	Lise Mifsud/ Fionnuala Butler Social Science	x	P. Michele Gordon Johnson Applied Behavioral Science	x	Jennifer Sanders/Gabriel Cuarenta-Gallegos Mathematics
	Catherine Ruiz Nursing	x	bree valle Performing Arts	x	Seth Hurley ASCC		Vacant DSPS
x	Laurie Buchholz Full-time At-large		Vacant Secretary				

Cards: Kelly Gottlieb Time Keeper: Erich Tucker Computer: Heidi Webber

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (5 mins.)

- Motion to pull item #6 on today’s agenda. Consensus.
- Motion to approve changed agenda. Consensus.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – ([31 JANUARY 2020](#)) (5 mins.)

- Motion to approve minutes. Consensus.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT: *All public comments will be limited to three minutes in length for each speaker.*

- Senator made comment to remind rest of senate that the scholarship application review committee is in need of volunteers. Each volunteer only needs to review 25 applications.
- Online Ed. Committee, noted with Canvas that we use apps and then they are not continually funded past 1 year. For example, ‘Proctorio’ used for authentication. We need to figure out a different system of how to get apps moved into and out of Canvas. The thought is we are being used to test it, but that is a waste of time for folks that do adopt it. We need to expand the committee of 6 so that it would be representative and so that the apps are vetted. We should not adopt them and always have them later pulled because of funding. Please go back to departments and divisions to see how apps are being used, and provide ideas on how to provide feedback on process to vet, implement, and keep apps that are used.

IV. BUSINESS AGENDA: *Be sure to discuss these items with your division faculty so you can adequately represent your division in reaching consensus on these items.*

Contents

1. **Bookstore Taskforce Report and Recommendations**
2. **2019 Institutional Learning Outcomes Report (First Read)**
3. **Director Evaluation Form (First Read)**
4. **AP/BP 5015 Residence Determination (First Read)**
5. **AP/BP 5035 Withholding of Student Records (First Read)**
6. **AP/BP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees/Certificates (First Read)**
7. **Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) Draft–Standard I.C (First Read)**
8. **Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) Drafts–Standard IV.C, the Introduction, and Quality Focus Essay (QFE) (Second Read)**

1. Bookstore Taskforce Report and Recommendations (Chris Gilbert, Cherie Moore, Matthew Fleming, 15 mins.)

Background: In Fall 2019, faculty had noted issues and questions regarding new bookstore processes and felt that they may have an adverse impact on students. The Academic Senate Council created a taskforce to research ways to improve bookstore service to students. The taskforce is now reporting back to Senate with their recommendations.

Recommendations:

(1) We recommend the Senate direct BN to revise its website so as to clearly distinguish, by means of three separate sections with different titles in distinct font sizes and/or styles, books/materials that are “Instructor Required”, books/materials that are “Instructor Recommended,” and books/materials that are “Bookstore Recommended”.

(2) We recommend that the Curriculum Committee form a subcommittee that will be responsible for quality and content control of information about specific sections in the schedule of classes. The subcommittee’s responsibilities would include:

- (a) Approving any annotations that will be added to the schedule to describe a specific section;
- (b) Approving blocks of “boilerplate” language so that all courses that need similar annotations will be described in the same way;
- (c) Determining which types of information about sections (such as those in which all materials are free to students) could be achieved by means of symbols with a key at the top of the schedule, how that key will be worded, etc.
- (d) Determining how requests for annotations for a given section (either as text or as symbol) will occur: who should submit them, who should receive them, how they are to be vetted, etc.

Proposal: The Academic Senate approves the Bookstore Taskforce’s recommendations.

- Presenter Cherie Moore reviewed how the task force came about and what they are currently working on at the 2 meetings they have had.
- Some issues have been resolved during the first two meetings. Some issues can be worked out just by talking to Justino at the bookstore and the committee.
- Increased price for lab manuals – Xanadu – there is a separate bookstore and an outside company so that has affected the price.

- Book recommendations that are not recommended by faculty – want to see a clear a delineation between instructor/bookstore book recommendations. For the time being those reference charts are not going to be sold unless requested. Justino is very open to making adjustments that the instructor wants.
- Language in class finder – led to 2nd recommendation – the curriculum committee needs to be involved and be a sub-committee – the quality and content – currently to just tell the DA (deans assistant) what you want it to say and they input it. Recommendation is that there be standard blocks, and other annotations with a symbol/key for materials fees and textbooks. Explaining this information helps with the review of the recommendations.
- Presenter – Matt Fleming noted that Justino was helpful in moving the faculty’s interest forward.
- Senator posed question as to why the ‘bookstore recommended’ info could just not be removed?
 - The bookstores response was that BN is for profit. The bookstore recommendations are for shopping purposes.
 - However, faculty can remove them the info themselves, or contact Justino to remove it.
- Senator thanked task force for their work. In regards to C/D and noted that Online Ed Committee looked at other colleges and found Handcock uses symbols too. However, we would be consistent across class finder/bookstore, etc. so students
- Senator – there is senate legislation requires certain notations be used to notify students of classes are “no cost”. We need to understand who has the actual authority to make these decisions so we follow the law.
 - Presented noted that a task force is trying to involve the Online Ed Committee and Curriculum are trying to come together to a faculty driven process together to decide those things.
 - Senator noted we are currently not in compliance, and the task force is working to find a process on how to implement so we are compliant.
 - Curriculum chair noted that the task force is not asking them to be the end stop, but to be the checker of and help make the college compliant.
 - Senator noted that there are issues with the working of D. The committee needs to decide the who, what, and when.
 - Presenter noted that D is talking about faculty, but we need to design the process and figure out who does the request go to and how it is implemented. We understand that it is required.
- Request for 5 more minutes. Consensus.
- Senator recommends a rewording of D. This task force recommends that in sub committee with the curriculum committee, makes recommendation to the.
 - Add “request from Faculty”.
 - recommendation to add word “collaborate” with division chairs.
 - Recommend to change task force to sub committee with curriculum. The process could involve chairs.
 - Curriculum chair recommends that there be a “choose from list” items, so
 - VP commented that softening the language and determining who is responsible.
- The task force recommends that the curriculum committee forms a task force/sub committee to be responsible for quality and content.

- President recommends that we bring this back for a second read after the feedback is considered.
- Motion to recommend that the proposal be amended. Consensus.
- Presenter thanked AS for their input and noted that the feedback will be taken by task force and considered in proposal changes.

Consensus on amended proposal. Will return for a second read.

2. 2019 Institutional Learning Outcomes Report (First Read) (N. Higgins and S. Kline, 10 mins.)

Background: The ILO Report is written every year. Previously the data was generated from student surveys sent to students who had applied for graduation, but because of decreasing response rates, ILO data is generated from eLumen reports based upon student learning outcomes at the course level mapped to an Institutional Learning Outcome. The ILO Report for 2019 is being presented for feedback.

Supporting Documents:

[2019 ILO Report](#)

[2018 ILO Report](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on the 2019 ILO Report.

- Presenter noted they are here for feedback only. Formerly surveys were given to graduates. Due to less responses process has been changed. Now the data is pulled from eLumen and the data includes all students in process.
- Noted red indicates those that went down. Green went up.
- The amount of assessed courses has gone down from one year to the next.
- Bottom of page 1 highlights some of the changes here.
- Senator suggested that under #4, that if it was a smaller number of statements from 15 to make it easier to assess.
 - Presenter noted we do have more statements than actual learning outcomes we look for.
- Will this be on web site?
 - Currently on share point. Will be put on IR website.
- Senator posted question to presenter if there are ways to improve?
 - If we had the courses reviewed more often, so you can get more data.
 - When SLO's were done by a task force, we ask DC to have their faculty go in and make sure they are linked the way they thing it should be linked. The SLOA coordinators currently do not have a way to confirm this is done.
- Senator commented this is a frustrating process.
 - Presenter agreed. It is difficult to see the data decline for various reasons.
- Math has a rolling list of when things are being assessed. Noted that there may be 20 section of once course and the next time another course is assessed there are only 2... this will show a decline in data.
- Motion to approve feedback.

Consensus on feedback provided.

3. Director Evaluation Form (First Read) (R. Finger, 10 mins.)

Background: Some Directors are long overdue for their evaluations. Cuesta College does not have a Senate-approved form for faculty to evaluate Directors. Deans who oversee Directors have requested that Academic Senate Council create a form that fills this evaluation void.

Supporting Documents:

[Draft of Form for Faculty to Evaluate Directors AP 7150](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on the draft of the form for Faculty to evaluate Directors.

- Presenter reviewed how this form came about and reasoning about it.
 - Noted that ‘Unsatisfactory’ does not have a blurb
 - When we were looking at the document. We are currently trying to get away from binary language as that is how things are moving forward.
- Senator asked who this form would be for.
 - President note that it would be for anyone who is not a dean but a manager and has title of director.
- Senator asked if it could remove “not going well”
- Senator agrees that it is best to move forward with making the document gender neutral.
- Too many things grouped into one questions. Consider breaking out the questions into smaller questions. How currently written, it makes it difficult to respond to the questions.
 - Recommend that there be an open ended question.
- Senator made a question, is there an issue with it being a longer document.
 - Maybe break into sub-questions but not get rid of notion that some questions are connected.
- Is the intention to put what you disagree with, and then explain yourself with an open ended question.
 - Some noted they prefer the sub questions.
- Motion to approve feedback.

Consensus on feedback provided. Will come back for a second read.

4. AP/BP 5015 Residence Determination (First Read) (M. Sanchez and R. Finger, 10 mins.)

Background: AP 5015 is legally required. AP and BP 5015: Residence Determination establish rules for the college to determine residency. The attached drafts have been developed and reviewed by the AP/BP taskforce, which humbly solicits feedback from the Academic Senate Council.

Supporting Documents:

[AP 5015 Residence Determination DRAFT](#)
[AP 5015 Residence Determination CCLC Template](#)
[BP 5015 Residence Determination DRAFT](#)

[BP 5015 Residence Determination CCLC Template](#)

Proposal: Academic Senate Council provides feedback on AP 5015 and BP 5015.

- The language in this document is outdated with the language in reference to gender neutrality.
- We can provide feedback even though Dr. Sanchez is not here.
- Senator recommended that it is also problematic regarding information about gender and hetero relationships.
- We need to stick with the idea that we stick with the legal aspect but we can make it the way that we want including fixing these items.
- Senator noted that this is a good example of taking something without reviewing what is acceptable.
- Question regarding if this is really a first read because this seems familiar.
 - This is a first read.
 - Agrees with senators assessment that we not make documents like this without
 - Who has made a new path in documents like this .
- Question regarding if we are actually in charge of this regarding residency.
 - There are several ways to confirm residency. This is a huge issue and huge expense to the students and time consuming for the staff that have to confirm the documentation.
 - VPAA noted that we need to note that the boiler plate language in putting into policy is not the best policy. However, there are some really complicated ed code and immigration law. At some point to acknowledge we will follow ed code best to our ability. Keep the perspective that the committee is working from with the language that is required.
 - Senator noted that some stuff is tied to things bigger than we are. If there is any way to make someone's job easier to assess is better.
- Clearing up the language would make this easier to the student. The clearest and student friendly, and equitable to the student. Make our intent clear.
- Time. Motion to accept feedback.

Consensus on feedback provided. Will come back for a second read.

•

5. AP/BP 5035 Withholding of Student Records (First Read) (M. Sanchez and R. Finger, 10 mins.)

Background: AP 5035 is legally required, and BP 5035 is legally advised. AP and BP 5035: Withholding of Student Records have been revised. AB 1313- Higher Education: Prohibited Debt Collection Practices removed withholding transcripts as a legal practice. The attached drafts have been developed and reviewed by the AP/BP taskforce, which humbly solicits feedback from the Academic Senate Council.

Supporting Documents:

- [AP 5035 Withholding of Student Records – CLEAN](#)
- [AP 5035 Withholding of Student Records – REDLINE](#)
- [AP 5035 Withholding of Student Records – CCLC Template](#)
- [BP 5035 Withholding of Student Records – CLEAN](#)
- [BP 5035 Withholding of Student Records – REDLINE](#)

[BP 5035 Withholding of Student Records – CCLC Template](#)
[AP/BP 5035 2019 Legislative Update](#)

Proposal: Academic Senate Council provides feedback on AP 5035 and BP 5035.

- This is getting updated because we can no longer legally hold transcripts. This came up at the policy and procedures task force.
- Other issues - \$1 will present student from being able to register. What thinks is important, but transcripts hold up transfer and job opportunities. This holds up housing and immigration. They can't view their grades or pass their class before. They can't log into to see degree progress. Recommends that we be very intentional of what we do with it.
- The slippery slope comment is true but is also not tru.
- Looked at another colleges policy and noted our policy says 2 written, where other colleges do monthly emails. The students should also have the right to appeal. We should have some of that added to the policy. SBCC that senator looked at.
- Question asked if there is a "small amount" like \$50 that is doesn't trip this policy?
 - Unknown.
- Do we have an appeal process if students owe money?
 - Yes, but not familiar with it.
 - Senator are usually clear why they owe money. The biggest issue is the residency.
- Question regarding how much money are we actually talking about?
 - Don't keep the students from succeeding. We would spend more money trying to deal when some cases they can be dismissed or forgiven.
 - Dan Troy said at CC that we have to give some of the funds to the state. Therefore, it is important to get funds from students.
- Need to have some ideas on ways to handle this issue.
- There are other BP's that need to be updated that also note holding of transcripts.
 - As a body we need to look at how this affects the students.
- Motion to approve feedback. Consensus.
-

6. AP/BP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees/Certificates (First Read) (M. Sanchez and R. Finger, 10 mins.)

~~Background: AP 4100 and BP 4100 are legally required. AP/BP 4100: Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates have been updated and reviewed by the AP/BP workgroup. AP 4100 updates language on the maximum number of units students may take on a Pass/No Pass basis for degree or certificate completion. In addition, AP 4100 outlines the minimum number of courses students must complete at Cuesta College in order to be awarded a degree or certificate of completion. Finally, AP 4100 outlines general steps the college will take to automatically identify and award students who have completed the requirements for a degree or certificate at Cuesta College.~~

Supporting Documents:

[AP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates – CLEAN](#)

[AP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates – REDLINE](#)
[AP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates – CCLC Template](#)
[BP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates](#)
[BP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates – CCLC Template](#)

~~**Proposal:** Academic Senate Council provides feedback on AP 4100 and BP 4100.~~

- Pulled from Agenda

7. Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) Draft–Standard I.C (First Read) (K. Bontenbal and J. Curtis, 15 mins.)

Background: The Accreditation Steering Committee is submitting standard I.C for Cuesta’s ISER to the Academic Senate for a first read. Please provide feedback on content only; final style and formatting changes will be done later. Consideration of all feedback will be made by the Accreditation Steering Committee and reported back to the Academic Senate Council.

Supporting Document:
[Standard I.C Draft](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on the 1st read of Standards I.C for Cuesta’s ISER.

- Presenter apologized for coming back so many times. Many others have now touched this draft so it needed to come back for a new first read.
- Senator has a list of comments: Section 1, ed programs, states that the curriculum deadlines outline in curriculum handbook, would caution posting handbook site because when SharePoint rolled over many of the links broke. Site the source in the handbook.
- Presenter noted they are trying to avoid live links.
- When it refers to ‘college website’ C-4, should note actual page.
- C7, academic freedom.
- Pieces 2-6 of evidence.
- C11 – operating in foreign location? What does that mean?
- Question about classes that are in China where we have instructors from say Germany, is that what we are talking about? VPAA confirmed that we are not talking about that.
- Agenda it talks about final style and formatting... is there going to be someone that reviews and works on the consistency? Is there going to be a clean-up.
 - There is a writing team with many members and they will be working on the final draft. The full completed ISER by the end of March, maybe early April.
- 1C, Stephanie Curry noted that all the work that we do directly comes from our mission statement. “all work of the college is...” move that to first paragraph, so we show intentionality.
- Call for more feedback. No additional feedback provided.
- Call for consensus on feedback presented.

Consensus on feedback provided. Will return for a second read.

8. Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) Drafts–Standard IV.C, the Introduction, and Quality Focus Essay (QFE) (Second Read) (K. Bontenbal and J. Curtis, 20 mins.)

The Accreditation Steering Committee is submitting the latest drafts of IV.C, the Introduction, and Quality Focus Essay (QFE) for Cuesta’s ISER to the Academic Senate Council for a second read. Please provide feedback on content only; final style and formatting changes will be done later.

Supporting Documents:

[Standard IV.C](#)

[ISER Introduction](#)

[Quality Focus Essay](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on the second read of Standard IV.C, the Introduction, and Quality Focus Essay (QFE) for Cuesta’s ISER.

- IV.C. no feedback at this time.
- Introduction. No feedback at this time.
- Asked for feedback on QFE?
- Senator noted that she appreciated the comments from previous feedback now being incorporated.
- Motion to approve feedback.

Consensus reached. Proposal approved.

V. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

- Tellus@cueta.edu creative writing contest
- Prioritization process – we will be forming a task force and work on the assessment tool. The idea of succession planning. Need some overlap to have a good succession plan.
- Compressed calendar leadership retreat happened. There will be a follow up meeting in April
 - Who is the we?
 - VPAA noted that it is by President, and it is her party, but she is not required to invite specific people.
 - A few models of calendar will be processed.
- Opening Day – it will be exciting, fun and celebratory. Fall Opening Day, staff and faculty will have separate meetings at the same time so that they can both eat together at noon.
 - Suggestion – it is challenging to have district to communicate to us. Right now it is out of balance. Needs to be more balanced. Does the district really need 3 hours?
 - GPIT got the same message. Faculty go to flex days and can use their time there.

VI. SUMMIT ITEMS

Are there any items, campus issues, and/or divisional concerns/issues that anyone wants to go to “Summit” for answers/clarification?

- Assembly bill of student senate having a vote, and they are very passionate about this. Student

president is unsure how this will be received. AA could write a resolution in support of this.

- BP on Academic Freedom will go forward.
- Ballot initiative about schools and other community things, and focusses on industries and commercial properties over a million dollars.
- While Cal-Brite and CFT and AA. Contact Sacramento people.
- Reach out to classified union to have them sit at senate and provide feedback and ideas to be represented, as a non voting member.
- Question to find previous notes and work from faculty retreat.

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS AND PUMA CHAIN:

Please share these items with your division faculty and other Puma buddies.

1. [Book of the Year—*The Honey Bus* by Meredith May](#)—Author Lecture and Book Signing on Wednesday, April 22
 -
2. [Neurodiversity Faculty and Staff Training](#): Tuesday, April 28, 2020, from 3 to 4:30 in Room 5401
 -

VIII. STANDING REPORTS (Time permitting – max. 3 mins. per report)

1. CCFT--D. Stakes
 2. Curriculum--A. Kahane
 3. Workload Committee-- A. Kahane
 4. College Council--R. Finger
 5. Planning & Budget--Erich Tucker
 6. ASCC Report--S. Hurley
 7. CTE Liaison--J. Stokes
 8. Guided Pathways Coordinator--H. Webber
 9. OER--K. Bontenbal
 10. OEI--C. Wilshusen
 11. Student Services Redesign--K. Bontenbal
- Curriculum is forming a sub committee to work on “Top Codes” and that they are correct because it has to do with pay. Working on process, and move every course to have a DE addendum. Even if they don’t currently have. This is so they can start one anytime they if it is already ready to go.
 - Workload met 2 days ago. Looked at course caps, and discuss best use of committee times. More efficiency type issues and broadened a little check with CBA. Should have a role in discussion regarding the shorter semesters, so that it can be evaluated and bring college up to the most FTE/FTES, yes it does fall into their per-view and they should be part of the discussion. Especially the workload and fallout of that. Should be invited to any future discussions. Could have impact on efficiency.
 - Would like to explore if it is necessary to still have it. Committee Chair agrees. The people who sit on the committee would agree.
 - ASCCC did survey that students want Ted Talks, there will be one in March. Then ask a teacher to say comments or give a talk after the Ted Talk. Goal to be a monthly thing. PDC could help with advertising it.

•

Next Meeting: March 13, 2020 1:30-3:30 | Room 3134/N3213

Roland Finger
Academic Senate President
805.546.3100 ext. 2769
roland_finger@cuesta.edu

Wesley Sims
Academic Senate Vice President
805.546.3100 ext. 2643
carl_sims@cuesta.edu

Alexandra Kahane
Curriculum Chair
805.546-3100 ext 2195
akahane@cuesta.edu



<http://www.cuesta.edu/departments/academicsenate/>