



Academic Senate Council Agenda
April 27, 2018: 1:30-3:30 p.m.
SLO Room 3134 (PDC) | NCC Room 3213 (Polycom)

	Stacy Millich President	x	Cherie Moore Vice-President	x	Alexandra Kahane Curriculum Chair	x	Debra Stakes CCFT President
x	Alec Valdez ASCC	x	Gabriel Searcy Part-time At-large	x	Wes Sims Full-time At-large		Elena Touryan N. County At-large
	Silvio Favoreto Biology	x	Amy Stapp Business	x	Heidi Webber Counseling		Carol Hurd DSPS
	Dave Fernandez Engineering & Tech.	x	Matt Fleming English		Michelle Craig Fine Arts	x	Bailey Drechsler Applied Behavioral Science
	Allison Merzon Grant Kinesiology, Health Science, and Athletics	x	Erich Tucker Lang. & Communication	x	Kevin Bontenbal Learning Resources	x	Michael Mogull Mathematics
	Catherine Ruiz Nursing		bree valle Performing Arts	x	Patrick Len Physical Sciences	x	Lise Mifsud/ Fionnuala Butler Social Science
xx	Donna Bower/ Laura Harris Student Development and Success						

Cards: Laura _____ Time Keeper: Gabe _____ Computer: Patrick _____

Filling in for President: Cherie

Filling in for Minutes while Cherie serves President role: Alex

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

(1 min.)

Approved with Consensus

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – ([April 13, 2018](#))

(3 min.)

Approved with Consensus

III. PUBLIC COMMENT: *All public comments will be limited to three minutes in length for each speaker. Opportunities for public comment will also be provided for each agenda item during discussion on each item and before proposals are called for approval.*

We got accepted into OEI! 10th college accepted. Great job Cynthia and Kevin!

IV. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

(5 min.)

Plenary Report next meeting. Summit report given (see Summit Minutes).

V. 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. Textbook Affordability OER Grant (First Read)**

2. **Faculty Prioritization Task Force Proposal (First Read)**
3. **AP 7120 Faculty Hiring Policy (First Read with MQDD edits)**
4. **SLOA Committee Elimination (Second Read)**
5. **Amend Description and Faculty Composition of IPPR Committee (Second Read)**
6. **AP 7530 Smoking and Tobacco Use (First Read)**
7. **Graduation Program Change (First Read)**

1. Textbook Affordability OER Grant (First Read) (K. Bontenbal, Q. Dang, J. Shepard - 10 min.)

Background: Cuesta College is seeking a grant with [COOL 4 ED California Open Online Library](#) for Education to address the high cost of textbooks. Please see the [Textbook Affordability OER Grant](#) description for detailed information.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on the Textbook Affordability OER Grant.
Feedback provided:

- Thanks to Janet and Que for funding grant; faculty for being interested
- We will be saving \$250,000, 2000-3000 students are benefitted
- Can anyone else add on? (A-No money for stipends, but you may participate, just not earn a stipend)
- Are only the listed disciplines eligible? (A- No, those were the ones that responded before the agenda-see previous answer)
- Due June 30, 2018
- Presenter asked for detailed feedback-what do you want to see on the 2nd read?
- Probably good to give everything; consult with Stacy
- Still early, but we wanted to get this through before summer since Academic Senate approval is required; be sure to express concerns now
- What is the impact on the bookstore? (A- They are their own separate business)
- The bookstore must be self-sufficient, they may be taken over, and students are not buying their texts there, \$55,000 in vouchers for students to get textbooks. Bookstore will always sell other things.
- Everyone (DSPS, bookstore, etc.) has been informed and is working with this.
- Bookstore is selling printed copies and will be an ongoing role.
- EOPS, Café, Calworks are giving vouchers to students for bookstore
- Can bookstore be non-profit? (Red carded by CM to get back on topic of OER grant proposal)

2. Faculty Prioritization Task Force Proposal (First Read) (B. Clark and B. Dumas-20 min)

Background: At its November 24th meeting, the Academic Senate Council voted to form the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Task Force to review and assess the current faculty hiring prioritization process and to recommend either an update or changes to the existing process. Over the past four months, the task force met on a weekly basis to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the current process, and the committee reviewed a handout one member compiled of processes used by six other comparable California community colleges. Ultimately, the committee decided to update the current process with some significant changes to promote more fairness and transparency in the prioritization process for all new, proposed faculty positions.

In 2017-2018, the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process involved three components: Administrative Ranking (30%), Objective (Quantitative) Ranking (40%), and Subjective (Qualitative) Ranking (30%). For 2018-2019, the taskforce recommends the following updates to the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process:

1. Service faculty and teaching faculty will follow similar but separate, parallel processes.
2. A fourth component is recommended: An addition of Cluster Ranking points to the prioritization process; this is based on a cluster ranking process which is currently conducted and facilitated by each cluster dean with the cluster's division chairs; each Cluster may adjust their Cluster ranking process as they see fit because of the new weighting of this part. The weighting for the four components will be as follows: Administrative (25%), Objective (35%), Subjective (35%), and Cluster Ranking (5%).
3. Faculty will vote to determine the Subjective Ranking, but service faculty will vote for service faculty positions while academic teaching faculty will vote on academic teaching faculty positions.
4. Instructional deans and the VPAA will vote to determine the Administrative Ranking for academic teaching positions and the Student Service dean and VPSS will vote to determine the Administrative Ranking for service positions.
5. The vote to determine the Administrative Ranking will take place simultaneously (in the same room and at the same time) as the faculty vote for Subjective Ranking.
6. The total points possible awarded in each criteria category for the Objective (Quantitative) Ranking component will be determined by members of the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Subcommittee of the College Council in a meeting conducted a month or more prior to the date of the final Subjective Ranking process. For example, although the Objective Ranking total is 35% of the overall, we determine the point distribution among the individual criteria under the Objective category previous to the ranking itself. It is during an initial Faculty Hiring Prioritization Subcommittee meeting, a month or more before the subjective activity & voting meeting, that points for each Objective criteria category (i.e. FTES/FTEF, etc.) would be determined.
7. The Subjective (Qualitative) process has been updated to ensure meaningful dialogue takes place before the final vote is conducted.

Supporting Documents:

- [The Prioritization Process Handbook \(Existing\)](#)
- [Faculty Prioritization Dialog Process Rubric \(Proposed\)](#)
- [Faculty Prioritization Position Rationale Form](#)
- [Faculty Prioritization Taskforce Recommendations Power Point](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on the 2018-2019 Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process as recommended by the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Task Force.

Feedback provided:

- Taskforce members mentioned; met weekly all semester
- Comment this was a College Council taskforce (Answer: Academic Senate voted for this taskforce and it is a senate taskforce, even though some of College Council taskforce members may have merged in)
- Are these two processes tied together for FT temp? (A- No- they are different)

- Objective criteria have always been an issue for teaching versus service faculty. How will these come together? (A- They won't in this proposal that is a parallel, separate process with # positions determined by Superintendent President)
- Is breakdown of criteria for this year or each year? (A- each year)
- It will be assessed and edited after each year to improve process
- Can service vs. academic faculty positions change each year? (A-yes)
- Concerns about President choosing # of positions in each bracket. Which service faculty vote on service faculty? The 2 people on the committee? (A- yes-do you want academic faculty to vote on this?)
- Regarding the vote on subjective criteria-why would the academic faculty not vote on service faculty too?
- Service faculty rarely come up first on the list; it is diluted by academic roles, we wanted to do right by them
 - Red card- not much time was spent in meetings on service faculty; this needs much more time to discuss and solve (outside of this meeting); let's reflect feedback on the proposal
 - Just trying to give feedback but we can give the time to the academic discussion
 - We may not have answers for you on this
- Why is the ratio of FT/PT objective vs subjective? How weighted? (A- It is in objective-highest or tied with highest ranking)
- Questions from CDS on Objective –How does efficiency factor in with attendance versus consensus? (A- It is based on IR numbers)
- How is the waitlist for ESL factored in? (A- They aren't)
 - It is discriminating
 - No, but the way you do that doesn't make data that is being considered; use the waitlist the rest of the colleges uses; I don't know how to fix it because I don't know how you are doing it. Work to collect data.
 - It is not fair to our students who can't use technology
- Can the institution consider smaller divisions that serve under prepared students? How can objective data be changed to handle areas with smaller FTES generation? (A- It generally does not change the list-subjective and admin serve a big factor)
- When first planning regeneration, did you consider using a rubric or trying to fix ours (and use other colleges)?
 - Ours is broader and includes more people; most are top-down and ours is not. Asking to start from scratch is a big task for 4 months
 - There was disagreement in the taskforce of whether to consider other colleges
 - Affirmative action- Can we have a built-in system to even it out?
- What are we accomplishing today? (A- Just feedback today, next time you can vote against it, but then we would stay with the current system; the taskforce thinks this is better)
- Librarians are not under either of those, which is disadvantageous
- Since you do both-do you want to be in one or the other?
 - Primarily as service faculty
 - Do you have a solution?
 - No
 - VP- Should come from the Dean but they are under Academic Affairs, disconcerting that there are only 2 doing the subjective
- Will there be changes for next read? (A- that's the expectation, to incorporate feedback, or an explanation why they can't)

3. AP 7120 Faculty Hiring Policy (First Read with MQDD edits) (L. Baxley and C. Moore - 15 min.)

Background: BP 7120 Faculty Recruitment and Hiring and AP 7120 Planning, Recruiting, and Selecting Full-time and Part-time Academic Positions had not been reviewed since 2010. Accordingly, a task force was created in the of Fall of 2016 to review and revise, as necessary, the policy and the procedure. The task force revised BP 7120 and AP 7120 and brought them to the Senate Council for feedback at the September and December meetings. The task force then met and worked collaboratively with the Vice President of Human Resources to make additional revisions. The Academic Senate Council approved BP 7120 & AP 7120 at the January 26, 2018 meeting. AP 7120 has returned to the Senate Council twice as additional modifications have been forthcoming. It has returned again as it now includes revisions that speak to Minimum Qualifications. It is on the Senate Council agenda for feedback. Upon a second read and approval of the Academic Senate Council, AP7120 will be placed on the Board of Trustee’s agenda, consistent with Cuesta’s policies and [Education Code 87360](#).

Supporting Documents:

- [AP 7120 Clean with MQDD edits](#)
- [AP 7120 Redline with MQDD edits](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council ~~provides feedback on~~ moves to approve AP7120 with MQDD edits.

Approved with Consensus with the following feedback:

- Does that include reading transcripts
 - Yes, but I will double check with Melissa; won’t be determining equivalency, but if they meet the MQs of the MQDD
- What about MQDDs that require certain courses?
 - That would be up to the screening committee
- It could use clarity so we know who vets it
- We can still vote to approve this today
 - Yes, we can approve and it will go to June BOT
- Plenary passed a white paper on faculty hiring and paper says that faculty should determine if applicants meet MQDD
- Section 3F-EEO –trained-the committee chair needs extra training
 - This is addressed in 4K
- Does this need to come back?
 - The process is clear, but HR needs to be sure to update processes so they follow this
- Add to hiring checklist: “I have consulted with the chair...”
- Sometimes hiring committee has an optimistic view on equivalency. Is there an ultimate check?
 - We should have training for the committee
 - This is not the way the process is right now. Are there suggestions?
 - No, but someone has to have the authority to ensure the minimum qualifications are met.
 - Is it a rule versus exception? Is that breaking it all down enough?
 - Ultimately VPHR is responsible. That is built in by law.
 - Should be degree yes or no and everything else goes to the equivalency committee
 - Should be in the HR paperwork and training

- Can we move to approve?

4. SLOA Committee Elimination (Second Read)

(S. Iredale - 10 min.)

Background: The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOA Committee) is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. (See Academic Senate By-Laws Section 2(A)(4)) The SLOA Committee researches and evaluates various SLOA “best practices” with the goal of making recommendations for the development and assessment of program and course level outcomes. This committee works collaboratively with the Faculty Professional Development Committee to bring speakers and workshops to educate the college community about SLOA matters.

Moreover, there are two faculty members that have release time to serve as SLOA co-coordinators. Their job description is as follows: “Under the general direction of the Assistant Superintendent/ VP of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate, and in collaboration with Institutional Research and the SLO Assessment Committee, the faculty SLO Assessment Co-Coordinators will work as a team to provide leadership and guidance to division faculty in the following areas: the production of course and program-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and assessment plans; course and program-level assessment mechanisms; the establishment of course and program level SLO assessment cycles; the development, alignment and assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs); and the development of faculty professional development activities related to SLO production, SLO assessment, and the use of assessment data to improve programs.”

The SLOA committee proposes the elimination of this Academic Senate sub-committee and recommends that the two SLOA Co-Coordinators be added to the Institutional Program Planning & Review Committee as permanent members. It is their view that, based on the description of the SLOA Committee and the job description of the SLOA Co-Coordinators, the functionality of the committee will continue through the efforts of the SLOA Co-Coordinators with oversight from the IPPR Committee.

Supporting Documents:

- [By-Laws of the Constitution of the Academic Senate](#)
- [SLOA Committee Description](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves elimination of the SLOA committee contingent upon the SLOA co-coordinators being made permanent members of the IPPR committee.

Approved with Consensus

5. Amend Description and Faculty Composition of IPPR Committee (Second Read) (S. Iredale - 10 min.)

Background: As discussed above, the SLOA committee proposes the elimination of this Academic Senate sub-committee and recommends that the two SLOA Co-Coordinators be added to the Institutional Program Planning & Review Committee as permanent members. It is their view that, based on the description of the SLOA Committee and the job description of the SLOA Co-Coordinators, the functionality of the committee will continue through the efforts of the SLOA Co-Coordinators with oversight from the IPPR Committee. This view is consistent with the IPPR Committee description which requires “Consult(ation) with the SLOA Coordinator and SLOA Committee, (about) changes related to the integration of student learning outcomes and SLO assessment with Program Review and the IPPR document and process.”

The Committee description would be amended to remove the reference to the “SLOA Committee” and the composition of the IPPR Committee would be adjusted to add the two SLOA Co-Coordinators. These revisions are supported by the IPPR Committee.

Supporting Documents:

- [IPPR Committee Description](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the proposed amendments to the IPPR committee description and composition.

Approved with Consensus with the following feedback:

- Not replacing 2 faculty positions, just adding two SLOA faculty? (A- correct)

6. AP 3570 Smoking and Tobacco Use (First Read) (T. Downing & C. Moore - 15 min.)

Background: In December, 2017 the Cuesta College Board of Trustees joined with over 1800 colleges and universities nationwide, including the UC system as of January, 2014 and the CSU system as of April, 2017, by approving BP 3570 a “Smoke and Tobacco Free” policy – to be implemented January, 2019.

The Tobacco Free Campus taskforce and Employee Wellness committee members representing faculty, administration, staff, Human Resources, and campus police collaborated to propose revision to AP 3570 that support BP 3570. Legal counsel has reviewed the proposal to ensure that it meets requirements of state law.

AP 3570 has been revised to summarize the policy and identify potential challenges, to define key terms, to detail policy and policy review, describe state enforcement procedures, and provide notice requirements.

Supporting documents:

- [AP3570 red line](#)
- [AP3570 clean](#)
- [BP 3570](#)
- [Implementation Taskforce timeline](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on AP3570.

Feedback provided:

- Will police be looking for violators? Is a student sitting in their own car in violation?
 - Yes
 - Police will not be actively seeking violators in cars (soft touch initially)
- What if they are regularly smoking in a car?
- Public safety is going to have a “light touch”
- The specific wording regarding the light touch was pulled by Legal, but it will be the approach; we wanted to emphasize tools for a healthy lifestyle; no text on fines in the AP

- Butt pick-up day was yesterday, spoke to students, everyone knew it was coming, interest in stress-relieving tools, got contact information and students want to give input to the group (one said he would smoke less if Cuesta got a ping pong table on campus)
- Will you study/track how students are affected, if they drop out, etc.
 - We have the statewide data
 - We are surveying students before and after implementation
- There are lots of reasons (mental health/anxiety) why students don't come to campus. Encourage them to see a counselor so they can add DE or build in breaks so they are supported during their academic experience.
- Gabe was asked to join the tobacco-free implementation committee (Gabe has a PhD in tobacco use)
- There was discussion on whether we could approve and we decided to just approve providing feedback as listed

7. Graduation Program Change (First Read)- Tabled because of time (C. Moore - 10 min.)

Background: Every year, the Academic Senate reviews the years of service of retiring faculty members to determine if they warrant the title of Emeritus Faculty with all the rights and privileges associated therewith. According to [BP 7210.3 Faculty Emeritus Status](#), “Upon retirement, regular (tenured) faculty shall be eligible for Emeritus Faculty Status if they have served Cuesta College for minimum of 10 years. Temporary faculty shall be eligible for Emeritus Faculty Status if they have served Cuesta College for a minimum of 20 semesters (not including summer sessions and semesters do not have to be consecutive).” Traditionally, the graduation program of Emeritus Status awardees has listed “years of service” as calculated using the formula described in BP 7210.3. At the April 13, 2018, meeting the Academic Senate Council voiced concerns around publication of the years of service using this calculation in the graduation program. It is too late to change the graduation program for Spring 2018 but it can be changed for Spring 2019. It is suggested that the graduation program either omit any reference to years of service or change it to “date of hire.” This proposal does NOT change the formula for calculation emeritus status years of service. It simply changes the wording of the graduation program.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council provides feedback on the proposal to change the graduation program wording regarding years of service.

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS: *Please share these items with your division faculty.*
 Counseling would like typed report option here each month

VII. SUMMIT ITEMS

Are there any items, campus issues, and/or divisional concerns/issues that anyone has that he/she feels need to be taken to “Summit” for answers/clarification?

Is it possible to have open gym for students and faculty for stress management and health?

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

- | | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. CCFT- Debra Stokes Greg Baxley | 6. FPDC–C. Wilshusen |
| 2. Curriculum–A. Kahane Text Flex 4/27 and 5/3
10-1 rm 2412; proposal limit 100 total all of campus and 25 per division each month; all proposals cleared by rep | 7. DE Committee–M. Fleming |
| 3. Workload Committee– C. Moore | 8. Book of the Year–C. Love |
| 4. College Council–S. Millich | 9. Faculty Lecture Series–L Baxley |
| | 10. CTE Liaison- J. Stokes |

5. Planning & Budget—C. Moore

IX. OTHER REPORTS—AS NEEDED (email Stacy if you have a report)

1. Basic Skills Initiative—R. Voge
2. SLOA Committee—N. Higgins/S. Iredale
3. IPPR—S. Iredale
4. Sabbatical Leave
5. Web Committee

CCFT report to the Academic

The All Member meeting was Thursday April 19 at 3 pm. I know many of you had conflicts and could not attend. The Approved minutes should be posted shortly to the CCFT website. These include a summary of all the grievances and disciplinary actions that our two grievance offices supported.

Our major effort between now and the end of the semester is to complete our membership audit with a signed member update card from all members. Please send in your membership update cards to Ed Conklin. He can look up your member ID too, simplifying the process for you.

We expect to hear about the Janus decision between now and June. We had an extensive discussion about how to prepare and respond in the Council meeting yesterday. We will communicate with you right away when we know the details.

We are also concerned that many PT faculty have not joined the union, because they think the fair share contributions are member deductions. Please tell your colleagues that if they did not receive a ballot for the just completed ratification vote, then they are not a member. The updated membership forms are posted on the CCFT website, on the FORMS tab. Please download, fill out and send to Ed Conklin.

Don't miss the opportunity to participate in the next officer election and contract ratification vote next Spring.

The Benefits committee has recommended that we keep our current medical insurance. The rates increased 1% or less. The Council voted in favor of this yesterday. Remember the open enrollment period for faculty medical insurance is over the summer and closes just after classes begin.

Julie Hoffman is still collecting suggestions to improve the faculty evaluation forms.

Next Meeting: Friday May 11, 2018 | 1:30-3:30 | Room 3134/N3213

Stacy Millich
Academic Senate President
805.546.3100 ext. 3270
Stacy_millich@cuesta.edu

Cherie Moore
Academic Senate Vice President
805.546.3100 ext. 2761
cmoore@cuesta.edu

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

Academic and Professional (10+1) Matters:

1. Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
2. Degree and certificate requirements.
3. Grading policies.
4. Educational program development.
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success.
6. College governance structures as related to faculty roles.
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes.
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities.
9. Processes for program review.
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development.
11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon.

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