



Academic Senate Council Minutes
May 11, 2018: 1:30-3:30 p.m
SLO Room 3134 (PDC) | NCC Room 3213 (Polycom)

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| x | Stacy Millich President | x | Cherie Moore Vice-President | | 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 |
| x | Dave Fernandez Engineering & Tech. | x | Matt Fleming English | | Michelle Craig Fine Arts | | 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 |
| x | Catherine Ruiz Nursing | | bree valle Performing Arts | x | Patrick Len Physical Sciences | x | Lise Mifsud/ Fionnuala Butler Social Science |
| x | Donna Bower/ Laura Harris Student Development and Success | | | | | | |

Cards: Mike Time Keeper: Kevin Computer Patrick

- I. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** (1 min.)
Approved with Consensus

- II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (April 27, 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.*

- IV. **PRESIDENT’S REPORT** (10 min)
 - **Spring Plenary Resolutions of Note**
 - [AB 705 & Identifying Appropriate Assessment Measures](#)
 - [AB 705 Support Request for Legal Interpretation and Delayed Implementation](#)
 - [Opposition to Online Community College](#)
 - [Support AB 2621 Calling for a Feasibility Study of Online College](#)
 - [Support of AB 2767 to Study Funding Formula](#)

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. **At-Large Senator Positions (removed from agenda-need to have election)**
2. **Equal Employment Opportunity Plan for 2018-2021 (First Read)**
3. **Textbook Affordability OER Grant (Second Read)**
4. **Faculty Prioritization Task Force Proposal (Second Read)**
5. **AP 7530 Smoking and Tobacco Use (Second Read)**
6. **Chancellors Vote of No Confidence**
7. **Graduation Program Change (First Read)**

1. **At-Large Senator Positions**

(S. Millich - 10 min.)

Background: The two-year terms of the Full-Time At-Large and North County At-Large Senators expire at the end of this term. According to the By-Laws of the Academic Senate, the at-large representative positions are two-year terms and are elected in the off years from President and Vice-President elections, which means that elections are to be held this year for positions starting next fall. Nominations were sought from all faculty to fill each of the two positions. The deadline for nominations was set for May 9, 2018 at 5 pm.

If more than one interested nominee is received by the deadline, the By-Laws indicate that an election occur. In light of the late date in the semester, it is requested that the election occur in the Fall. In the event that there is only one nominee for a particular position, the Academic Senate Council may appoint the nominee to the position without an election of the entire faculty body.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council appoint a Full-Time At-Large and/or North County At-Large Senator if there is only one nominee for the position(s). If an election is required for either position that the election occur in the Fall.

2. **Equal Employment Opportunity Plan for 2018-2021 (First Read) (M. Richardson 15 min)**

Background: The Chancellor's Office requires an EEO Plan to be submitted every 3 years, no later than June 30th. The Equity Action Committee approved/endorsed the 2018-2021 EEO Plan on April 18th. This item is on for approval despite it being a first read given the June 30 deadline.

Supporting Documents:

- [EEO Plan 2018-2021](#)
- [EEO Plan 2018-2021 redline](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the EEO Plan.

Approved with Consensus with the following feedback:

- This has to be passed by 6/20
- HR Director says Title language added to the plan
- Latinx versus Hispanic?
 - Title 5 language is Hispanic and not caught up with current Latinx term

- Bullet 1-Comparing % of various groups in analysis section; not seeing that component in other colleges
- Policy statement- cultural competencies-should be put in the definition section (not just policy)
 - All of these are in Title 5
- Re: Applicant pool: Asian Indians?
 - This is a Title 5 requirement
- %s should be labeled on bar graph
- Multiple tables should list “ns”
- Ideal language to Cabrillo College EEO plan....EEO officer component Heading: Election Procedures. Screening of interviews committees conflict with our policy?
 - There is separate training for EEO Rep on committee; this does not take over our policy
- Under E, EEO officer must approve all materials.
 - Our policy refers to this
- Would you add non-binary gender to the 3rd category?
 - Title 5 doesn't require us to report this yet
- Title 5 is the EEO issues and Equity Committee can do the policy?
 - It is strictly EEO and HR is doing all of this now
- What can be changed from feedback today?
- SP/LA/Cabrillo/Sierra just have bar graphs and no analysis
 - This is feedback we got about needing to improve
- Is there a parenthetical we can add?
 - Yes, we can do N2
 - Also we will change: exercising cultural competency, label percentages, and N will be listed

3. Textbook Affordability OER Grant (Second Read) (K. Bontenbal & Q. Dang - 10 min.)

Background: Cuesta College is seeking a grant with COOL 4 ED California Open Online Library for Education (<http://www.cool4ed.org/>) to address the high cost of textbooks. The accompanying document gives details about this grant project. The grant is due by the end of June 2018 and needs approval by the Academic Senate. Since this is the last Academic Senate Council meeting before the grant application is due, we are seeking the Academic Senate's approval to apply for this grant. The grant application had not been released by the time is agenda item was submitted, so we are supplying you with the details on the attached document. Some of the details, specifically the budget items, may adjust slightly after we get confirmation from Santa Barbara City college, our partner in this grant, regarding their commitment.

Supporting Documents:

- [Cuesta College OER Grant](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves Cuesta College applying for the Textbook Affordability OER Grant with feedback provided at the May 11, 2018 meeting.

Approved with Consensus with the following feedback:

- Are 300 dollar ones included?
- Why not the bookstore staff instead of the library staff?
 - We want faculty working with faculty and the bookstore is not stable right now
- Will there be books for these in the bookstore?
 - Yes, copies for the students to purchase

- There are lots of books for 50 dollars or less; are we sure these will be less?
 - Most books identified are at least 100 dollars
- Students ask counselors how much a book is going to cost so can this information be made public?
 - Let's post which ones will be free.
 - Some announce in Welcome Letters
- Some faculty are not aware of this

4. Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process (Second Read) (B. Clark & BA. 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. At the April 27, 2018 meeting, the Academic Senate Council provided feedback, which resulted in some changes to the process, which are highlighted in the text below.

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 the same process, but with different objective criteria.
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. All committee faculty and administrators will vote for both service and teaching faculty to determine the Subjective Ranking.
4. 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.
5. 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 each year, 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.
6. The Subjective (Qualitative) process has been updated to ensure meaningful dialogue takes place before the final vote is conducted.

7. The waitlist will be removed as an Objective criteria, but can be explained in the Subjective rationale. Because of this change the Fill Rate will be capped at 100% for the Fill Rate Objective criteria.
8. Each year, the process will be reviewed by an Academic Senate taskforce for evaluation of the above changes and for continued edits and improvements, including, but not limited to the review of other college processes and the elimination or addition of select objective criteria and weighing.

Supporting Documents:

- [The Prioritization Process Handbook \(Existing\)](#)
- [Faculty Prioritization Dialog Process Rubric](#)
- [Faculty Prioritization Position Rationale Form](#)
- [Faculty Prioritization Task Force Recommendations Power point](#)

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

Approved with Consensus with the following feedback:

- Are waitlists used for service faculty? (no)
- Thank you for all of your time on this
- Thanks Cherie, thanks committee, the process hasn't worked in the past, always been a problem
- Information from Stacy from other colleges was given to the committee, some committee members were advocating for a bigger change, but we got to a point where most of us agreed
- There are misconceptions that we didn't modify- we did changes how weighting was done, faculty role in the objective process, % decrease for admin and objective, now admin votes separately in same room as the committee, and subjective process. Let's see if this works and decide if scrap it next time. This is the biggest change since we started in 2009. We did make major changes.
- Could we do a parallel process to show this one and a different one?
 - We will be doing this comparing this to our previous year

5. AP 3570 Smoking and Tobacco Use (Second 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.

At the April 27, 2018 Academic Senate Council meeting, this item was on for feedback and no changes were requested.

Supporting documents:

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

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves AP3570.

Approved with Consensus with the following feedback:

Enforcement section:

- Visitor violation subject to “stay away”? (Already exists)
- Any person can report? (yes)
- No different than any other violation; follows same process

6. Vote of No Confidence For Chancellor Eloy Oakley**(S. Millich -20 min)**

Background: The Academic Senate of California Community Colleges has expressed concerns over matters such as the proposed funding formula, the proposed fully online community college, and the implementation of AB 705; yet, California Community College Chancellor, Eloy Oakley, has persistently declined to engage in the consultative processes of participatory governance established in law (AB 1725). Chancellor Oakley has also excluded faculty leadership groups from policy meetings. Therefore, some Academic Senate Councils, including San Diego Mesa College and Glendale Community College have passed, respectively, a Resolution Affirming a Vote of No Confidence in Chancellor Oakley and a Motion Affirming a Vote of No Confidence in Chancellor Oakley. Glendale’s Motion opines that “Chancellor Oakley is failing to fulfill the California Community College mission, and by doing so, is actively harming the California Community College System.” A discussion about whether to join those Colleges by approving a Resolution Affirming a Vote of No Confidence is before the Academic Senate Council for consideration.

Supporting Documents:

- [Resolution Affirming a Vote of No Confidence in Chancellor Eloy Oakley](#)

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the Resolution Affirming a Vote of No Confidence in Chancellor Eloy Oakley.

Approved with Consensus TO TABLE FOR FALL with the following feedback:

- Senate President suggests tabling until Fall and redraft our concerns with process instead of the focus on the person. Wants senate feedback
- Counselors have strong opposition to this
- One of constituent not in support; if we do have it I would like more information of what he did wrong (this was all in President’s report)
- Would Fall change our outcome? I am against not doing it for fear. These 4 colleges stepped forward and we should not wait to see if it is safe.
- I am in support of a resolution because of consultation and appreciation of the participatory process. The chancellor speaks well but he is not following participatory process or collaborating with academic state senate.
- Executive Board is not in agreement but waiting on the state senate
- My division can’t vote today
- Some are not connecting the dots from the beginning report of this meeting

- Math email concerns were read:
 - I have two main concerns about the no confidence vote: passing a No Confidence resolution as a single college and hurrying into a vote of No Confidence prior to another type of communication.
 - I do not feel our own Cuesta No Confidence vote would move us any closer to an objective of forcing the collaboration required by AB1725 and may in fact have more negative consequences than positive ones at this juncture in time.
 - Any significant action we consider should be done with a large group of colleges -- whether it's a resolution or other communication, it should be signed by many colleges, not just one. A vote of No Confidence one college at a time puts us on a short list of schools that made an extreme statement. This could backfire for our college. I also do not think it will lead to the outcome we would hope for.
 - Could we consider starting with a resolution written in the affirmative? A resolution, stated in the affirmative about the collaboration we want to happen, following law (AB 1725), could still be communicated with our representatives as a starting point this spring. We could do this as a single college, but of course any communication carries more weight if it is supported by a large group of colleges. If we, collectively with other colleges, build a trail of communications, the group of colleges would then have greater impact down the road if it is determined that we needed to vote No Confidence --- especially as a new governor enters the arena.
 - I would support a vote of no confidence in Chancellor Eloy Oakley if and only if it were done on a state wide level, such as at Plenary. Given the way that Cuesta College has been utilizing the stability funding model, a vote by our college could be interpreted as retribution for the chancellor's proposal to restrict this approach. If our vote were interpreted as retribution, it would minimize the affect of such a vote, in my opinion. Given that we will have a new governor soon, we may want to focus our efforts on joining with other academic senates to make a change through the political process.
 - I am against a vote of no confidence for Chancellor Oakley. He has a perspective that few on this campus understand or know. He was superintendent-chancellor of Long Beach City College when they did away with the traditional placement model and used high school performance to place students in math and English. Their success and pass through rates increased. I can understand his desire to change the way we've been doing 'business.' It hasn't been working well for many students. I've seen it teaching basic skills these past 10 years. I think it's time for change, too.
- I think a no confidence vote should be something that comes directly from ASCCC. If the consultation between faculty and the chancellor's office regarding the interpretation of AB705, the on-line college, and the changes to the funding model do not improve over the summer, then we have another plenary session in the Fall, and our Academic Senate can put forward a resolution that can be voted on by all community college faculty representatives.
- I don't think the time is right yet for this.
- Some appreciated his focus on Equity (others commented his work on these projects in inequitable, as shown by President Regina Stroud)
- We need more time to engage in deeper discussions
- I get that we want to be careful, but shouldn't say this good can be traded for bad.
- Didn't seem constructive; should be more than just a vote of no confidence
- Counselors would have issues; need more time to look at details and history

- Why not any statewide resolution? (Chancellor's; office altercation at Plenary was discussed)

7. Graduation Program Change (First Read)

(S. Millich - 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~~ **approves** change to the graduation program wording regarding years of service. **(Amended to approve)**

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS: *Please share these items with your division faculty.*

1. OEI Acceptance and Opportunity: The Distance Education Committee is excited to share that Cuesta College was accepted to join the Online Education Initiative Consortium as part of the 2018 Student Equity Cohort. We will join a group of innovative colleges committed to significantly improving access, student success and equity in online learning. **The first step as a new Consortium College is to begin planning for your local OEI team, which includes identifying team members and conferring with the OEI Implementations and invite faculty to participate in the Course Design Academy.**

Most importantly, improving student success begins with faculty professional development, which is offered through an ongoing partnership between the OEI and @ONE. With their combined network of CCC peer faculty, instructional designers, and accessibility specialists, they have helped faculty redesign over 100 courses to align with the best practices found in the [OEI Course Design Rubric](#) (included in our Distance Education AP4105). As a result, courses that are designed aligned to the course design rubric are seeing an almost 5% increase in student success rates when compared to similar courses systemwide! As a new Consortium College, our faculty now have the opportunity to participate in this professional development through the [OEI Course Design Academy](#), a free program that promotes student success, ensures equitable access, and enhances the teaching experience in online courses. As a participant in Course Design Academy, faculty receive:

- Confidential feedback and course design recommendations from fellow online faculty through peer online course review.
- Support from a Canvas Course Design Specialist (CCDS) to assist instructors with applying the feedback and getting the most from the tools and features in Canvas.
- Hands-on assistance, as needed, from Accessibility Specialists to make courses fully 508 compliant!

- Badges awarded for aligning with each section of the OEI Course Design Rubric: *Content Presentation, Interaction, Assessment, and Accessibility*.

This opportunity is open to all full-time and adjunct instructors who **teach a fully online** course that is **part of an ADT (Associates Degree for Transfer), General Education Transfer Pattern (CSU or IGETC), or CTE (Career Technical Education)** program. The instructor must have **taught the course for at least one full term** in Canvas prior to joining the Course Design Academy.

We are looking for experienced faculty to become members of the local peer review team at Cuesta, faculty to work on redesigning courses to align with the OEI rubric, commit to submitting a course for the exchange, and participate in the professional development. We are working on stipends and other incentives for existing Distance Education Faculty to work on the team as an Course Reviewer and/or redesign courses.

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?

- Dismayed by Jeffrey Wallace (Social Sciences Division) passing and no message by the President (comment was made that sometimes it takes time to coordinate family members to get all of the facts straight before announcing)
- What is the progress about an open gym? (Comment was made to ask Allison for an update)

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

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. CCFT- Debra Stakes | 6. FPDC–C. Wilshusen |
| 2. Curriculum–A. Kahane | 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 |
| 5. Planning & Budget– C. Moore | 10. CTE Liaison- J. Stokes |

CCFT report to the Senate

We have had our last EB and Council meeting for the semester.

Our new Treasurer, Elizabeth Lobo will begin in July. She will go to a 2 day training in Sacramento during that month.

Ed Conklin retires as Treasurer’s with many thank yous for a job well done. He is already actively training Elizabeth to assure a smooth hand-off.

Greg Baxley begins as lead negotiator this summer. He will take a 4 day training on “winning a great contract” at the CFT Summer School.

CCFT is missing a couple of dozen member update cards to complete our required membership audit. This is in preparation for a decision from SCOTUS about fair share fees. We invite non-members to submit a membership form now to still be counted within our bargaining unit. Greg’s email this week summarized the advantages of Union membership, not the least of which is to present a united front to the District in demanding fair increases in compensation.

The revised salary schedules will go to the Board for approval in June. We will be working toward a sign-off on

Article 4 and Article 5 language after that.

The other adjustments to Article 4 include accurately including the language from the Longevity Grievance MOU and the increased payments for Work Experience advisors.

For Article 5 we expand the language that describes the work of librarians and counselors and add language to describe the Instructional Designer. We wrote this language to specify a 197 day position, but the paperwork needs to catch up. This will make sure that Cynthia is fully compensated for her work in the summer and between semesters.

We also make the language for Division Chair duties to be consistent between the Student Service and Academic Chairs.

The proposed revised process of selecting Chairs will be addressed in the Fall. Some concerns from PT faculty need to be addressed. This change would impact all faculty, so the EB decided that more input is necessary. Need to look at compensation for PT committee members and participation in Division meetings in general.

And finally the adjustments will incorporate language that guarantees you 4 full days after finals before grades are due.

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

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

Next Meeting: August 24, 2018 | 1:30-3:30 | Room TBA/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/>