

Yuba College  
**Academic Senate**  
M I N U T E S  
October 23, 2008

**Senators Present:** Nickolson (president), May (vice-president), Boren, Buckley, Canto-Lugo, Davidson, Devries, Heaton, Kemble, Kitchen, Morgan, Ramsey, Willson

**Guests:** Dobbs, Edmunds, Hulin, Lopez, McKeever, Monohan, Smith

Meeting called to order y at 12:00.

1. Agenda: approved.
2. Minutes: approved, with corrections
  - a. **Further correction to minutes from Oct. 9, 2008:** In those minutes, it was reported that Thoo argued that sabbatical replacements are every bit as important as regular one, so he was concerned at lowering the number of members on the hiring committee. In an email (email follows minutes), Thoo clarified that his concern was not “for lowering the number of members on the hiring committee for sabbatical replacements in general. I only opined a concern for lowering the number of \*faculty\* on the hiring committee.”
  - b. There was some discussion of the Mathews email pointing out that the minutes are publicly available, so Kemble’s levity might make the Senate appear unprofessional. Kemble noted that the message had gone out publicly by accident; everyone agreed that they had assumed this. There was a range of responses, from the suggestion that a sense of humor is needed in these heavy times, to a call to consider the suggestion seriously. Kemble felt alternately praised and chastised.
3. Committee reports
  - a. **Diversity Team** (Lopez): Adrian Lopez introduced a document that develops strategies to infuse the framework of ten themes, presented to the Senate last year, into the District in areas such as student services, etc. The first draft was developed among the Team with feedback from a number of sources, including Nickolson, the Curriculum Committee, and the Woodland Senate. Lopez requested substantive feedback from the Senate as well. The goal is to produce a final draft with faculty and administrative buy-in by the end of the semester. He will return in two weeks to continue this discussion. Kemble, as at-large representative, offered to send an electronic version to all faculty so that division reps could follow up with emails requesting feedback from their constituents.
  - b. **Study Abroad:** Edmunds presented the Study Abroad Committee’s purpose statement and noted that the program is up and running. This is the culmination of a process begun many years ago, when he, Sealander, and Murai, under Dr. Lowe, produced field trip guidelines. Dr. Harrington asked that this process go through the Senate—and voilá, here they are.

There are two kind of Study Abroad programs: 1) Semester-length programs, which Yuba used to be involved in (Edmunds taught a semester in England). At the time, Yuba

was part of a consortium of schools that pooled resources, but that consortium broke apart. Many colleges have now started their own consortia, so there are possibilities that Yuba could join it. However, the future of this kind of SAP is “in the future and dicey.”

2) Short term, which would consist of 10-18 days. Several of these are in the works.

These short term programs have strict timelines; for Edmunds’ 14-day trip to England, planned for Dec. 2009, the paperwork will need to be in by January. Paperwork includes a course study outline and a detailed and specific itinerary. In response to May, Edmunds said that the first under these new guidelines might be a course during Summer 2009 by Rubiales, though there is some question as to whether the paperwork will have been in in time (there is a hope for some flexibility, as this would be the first under the new guidelines). Otherwise, Edmund’s course would likely be first, though there are some rumblings from Murai and Julian.

Short-term programs have variable units, ranging from 1-3 units each. Edmunds expects his to be a 2-unit course with some advance and follow-up class time.

- c. **Ad Hoc Hiring Committee** (May): May announced that the committee should have a hiring manual to look over soon, but in the meantime the committee has some recommendations about the interviewing process, including: there should be fewer questions (as few as half as many); the questions should be open-ended; and follow-up questions should be encouraged, not merely allowed. The process has been painstaking, so there are no detailed recommendations yet. There is further information in the Vice President’s report (following the minutes).

One other important recommendation: the committee recommends that the Senate Vice President and a designee from the administration should run an orientation meeting for all hiring committee chairs. This administrative designee should be up to the administration, though for obvious reasons should not include the Director of Human Resources.

Willson recommended the committee also look at the application. May affirmed they would look at this, but not in time for this round of hires.

- d. **Faculty Evaluations** (Willson): The committee has developed a philosophy from which the procedural questions will be developed. They presented the document to the YCFA, who expressed a concern over the issue of the “burden of proof.” The responsibility is on the evaluatee to prove him/herself, perhaps with a portfolio (for lack of a better word). They will be reexamining tenure evaluation as well. Suggestions can be sent to committee members or to the wiki.

Smith noted that the concerns expressed by the YCFA were not official comments but just “people talking.” The idea was that fostering accountability is always good, but they wanted to encourage feedback from constituents. Willson pointed out that this is just the philosophy; there’s a lot more work to be done to make it concrete.

Davidson wondered, if the philosophy of the process places the burden of proof on the

evaluatee, what happens if the evaluatee’s standards of “good instructor” differ from the evaluators’? Evaluatees would be happy to provide evidence within clear categories, but without such guidance, what the evaluatee thinks could be off the mark of what the college thinks. Willson said that she doesn’t know that the college thinks.

4. **Presidents Report** (following the minutes)

- a. Nickolson added several items to her report:
  - i. Nickolson handed out a draft of a new “guiding framework”—statements of vision, mission, and core values—that have developed to move from the previous District-focused statements to a more college-focused framework. She requested feedback before the end of the semester.
  - ii. Nickolson handed out the State Academic Senate’s “Discipline List Revision Proposals” and requested the Senate get feedback from their constituents.
  - iii. Nickolson wanted to make the Senate aware that, the previous day, she had been requested to sign a matriculation report that she had not had a chance to look at. Since matriculation reports involve allocating funds, she felt this was particularly inappropriate, but part of a growing pattern. Years ago, she said, a matriculation committee would make a report and present it to the Senate. This time, she received it so late (it was due Oct. 31) that we can’t appropriately act on it—indeed, Galamba from the Woodland Senate had not even received the document. Nickolson refused to sign it without going through the proper process. We must not allow the Senate President’s signature to become simply a rubber stamp.
- b. Davidson wanted to clarify the President’s report’s claim that the state budget “may put new positions into jeopardy”—does “new” refer to recent hires, or to possible future hires? Nickolson affirmed that this referred to future hires.
- c. Nickolson reported that she had emailed the State Academic Senate president to ask the state’s policy on issues like taking a stance on Proposition 8. Discussion:
  - i. Davidson noted that he had brought the suggestion up in the Senate because the ASYC had told him they could not take a political stance. He expressed concern that the students would perceive an imbalance of conservative views on the campus. ASYC plans to work with other parties to get education and information on the campus; the problem is that the vote is only ten days away. He does not see Prop 8 as a political issue, but a rights and discrimination issue. If the proposed amendment had to do with interracial couples, he argued, it would likely not be seen as a political issue. And it’s not often we have the opportunity and responsibility to address issues that deal with *rights* being taken from our students and community citizenry.

He read from the proposed Diversity Team’s Diversity Plan, which states in their “Principles of Community” that YCCD will “affirm the dignity of all individuals and strive to uphold a just community in which actions of discrimination and hate are not tolerated” (bullet item 2) and “we confront and reject all manifestations of discrimination” (bullet item 5). These statements can be found on page 8 of the Oct. 17 draft of the Diversity Plan, which has been emailed to all faculty. He

fears that we use all the right words, but when given the opportunity do not take much action.

- ii. In response to Boren's query about what Davidson proposes the Senate do, Davidson wanted to determine what the Senate response would be if this passes. Currently there is only 1 out of 150 faculty members who is "out," although it would be highly improbable that there is only one LBGT faculty member out of 150. There is also no LGBT club on campus... why is that? He offered these points to demonstrate how easy it is to perceive that the college is not impartial to the LGBT community.
  - iii. Boren noted that bringing the issue before the Senate makes it a political issue and puts the Senate in a difficult position. He would support actions to educate the community about the issue, but taking a stance on a Proposition puts the Senate on shaky ground.
  - iv. Heaton argued that this is a tough call because people with religious convictions want their side heard as well
  - v. Smith made the distinction between being reactive and proactive; Yuba has a tendency to be reactive. But here we have *the* civil rights issue of our moment; as a historian, he does not want to miss the opportunity to be on the right side. This is an issue about consistency, about right v. wrong.
  - vi. Heaton welcomed a forum to deal with all Propositions since so many of them are confusing.
  - vii. Willson noted that clubs are initiated by students or faculty members, so there should be no reason not to have an LGBT club. Davidson replied that some students had been inspired after the National Coming Out Day seminar on October 15 to start a club—and found themselves having to walk past the aggressive, bull-horned preacher on the way to Bowman's office. He never heard from Bowman about whether the students actually did proceed or whether they were intimidated. Similarly, he has had to provide a safe, alternative testing time for a math student who was threatened after being seen with her girlfriend. The LBGT community does not feel safe at Yuba College.
5. **Vice President's Report** (following the minutes): No questions.
  6. **Old Business**
    - a. **District Administrative Hiring Process:** Nickolson reported that she still had received no response to her requests. All is status quo.
  7. **New Business: none**

Adjourned at 12:55, amidst continued discussion about Prop 8, the LBGT community, the preacher and his group's lawsuit against the college, and Marc Flacks' forums on various election issues.

YUBA COLLEGE

Academic Senate

TO: Academic Senate Members

FROM: Helen Nickolson

SUBJECT: Weekly P Report

DATE: October 22, 2008

- I asked previous Senate presidents to sign the Response to the Board and mailed it to individual Trustees.
- This past Tuesday I attended my last SLO meeting. Tim May, as VP, will be taking my place. At this point, all eight institutional SLOs have been completed and the research/assessment being conducted will be part of an annual report which will be publicized every summer by the Institutional Effectiveness Officer. Both Yuba College and Woodland Community College will now have their own SLO committees which will focus on program and course SLOs.
- I heard a presentation by Drexel University representatives. Their focus is on graduate programs, especially programs will lead toward administrative positions. Drexel is private and new to the Sacramento area.
- I reported to the D&D group on the meeting that the Senate sponsored on open educational resources, which centered on lowering textbook costs. This is a very critical issue for our students. The Senate last year passed a resolution to join CCCOER but we have not heard from the Chancellor or Board of Trustees if, in fact, they would like to do so.
- I also explained to the D&D group the Senate's position on the grade change procedure. The form, signed by the student and dean, which needs to be turned in is very confusing and needs to be modified so that the Academic Senate Standards Sub-Committee has the appropriate statements and documentation. VP Trutna will work on revising the form and clarifying instructions.
- At College Council we discussed:

- The use of facilities and the need to have more custodians. It appears that after weekend events in particular, Yuba custodians have to work much harder because some areas are left in terrible condition. Actually, I was shocked by some of the stories I heard.
  - Campus climate and safety as it relates to public access and individuals or groups who want to exercise their right to free speech but are insensitive to the rights of others.
  - Accreditation, the midterm report and the substantive change report. These reports may be found on the YCCD site under committees and under institutional effectiveness.
  - President Mendoza reported that the instructional equipment funds have been allocated to YCCD in the same amount as last year but the funds have not been separated by Yuba College and WCC. The internal process to request money will start soon. Because of the state budget stalemate, we are several weeks behind in this process.
  - The state budget appears very bleak and there will probably be mid-year cuts. This may put new positions into jeopardy.
  - President Mendoza passed out a Yuba College Guiding Framework for a vision, mission, and core values statement. I'll bring copies of the draft to the Senate meeting so that you may provide a response by the end of the semester.
- Last week we discussed the possibility of taking a political stance on Proposition 8. I wrote Mark Wade Lieu, State Academic Senate President, and this was his response:
    - We don't have any guidelines about taking political stances. However, as evinced by some spirited debates at session, political viewpoints vary widely among faculty. With that said, I would recommend focusing on Proposition 8 in the context of the students at Yuba - perhaps in the context of equity and diversity. Another tack to take is to support the Associated Students if they decide to take a position on the Proposition. Again, it would relate the Senate's action to the students.
- I asked John Langston, Senate Representative on the Safety Committee, to give us an update. According to John, the committee hasn't had a full meeting yet but will in February, and he will report after that.
  - I will be meeting with the Writing Language Development Center Coordinator Committee (Alt, Nather, Smith, and Nickolson) Monday, October 27 to review the coordinator request. Dean Dobbs and several language instructors will also be there to respond to questions. After that, the request will go to Vice Chancellor Espinoza for a final decision.
  - I have heard nothing further on the District Administrative Hiring process.
  - Dr. Harrington has scheduled a meeting for November 12 to discuss the Board's statement to the Senate which said "...It is inappropriate for the Senates to be engaged in the negotiations process."

Academic Senate of Yuba College

Vice President Report- Week of October 22, 2008

I wish I had a nice, upbeat report to give to everyone. I do not. But I will start with the good news first:

Helen and I decided the December mentor meeting (Friday, Dec 5) should be a combined Senate Meeting/ Senate social/ Mentor social. The idea is to conduct a regular Senate meeting at Helen's house on December 5 at 3 p.m. (An open meeting—public invited—agenda, etc.) The idea will be to have our new faculty witness a gathering of dedicated professionals who are still getting the work of the college done. We want them to see what the Senate is truly about, not what they have heard it is about through inaccurate "Board" statements, etc. Then Senate members and new faculty (and spouses/friends) will have a nice December social.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Hiring met Monday (Syda, Langston, Bliss, Lee, Thoo, May) and we are carefully working our way through the Hiring Manual. Before Winter Recess, we will have suggestions to overhaul the faculty hiring process, particularly the interview process. Our recommendations to the Senate and YCFA can not be approved in time for this hiring round, but a key recommendation will be to revise the process of interviews to make them more lively and spontaneous and informative—with careful adherence to State and Federal regs for public sector interviews. We want half as many questions, more open-ended questions, more time between interviews for discussion, a tour of the campus for candidates.

The Hiring Committee does have several recommendations for immediate Senate action. Assuming the Board approves the six automatic refill positions, we request that the Senate and District sponsor an orientation session for all hiring co-chairs and EEO's in December—familiarizing them with the hiring manual and insisting that they hold preliminary meetings with their hiring committees to make sure all faculty on the committees know the current hiring manual procedures. The orientation session should be run by the Senate VP and by an Administrative appointee—perhaps the VP of Instruction. Obviously, the HR Director—whom the Senate has formally requested be placed on leave and whom the faculty regards as persona non grata at this institution for his conduct as an administrator—will not be an appropriate designee. (By the way, the Senate also needs to request an administrative designee to replace the HR Director on the ad hoc hiring committee and any other college committee—ad hoc or standing committee - that includes faculty members.)

To say that the Senate's relations with the Chancellor are chilly would be an

understatement. Many of us are perplexed by Dr. Harrington's stance toward the Senate. For three years, Helen Nickolson worked indefatigably as Senate VP—recruiting faculty reps for committees, resolving equivalency apps, serving on hiring committees, keeping the Senate organized and on task. The Board is well aware of our Senate President's professionalism. In fact, the District is truly beholden to Helen for those three years of keeping the committee system functioning smoothly and making sure the business of the District was performed in an orderly and timely fashion. But last June, just one month into her tenure as Senate President, the Chancellor pursued a course of action relative to the Senate that is unprecedented for our college. She has, in essence, shunned our Senate President and—in the process—the Senate. She excluded Helen from the hiring process for the Vice-Chancellor. (Normally— had past practice and established Administrative Procedures been followed--Helen would have co-chaired that hiring committee.) Part of Dr. Harrington's official explanation during the June Board meeting was that the new Vice-Chancellor is a District-level administrator who will have little interaction with the faculty. (Just this week, the Vice-Chancellor chaired a meeting of mostly faculty to organize the push for SLO work prior to accreditation; she will confer with faculty concerning coordinator requests; she is overseeing faculty flex matters. The list goes on; the Vice-Chancellor of Educational Affairs is obviously directly involved with faculty and educational affairs.

Then several weeks ago, in response to the Senate's well deliberated and carefully articulated position regarding the District hiring policies and the performance of the HR Office, the Chancellor impugned the integrity of the Senate, declaring that we are engaged inappropriately in the negotiation process. The Senate requested a meeting with Board members to discuss this claim. This week, Dr. Harrington's secretary has scheduled a one-hour meeting so the Chancellor can "review" the Board statement with a group that includes the Senate Presidents and Vice-Presidents of Yuba and Woodland and the two college Presidents and the Vice-Chancellor. When George Galamba, on behalf of the Woodland Senate, asked for clarification of the purpose of the meeting and for an alternate time when more than an hour could be spent to resolve issues of mutual interest between the Senate leadership and the Board's official designee, the response came via the Chancellor's secretary that she was available for just one hour. I, too, have written to the Chancellor, asking for more time and for more communication.

We have requested direct and clear communication with Board members or with

Dr. Harrington regarding matters of mutual concern and shared responsibility. The Chancellor has not deigned to reply. We are at a loss to explain the course of action pursued by the Chancellor toward the Academic Senates of this District since June of last year.

Email from John Thoo to Secretary Kemble, 10/18/08 (see item 2a)

Dear Greg,

Hi. In the minutes you recorded,

- > Sabbatical Replacement Postion: During discussion, Heaton read from a
- > Sept. 22 email from Thoo, who argued that sabbatical replacements are
- > every bit as important as regular one, so he was concerned at lowering
- > the number of members on the hiring committee.
- > Nickolson (and others) noted that this had been discussed several
- > times already. Changes were approved.

I did not opine a concern for lowering the number of members on the hiring committee for sabbatical replacements in general. I only opined a concern for lowering the number of \*faculty\* on the hiring committee. To wit, here are portions of my e-mails to Cathy Heaton on the matter.

On September 29, 2008 5:17:43 PM PDT I wrote to Cathy:

- > Thanks, Cathy. I would say do NOT decrease the number of division/
- > department faculty on the committee.

On September 27, 2008 8:46:40 AM PDT I wrote to Cathy:

- > I think that more care needs to be taken in hiring a long-term sub
- > than in hiring an adjunct. A long-term sub would function essentially
- > as a f-t faculty for an entire year. Plus, the experience would put
- > the long-term sub ahead of adjunct when applying for a f-t position.

Once again, I do not object to lessening the number of administrators on a hiring committee for a sabbatical replacement; I am only concerned about reducing the number of division/department (particularly, department) faculty on such a committee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

---John.