

Yuba College
Academic Senate
M I N U T E S
February 19, 2009

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

Guests: Alt

Meeting was called to order at 12:02.

1. Agenda: Approved, with the addition of 7a.
2. Minutes from Feb. 5, 12, and 17 all approved.
3. Committee Reports
 - a. EEO – (Al Alt)
 - i. Director Alt handed out a packet of material that had been given to the Board.
 - ii. Director Alt summarized the situation so far: Prop 209 (1996) prohibited demographics as a criterion in hiring. The California Community College System Office created a “model plan” to help sort through the complexities of the law re: Equal Employment Opportunity. This plan finally made it through the statewide shared governance process in 2007. After Yuba Community College District lawyers reviewed the plan, Yuba’s EEO committee began working on “local modifications” to the admittedly legalese document.

Districts in the state have taken three approaches to this model plan: 1) do nothing until absolutely required; 2) work on components that do not rely on statistical analysis, holding off on the latter until the data has been supplied by the state; or 3) work on the whole plan, providing their own statistical analysis. Yuba chose #2.

- iii. The EEO Committee views the document as being like a Board Policy, which provides general guidelines that are then translated into specific local procedures. The Committee prioritizes policies and implements them as they are able. Once the EEO policy is approved by the Board, the committee will draft a statement of work with timelines, etc. Thus, the document now is technical and legal.
 - iv. Willson and May expressed concern that the Senate is being asked to endorse a document filled with such legalese that it simply isn’t understandable. May added that the Senate had expected a step-by-step explanation of the document in December, and now is being told—just before the document goes to the Board—“Don’t worry about it.”
 - v. Director Alt pointed out that the committee chose to leave the document in its technical form to avoid liability if a “translation” created differences between the model plan and Yuba’s plan. And since the document did not, as the committee had hoped it would, include ideas on implementation or a discussion of best

practices, etc., the committee decided that there was no need to modify the technical document.

- vi. Further, Director Alt noted that there has been a Senate representative on the committee, and the assumption is that members of the committee are to report to their constituent groups. Thus, he had assumed that the Senate had been seeing the work all along.
 - vii. Nickolson asked if the document could be made understandable, perhaps by adding an executive summary at the beginning and section summaries throughout. Davidson, drawing on his corporate experience with Disney, noted that the District lawyers should have done this already. Director Alt felt that this should be possible, and would take the suggestion to the committee.
 - viii. May argued that the Senate feels that there is a “full court press” to get documents like this one (along with the Diversity Plan) before the Board, and asked directly if the document was going to the Board without Senate approval. Director Alt explained that his mandate comes from the Board, who has asked for a document “sooner rather than later.” Since he takes direction from the Board, he did intend to present it to them at the next Board meeting. He also noted that the document was going to the Board as “information,” not for action at this next meeting.
 - ix. May complained that, as with the Diversity Plan, faculty is being treated like another “stakeholder,” but this document crosses into territory that the Senate must, by law, sign off on. Director Alt repeated that he takes his mandate from the Board, and May’s complaint is a Senate-Board issue and needs to be addressed as such.
 - x. Director Alt affirmed that he would bring the Senate’s request for an executive summary plus section summaries.
- b. Election (Heaton)
 - i. Heaton expressed concern that she had not yet received nominations for either of Lake’s positions (full-time or adjunct). Kitchen said he was talking to a couple people as possible volunteers. There was some concern with getting the nominations in time to meet the Constitution’s deadlines.
 - c. Hiring Process Committee (May)
 - i. May announced that the Ad Hoc committee has made some suggested changes to the current hiring handbook (which is the one on Yuba’s website). He will bring a summary of recommendations for the next meeting’s discussion.
 - d. Constitution (Canto-Lugo)
 - i. There will be a meeting at 2:00 to try to finalize a strong draft.
4. President’s Report (see attached)
- a. Nickolson reported that we’ve met Goal #4 of the Academic Senate Goals for 2008-09 (“Develop manual for adjunct faculty”)! Yay! (Though it turns out we’ve had such a manual for years now...)
 - b. Next week’s Board meeting is in Woodland. Nickolson and May will go to the planning session and meet with Woodland’s Senate. Newly tenured faculty will be invited to attend a future meeting (probably March 19).

5. Vice-President's Report
 - a. Nothing to report (slacker).
6. Old Business: none
7. New Business
 - a. Tenure process:
 - i. Davidson moved that, at some point in the future, the Senate have a meeting to review our part of the tenure process to determine what went well and what did not, and how we can improve; to discuss the material Nickolson sent via email re: revising the process; and (in closed session) to draw upon actual events from this year's tenure hearings. Motion passed.
 - ii. Nickolson noted that, on April 3, Bess Smith (from the State Academic Senate) will do a workshop on evaluation and tenure, equivalence, and disciplines. Her workshop, a position paper on tenure from the 1990s, and the tenure handbook should all be consulted as background for future discussion.

Adjourned 12:55.

YUBA COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE

TO: Academic Senate Members
FROM: Helen Nickolson
SUBJECT: Weekly P Report
DATE: February 18, 2009

Meeting with President Mendoza and Vice-President Trutna:

- Mendoza forwarded the Senate request to Dr. Espinoza to re-open the Flex Coordinator position. The request was forwarded to Dr. Espinoza since she is a District administrator and Flex Coordinator is a District position. I have not heard what the District is planning to do with Flex but I have provided Mendoza with Ed Code areas that specify Flex to be under the purview of the Senate (attached)
- Both Mendoza and Trutna offered assistance with accomplishing Senate goals, especially the goal to clarify the policy regarding cheating
- They suggested that we revise the Faculty Evaluation Handbook and include Senate expectations for tenured and non-tenured faculty; for non-tenured faculty, the expectations should be noted by year and should increase in scope without being unrealistic
- We discussed the committees of importance for accreditation and the need to start developing the structures. The committees include SLO, Accreditation, and Ed Master Plan. We scheduled a full day planning session on Friday, March 6
- One of the Senate's goals is to develop a Manual for adjunct faculty. It turns out the Tanna Thomas has produced such a manual for approximately 15 years. She gave me the latest copy and I will bring it to the Senate. According to Thomas, all adjunct faculty receive the manual every year.

Tenure Hearings

- The Tenure Hearings had some very difficult moments and we need to continue working on smoothing out both procedures and policy

Area A Meeting

- This is an FYI in case you're interested in attending the Area A meeting. The meeting will be held at San Joaquin Delta on Friday, March 27th

Plenary Session

- This is also an FYI in case you're interested in attending the next Plenary Session. This Session will be held April 16, 17, and 18 in San Francisco

State Academic Senate Workshop

- Friday, April 3—Beth Smith from the State Academic Senate will conduct a workshop on equivalence, minimum qualifications, evaluation, and tenure. Please put this on your calendars

Diversity Plan

- I requested clarification from Dr. Harrington about how the Diversity Plan will be presented to the Board but have not received a full reply. The Senate has very clearly expressed the desire to not have the appendix presented as part of the Plan since it contains so many elements that fall under the purview of the Senate: curriculum and evaluations to name just two