

Yuba College  
**Academic Senate**  
M I N U T E S  
September 3, 2009

**Senators Present:** Nickolson (president), May (vice-president), Boren, Buckley, Davidson, Kemble, Morgan, Ramsey, Stemmann, Turner, Weiss, Willson

**Guests:** Syda, Trutna

Meeting was called to order at 12:00 pm. Nickolson supplied some kind of sweet doughy pastry thing, probably Greek.

1. Agenda: approved
2. Minutes: August 27, 2009 approved.
3. Announcements / Reports
  - a. President's Report – Nickolson
    - i. Nickolson emailed the report to the Senate (report follows minutes)
    - ii. Nickolson handed out a copy of both Board and Administrative Procedures dealing with the specific process that must be followed to discontinue a program (BP 4021 and AP 4021 follow these minutes). Summer school, in itself, may not technically be a program, but it affects many programs and should have been given the same thorough review of program discontinuance. Nickolson will present this information to the Board and insist that they follow the spirit of their own policies and develop a policy to deal with semester or evening discontinuation.
    - iii. Davidson found it a “shocker” that the Board does not follow its own policies on collegial consultation and asked what the Senate response will be. Nickolson said she would inform the Board at the next meeting, which will also inform the public. Davidson noted that, for this reason (informing the public), groups must speak up when they are not consulted as they should be.
  - b. Vice-President's Report – May
    - i. May emailed his report to the Senate (report follows minutes).
    - ii. May noted that that Dr. Adkins and Dr. Trutna claim that the Senate was indeed consulted on the question of cancelling summer session. When Nickolson and May insisted this was not so, they were told that it “might have been mentioned” to the Senate in College Council. Unlike the Senate, and the rest of the world, who believes “consultation” means “soliciting professional advice from experts,” the administration seems to believe that “consultation” means “mentioning in College Council.”

- iii. May noted that accreditation has been pushed back a year. According to May, Dr. Trutna argued that, even though accreditation will not happen until 2012, this actually puts more pressure on the school because the accreditation standards, especially regarding SLOs, will be more demanding than they would have been in 2011. May argued that these issues pale compared to the cutbacks on curriculum, cancelling summer school, laying off classified staff, etc. Davidson was saddened to see it pushed back because the District needs the outside feedback on its actions and its shared governance. Kemble noted that pointing out the “higher standards” for 2012 is a way to try to keep us busy so we can mind what Dr. Harrington calls “our business.” Nickolson emphasized that we *are* doing our business. All issues that affect professional and academic matters is our business.
- iv. Stemmann asked why a later date puts more pressure on the school. Nickolson explained that the expectations regarding SLO are much more complex at that stage of implementation. There is also the complexity involved in getting Yuba College and Woodland Community College on the same accreditation schedule.

c. Announcements

- i. Willson learned that WASC has no appeal process for employees, just for students. Nickolson said she’d contact ASYC to be sure they know this.
- ii. Boren wondered what leverage the Senate has to make things happen.
  - 1. Nickolson announced that we are using all legal means we have access to: we have sent a request to the state Academic Senate and will have a phone conversation next week with Jane Patton, State Academic Senate President, about our shared governance issues (and, at the same time, the tenure process). We have sent a packet to the legal counsel of the Chancellor’s office and to the state Academic Senate. We do not have money for a lawyer, but in compliance with the Ed Code, the Board is supposed to uphold the rights of the Senate. This makes our situation a legal issue.
  - 2. Boren inquired about grand juries, as had been discussed last semester. May said that an independent group from the college has approached him, showing interest in requesting a Grand Jury investigation. Willson recommended that they remember to include Lake in the process.
  - 3. May echoed John Almy’s point at the Sept. 1 rally: If our “leaders” asked us to follow them, we would not. If Nickolson asked, we would follow – which is true authority and power. That is the leverage we have.

- iii. Nickolson called on the Senate to encourage people to attend the Board meeting on Sept. 9.
  - iv. Boren asked if the district has a plan of action with dates, like he remembers the school had years ago. Nickolson noted that there is no budget committee at either the college or district level, so there is no one to make such a contingency plan. Syda noted that the College Council did have a general schedule (including due dates of the budget, etc.) but nothing detailed.
- d. Reports and Recommendations on budget – Division Reps
- i. Buckley announced that Social Science had been talking about cutting the cosmetology program. She noted that Dean Davis had been trying to cut adjunct classes in a way that kept an adjunct in each section or department. Boren inquired about the savings from cutting cosmetology since they are not simply a program in the school; Dr. Trutna explained that we have a contract with them and noted that they'll still be at Yuba, just not being reimbursed. Buckley said that Davis announced the amount cutting cosmetology would save and it was big.
  - ii. Ramsey announced that the Language and Fine Arts Division had called for the Sept. 1 rally. The division does not want to put forward more information (such as class schedules, etc.) until we get more information from the District. May added that the faculty of Language Arts, like faculty throughout the district, disagree with planned layoffs of classified personnel who are directly involved in teaching or student services. If layoffs must occur, for every one redundant or incompetent administrator laid off, three or four classified positions are saved. The District is top-heavy; any layoffs at the top will have the least impact upon instruction and curriculum, not to mention institutional morale.
  - iii. Davidson announced that MESH did not have a lot of ideas; they were looking at the magnitude of the cuts being demanded of them (10-20% cuts in available sections for the Spring). In response to the Senate's motion (Aug. 27) not to forward spring schedules, math faculty are holding their schedules back. Kemble noted that the English faculty had turned in the basic schedule before the motion but was withholding a prioritized list of possible cuts that Dean Dobbs had requested.
  - iv. Willson questioned why Distance Education is considered its own program when, she argues, it is a method of delivery. Distance Ed should have a separate budget, the same way maintenance has its budget, with FTES/FTEF divided between Woodland and Yuba. For example, if Dean Mills cuts a math class from Distance Ed, this is in effect "double-dipping" cuts to the math department. Syda noted that this is an excellent

example of where isolation breaks down in practice: we need communication among schools, divisions, and departments because, for example, Woodland might cut a course that has also been cut in DE and/or at Yuba—and there would be no way to know that the same course has effectively been cut three times. We really aren't big enough to be two schools.

- v. Boren had nothing to report, mostly because he hasn't heard anything yet; student services has not met and Dean Farrell doesn't talk about the budget. He has heard a rumor that the MOU with Sacramento State has been cancelled. This puts the Sac State transfer counselor, who comes to Yuba 1-2 times per week for transfer counseling and on-the-spot registration, in limbo.
- 4. Old Business – none (covered in discussion of division budget reports).
  - 5. New business
    - a. Reception for Dr. Adkins
      - i. Though some thought we should at least postpone the Senate's plans for a reception for Dr. Adkins, most agreed that the professional and ethical thing to do is to hold it as planned.
      - ii. Nickolson will send an invitation to full- and part-time faculty to her house for Sept. 11 at 4:00 at her house. Faculty will be asked to bring a favorite drink; Senate members will be asked to bring a good serving of hors d'oeuvres.
    - b. Grade appeal
      - i. Nickolson received a grade appeal from the appropriate dean. Since there had been a different instructor at the beginning and end of the course, the dean asked that an extension be given for further review by the instructor. Nickolson agreed.
    - c. Request for change in minimum qualifications for reading
      - i. Nickolson noted that the list of minimum qualification changes is not out yet; she will bring this back to the Senate when they are so that all the requests can be sent to the Board at the same time.
  - 6. Bin
    - a. Davidson moved (Boren seconded) to confirm John Langston as member of the BSI committee. Passed unanimously.
    - b. There has been a suggestion to make a list of faculty to serve on student grievances, or to put the process under the Academic Standards Committee. Nickolson will put it on the agenda for the next meeting.
    - c. May returned to the question of moving the October Board meeting to Marysville, since it is the meeting where the budget and, perhaps, layoffs will be announced.

Willson moved (Davidson seconded) to ask the Board move the October meeting to Marysville. Passed unanimously.

- d. Davidson inquired about the future of the mentoring program. May said the program was evolving into a collegial exchange about professional development, teaching, and so on, removed from the politics of the district. The next step: eliciting suggestions for workshop. So far he had been talking to the mentor group, but will soon put the question to the faculty at large.
- e. May noted that the discussion of the mentor program revealed that at least two newer faculty, who will remain anonymous, responded that they were embittered and wished they had not accepted a position here. They were pleased that the mentor program would not be political, but they were so discouraged by what was happening here – what they see as a war against faculty – that their morale (as with many faculty) is very low. May noted that they are also concerned about their jobs.

The (to use Nickolson's description) "somber" meeting adjourned at 12:52 pm.

YUBA COLLEGE  
Academic Senate

TO: Academic Senate  
FROM: Helen Nickolson  
SUBJECT: Weekly P Report  
DATE: September 2, 2009

Meeting with Adkins, Trutna, May, and Nickolson—August 27, 2009

- Discussed Senate goals—the overarching goal will be the “Restoration of the Collegial Consultation Process” and an additional goal will be to “Promote Academic Integrity”
- Spring schedule extension—Final additions and changes may be made until September 18, the first proof will be October 6, and the schedule does not have to be camera ready until October 22
- Kendyl Magnuson, Yuba Registrar, is looking for feedback on the electronic format for the fall census rosters
- Yuba College is not moving forward with the MESH dean position
- Accreditation has been moved back for one year—both good and bad
- Discussion about having a list of faculty to serve on student grievances or to have the Academic Standards Committee take on that function—need further review by Senate
- Curriculum Committee Membership—There was a question as to which members should be voting—How/Who votes is the responsibility of each committee and not for the Senate to decide
- Chartwell’s is under new management. On a separate note, Flavors will be in charge of the hot food area.

Memo from Dr. Harrington:

- We will meet Thursday, September 3<sup>rd</sup>, from 3-4:30 for the District/College/Senates Leadership discussion. Her memo included the following pending items carried over from the May 19<sup>th</sup> meeting:
  - Shared Decision-making Training - */scheduled for Oct 16th/*
  - Brown Act Training - */tentatively scheduled for Oct 16th/*
  - Tenure Review Process (and any items needed for District/YCFA MOU) - */all attorney feedback received and reviewed; have the two senates established criteria for tenure review process yet?/*
  - Sabbatical Leave Replacement Process - */status?? (This was Paul's item last year)/*
  - Faculty Hiring Process - *(/are there proposed changes to the agreement adopted by the Board in 2006?/)*
  - //- BP and AP 2510 (Shared Decision Making) - */final drafts ready for review*
  - /- AP 7121 (Administrative Hiring) - */recommendations reviewed, final AP ready for distribution/*
  - AP xxxx (Curriculum Integration) - */being handled by joint curriculum group?/*

- AP 7161 College Flex Program - /completed/
- Masters Teaching Interns - /next steps?/
- The League and State Academic Senate training session on Shared Decision Making will be held Friday, October 16<sup>th</sup> in the afternoon.
- The Brown Act Training will take place on Friday, October 16<sup>th</sup> also
- Tenure Review Process—It appears that the District has received clarity on this issue.

Items I requested to be placed on the YCCD Board agenda (senate was copied in on email):

- Study Abroad
- Expenditures and Productivity by YCCD sites
- Senate Access to the YCCD Board

Dr. Adkins has accepted the Senate's invitation for a welcome reception. This will take place on Friday, September 11<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 PM.

As directed by the senate, I requested legal assistance from the State Academic Senate and from Legal Affairs at the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (senate was copied in on email).

I have requested three times this past week, in writing and on behalf of the senate, that Chancellor Harrington meet with all faculty, staff, community, and students to respond to questions about the fiscal crisis we are undergoing. These letters were written and signed by the YC Senate, YCFA, CSEA, and ASYC.

I attended the rally sponsored by the Language and Fine Arts Division requesting a meeting with Chancellor Harrington. Although Chancellor Harrington did not address the group, I'm glad I attended and heard students, faculty, and staff speak. I was particularly moved by the plight of our veterans who will not be able to receive benefits during the summer because of the summer program cancellation.

Please remember to send cards to Fernando Canto-Lugo.

\*Vice President's Report

\*

- Helen and I met last week after our Senate meeting with Dr. Adkins and Dr. Trutna. The most important topic for the two of us was the cancellation of Summer Session, and the process that was followed in reaching that decision. Helen and I pointed out that this is a major curricular decision and the Senate was not consulted. We were told that the Senate was consulted. In the view of the administration, if an item is mentioned in \_\_College Council or in the leadership meetings, then consultation has taken place\_. Helen and I insist that consultation involves soliciting the professional, expert advice of the faculty--especially on curricular and program decisions for which the Senate is by law to be consulted and for which senior faculty have a knowledge of our institutional history. The administration canceled summer session after Proposition 13. Students were unable to obtain the transfer courses needed to complete their plans, veterans were unable to receive benefits, students on vocational certificate program tracks were set back, leading to the loss of job opportunities. Lastly, students who needed to make up a course to stay on graduation track were set back. Students went away and stayed away. And of course, summer students are among our most motivated and most articulate, meaning the cancellation of summer session damages our image in a community that is already questioning the management of our college.

-Dr. Adkins wanted to know what our Senate Goals are. Helen submitted a full list, emphasizing our number one goal: a restoration of the collegial consultation process. As the above item illustrates, the Senate is not being consulted on curricular and program cuts, which is why we have filed a complaint with the Legal Affairs Department of the Chancellor's Office and with the State Academic Senate.

-Helen and I were told that the Deans would the next day (Thursday, August 27) submit a list that would contain possible cuts. Among those cuts would be classified positions. What we wanted to know is why classified positions that directly affect instruction and student services appear to be at the top of the list. As with the cuts to programs and curriculum and summer session, some of the possible layoffs appear to directly affect students and instruction. We want to know why. A fair question is whether classified positions are being held hostage for ulterior purposes. Otherwise, why select positions that affect students the most?

-Helen and I asked how students were being consulted relative to the closing of summer session, the cut back in curriculum, the possible elimination of programs. We were told that ASYC has representatives on the College Council. If matters are mentioned in College Council, then the students, in the view of the administration, have been consulted. ( Students as well as faculty and classified have shared governance rights under Title 5).

-I am attempting to see if the mentors and veteran faculty have an interest in keeping the mentor program alive, even beyond new instructors' first year. I will report back to the Senate soon on this matter.

-I am looking for replacements on the SLO committee for Language Arts and Voc Ed; both reps stepped down. Other standing committees and evaluation committees are fully staffed.

-One of the things we are attempting to find out--without great success as yet--is the scope of the possible cuts in the instructional area. Our position, of course, is that open discussion should take place so that we can determine if the possible cuts are fair to instruction. In Language Arts, for example, the Library and the Writing Center will be hardest hit. Why the library? Why the writing center? What is the sense in these dramatic cuts that will directly affect students? Again, the question is the same as it was all summer: why are we going straight at instruction, curriculum, the students? What are we possibly cutting far away from instruction, as in District Management--either in support staff or administrators? If there are possible layoffs directly affecting instruction, there should be possible layoffs of administrators or administrative support staff, areas that affect students the least.

- Helen and I were also told that Accreditation has been delayed for one year--that the application for delay, which was pending throughout the summer, was approved. Meaning, of course, that the push for two more administrators and the full court press on the faculty regarding accreditation was premature at best; at worst, it was disingenuous. An argument was advanced by Dr. Trutna and Dr. Adkins that somehow the delay in accreditation puts even more pressure upon the institution; I spoke with Helen afterwards and we agree that the argument is so finely nuanced you will have to hear it first hand from the administration; I could not do it justice in summary even if I wanted to, which I do not.

## **BP 4021 Program Discontinuation**

*Reference: Education Code 78016; Title 5, 50122, 55130*

This policy is based on the following guiding principles:

Considerations of program discontinuance are distinct from program improvement and review;

If there is mutual agreement between the affected staff of a program and the administration, and when students will not be adversely affected, the processes of this policy do not need to go into effect;

Program discontinuance is both academic and professional for local academic senates, and insofar as the procedure impacts employment, it is a matter of collective bargaining in all cases. In addition, if this procedure needs to be invoked, or if a program is to be discontinued on the basis of mutual faculty/administration agreement, the Yuba College Faculty Association and Yuba College CSEA will be notified and given the necessary time to resolve the issues of collective bargaining.

This policy does not apply to categorical programs that have lost their source of funding.

Vital educational considerations include the following: effects on students, balancing the college curriculum, budget planning, and issues of regional coordination for occupational programs. Qualitative as well as quantitative data need to be used as a result. Qualitative data are less statistical and more value laden. The quality, breadth and depth of the curriculum and the teaching and learning process should be taken into consideration. Student satisfaction and how articulating universities or employing business and industry perceive the program are factors as well. Quantitative data may include the following: weak enrollment trend (e.g., lack of demand); low student participation; poor retention; poor term-to-term persistence for those in courses in the major; poor rate for student achievement of program goals; lack of demand in the workforce; and/or unavailability of the transfer major.

All programs at the college need to be analyzed in the same fashion - -the criteria for review may vary with the type of program - - to determine if a change needs to be made. These criteria would be established before the procedure, AP 4021, is used.

### **See Administrative Procedure 4021**

New Policy - Approved 10/05

[The original of this document can be found at:  
<[http://www.yccd.edu/board/view\\_bp.php?id=67](http://www.yccd.edu/board/view_bp.php?id=67)>]

## Chapter 4—Academic Affairs

### AP 4021 – Program Discontinuance

*Reference: Education Code 78016; Title 5, 51022, 55130*

The Program Discontinuance Procedure will be implemented after a program has been identified. It is designed to facilitate the thorough review of the program, make recommendations for improvement and when necessary to recommend termination. The Educational Master Plan should be used as a resource in making decisions about renewal or termination of a program. For vocational or occupational programs, the Education Code and Title 5 specify that such programs be reviewed every two years to ensure they meet legal standards.

Criteria to identify at-risk programs need to: be clearly stated; contain uniform measures; contain a specific set of measures for categories of programs; be based on trends over time – three to five years; consider future projections; and relate to the college mission and goals. The criteria may include low growth/low enrollment, low retention/persistence/completion problems, labor market changes, obsolescence, articulation changes enacted by transfer colleges or universities or inadequate resources provided.

1. A review process will go into effect when the Chief Instructional Officer at the college, in consultation with the discipline faculty and staff along with the appropriate Dean, using the factors listed above, has determined that a program is in jeopardy.
2. Department/program/discipline members and the administrator working directly with the program will identify aspects, i.e., qualitative and quantitative data, which apply to the specific program, and then do a preliminary analysis of items related to the mission of the college, enrollment trends, workforce-related issues, completion rates, articulation issues, course availability (both lower and upper division), and outside agency requirements. Then formal notice, including the factors used to make the determination, will be sent to the President of the Academic Senate, the co-chairs of the Curriculum Committee, the President of the Yuba College Faculty Association (YCFA), the President of California Schools Employees Association (CSEA), the College President(s) and the Chancellor.
3. The department/discipline/program will then work internally for one semester to review program goals and attempt to ameliorate the situation. Ongoing documentation will be needed. Notice of progress will again be sent to the President of the Academic Senate, the co-chairs of the Curriculum Committee, the President of YCFA, the President of the CSEA, the Chief Instructional Officer at the colleges, the College President(s), and the Chancellor.
4. After one semester, the Chief Instructional Officer of the college and the President of the Academic Senate will convene a Program Renewal Committee. This committee consists of all members of the department, the appropriate Dean, two faculty members from outside of the Division appointed by the Academic Senate, and one

Dean from outside of the Division. If the program has an advisory committee, two members of the Advisory Committee would be included. The Dean in charge of the program and a faculty member selected by the faculty would co-chair the committee. Other personnel from the College may serve as resources to the committee – student service professional, articulation officer, research director, etc.

5. If closely related programs are identified for review, then only one committee will be formed. The membership would be the same as listed above with all faculty members serving as members of the committee. If more than one program has an Advisory Committee, then two members from each advisory committee would be added.
6. The committee is given one semester to thoroughly review the program and to make recommendations to the appropriate administrator.
7. The Program Renewal Committee would consider the following where appropriate:
  - What has been the enrollment/participation history of this department over the past three years?
  - Is the curriculum appropriately aligned?
  - What modifications need to be made based on labor market demands or is the program no longer needed?
  - Would the program be better suited to incorporation under another program?
  - Are the classes appropriately scheduled?
  - Would active recruitment and/or joint industry ventures improve the program?
  - Would a targeted marketing program benefit the program?
  - Would enhanced career and counseling services benefit the program?
  - Is the program located at the right geographical location in the District?
  - Does articulation both up and down need to be reviewed?
  - Are the faculty appropriately trained for the current needs of the program?
  - Are other services available that meet the needs of the students?
  - Is staffing adequate and is staff adequately trained?
  - Are the physical resources appropriate for the program?
  - Are there similar programs located at other community colleges that are successful and could be studied?
  - Does the program have an appropriate level of outside support?
  - Could the program be aligned with another community college?
  - What effect would the termination of the program have on local and regional industry needs?
  - What effect would termination have on students currently in the program?
  - For a vocational or occupational program – does the program meet all legal standards?
8. The program renewal committee would make one of three specific recommendations:
  - The program provides a critical service to the community and needs to be retained as is with only slight modification.

- The program needs to undergo a major restructuring to see if it can be renewed.
- The program needs to be phased out and the instructors retrained.

9. Timelines:

- If it is determined that the program provides a critical service to the community and needs to be retained as is with only slight modifications, the department would be given one year to make these minor modifications.
- If it is determined that the program needs to undergo a major restructuring to see if it can be renewed, the department is given one year to complete the major restructuring and an additional one to two years to see if it is successful. The committee would identify what successful includes.
- If it is determined that the program needs to be phased out and the instructors retrained, the instructors would be given the opportunity for retraining under YCFA Collective Bargaining Agreement and the CSEA Collective Bargaining Agreement. The program would be phased out within one year, but students in the program would be given the opportunity to complete the program, which might mean that a class or two would be completed after the one year time.

The Administration, upon the recommendation of the Program Renewal Committee and the Academic Senate, will make the appropriate recommendation to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

Revised: 12/01/2006

Revised: 7/25/2005

Adopted: 7/21/2004

[The original of this document can be found at:  
<[http://www.yccd.edu/board/view\\_ap.php?id=36](http://www.yccd.edu/board/view_ap.php?id=36)>]