

Yuba College
Academic Senate
M I N U T E S
September 24, 2009

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

Guests: Jensen-Martin, Magnuson, Orton, Syda, Trutna

Meeting was called to order at 12:02. Zucchini (rhymes with, among other things, Panini) bread from Larry Michel.

1. Agenda: Approved with additions
 - a. 5a: Effects of layoffs on instruction
2. Minutes: minutes approved with minor corrections.
3. Announcements / Reports
 - a. Announcements
 - i. May announced that the college is in crisis.
 - b. President's Report – Nickolson
 - i. Report emailed in advance (report follows minutes)
 - ii. Nickolson requested that FLEX be offered for the Oct. 16 tenure/shared governance meeting
 - iii. Nickolson noted that she had not yet received a response to her latest letter, which was in response to Trustee President Flory's letter.
 - iv. Nickolson will be absent October 26-30.
 - c. Vice-President's Report – May
 - i. Report emailed in advance (report follows minutes)
 - d. Waitlists – DRAFT of process – Kendyl Magnuson
 - i. In response to confusion among students, difficulties identified by faculty, and fairly heavy administrative burden for the registrar, Dr. Magnuson drafted a policy that seeks to create an automated system that is fair for students and simplified for faculty and staff.
 - ii. The old system involved closing classes with waitlists on the Thursday before classes begin, shifting from an automated process to a completely manual process that required students to register with signed add cards. To make the system work, however, "weird things" had to be done in the system, such as lowering caps to 5 to keep classes closed. Further, students often delayed turning in their add cards.
 - iii. Dr. Magnuson proposes that the process be made entirely automated through the end of the first week of classes (which is the deadline for registration without faculty permission). The wait list would become the

main means of registration (though faculty always have the option to add students as overload). Faculty would be required to drop no-shows and other drops through Webadvisor during the first week. Students would no longer be allowed to “class crash” (i.e., show up for the first day of class and hope to get a signed add card), but would work through the registrar to get on a class’s waitlist. And the system would automatically transfer students from the wait list into slots made available by dropped students.

- iv. Dr. Magnuson noted that this asks us to think about registration policies differently than we have in the past. We have taken a half step toward automation; he wants us to complete the step we already started.
 - v. Stemmann wanted to know what happens if the first person on the wait list is also a no-show. (Davidson later affirmed concern about this issue). Dr. Magnuson noted that within a few days Information Technology should be finishing a WebAdvisor “test instance,” allowing them to test scenarios like this. He would like the system to allow dropping from the wait list as well as from the roster.
 - vi. Boren noted that the system should be fair to all students. Right now, and in the policy draft, the existence of a wait list is agreed upon by the deans and faculty, so not everyone follows the same policy.
 - vii. Syda noted that the workaround of dropping class caps to 5 has only been in place for two or three semesters, but (aside from some minor glitches) has worked well. Dr. Magnuson noted that this workaround requires deep system changes that compromise data integrity. He also noted that Tanna Thomas pointed to difficulties it causes for administrative assistants as they have to make the next semester’s schedules; they get printouts saying class caps are set at 5 and have to do extra work to get the correct numbers.
 - viii. Jensen-Martin noted that in large classes, wait lists set at only 7 students have been a disaster and argued that, for such classes, a larger wait list would help make this automated system work.
 - ix. Dr. Magnuson summarized: his proposal seeks to create an automated system for the first week of classes that is fair for students, that saves faculty from being wait list managers, and that saves staff from the current heavy administrative burden. It requires that each instructor manage the roster through WebAdvisor according to the instructor’s drop policy as laid out in the course’s syllabus. The proposal is in the drafting stage; its real purpose is to show alternatives and consequences of each choice.
- e. ACCJC Follow Up Report – Dr. Trutna
- i. Dr. Trutna began with a commercial: On Nov. 19, there will be Accreditation Liaison Officer training in San Francisco. He welcomes

anyone who wants to go. (May noted that Maris Wagner expressed interest in attending.)

- ii. Background: Phil Krebbs and Rick Bliss wrote an accreditation report in 2005. A midterm report was turned in October 2008. The ACCJC accepted that midterm report with the requirement of a follow-up report about evaluation of Yuba College's progress in several areas.
- iii. Dr. Trutna emphasized that the point of this follow-up report is *not* to address issues of actual progress in the five distinct areas, especially Planning and Shared Governance, identified in the ACCJC recommendation #4,, but only that the school has put a process in place for their evaluation. This is not a self-study; ACCJC is only requesting proof that a process has been set up and has begun to evaluate the identified areas.
- iv. Thus, the ACCJC is interested in *evidence*—documents, policies, minutes, etc.—that the process has begun. At this point, he reiterated, results are not relevant. Thus Dr. Trutna assembled the report, drawing primarily on the Institutional Effectiveness Pilot Survey and the IE model as presented to the in September, as recorded in the Board minutes, to show evidence of the process in action.
- v. May acknowledged the clarification but argued that the Senate should take this opportunity to highlight our lack of shared governance by refusing to support the document as it stands. It should be rewritten to reflect that we have a crisis in shared governance. This should be part of a larger strategy that lets the Chancellor's Office and State Academic Senate know that we have an untenable situation here. This may not be the purpose of the document, but we should use it as such—perhaps through an addendum or letter explaining our situation.
- vi. Davidson noted that the document has unclear and shallow analysis of results; it notes a “difference” in perception between leadership and committee members about committee roles and effectiveness, but ignores the obvious problem that a small percentage of *either* group claims to understand their role or effectiveness. If a report offers analysis, it should offer real analysis.
- vii. Dr. Trutna repeated that he is limited to things the ACCJC accepts as evidence. In this case, the analysis came from Board meeting minutes. Davidson noted that there have been many public comments at Board meetings (especially at the most recent meeting) that either don't make it into the minutes at all or are spun through careful selection. Jensen-Martin noted, in support, that nothing she says ever makes into the minutes except in watered down summary form.

- viii. Ramsey inquired about the Institutional Effectiveness survey process, which was also cited as evidence of a process. As she recalled—and this was affirmed by many in the room, especially Buckley—many of the questions did not make sense; those that did were focused only on internal communication, and not (as the Follow-Up report claimed) internal *and* external communication.
- ix. Dr. Trutna wanted to make clear that accreditation standards are not interested in AB1725. Accreditation has nothing to do with the laws (which vary among the many institutions the ACCJC covers), only with a series of clear, often yes/no questions. Kemble noted that this may be true, but one of the areas that the request for the Follow-Up Report (and thus the Follow-Up Report itself) deals with is precisely the “Shared Decision Making Process.” After all, the words appear 24 times in 10 pages. And an accurate report would note that the process put in place—for example, the IE surveys—is flawed.
- x. Nickolson asked if Dr. Trutna would consider redoing the report. She stated that she cannot put her name on it as it is, especially with Senate objections. Dr. Trutna reiterated that he is limited to finding *evidence* that the Committee would find acceptable; he can’t work with feelings. He will, however, see what changes he can make.

Meeting adjourned at 12:57. There was no time for Old or New Business as listed on the agenda.

The Senate Secretary ate the last piece of zucchini bread.

YUBA COLLEGE
Academic Senate

TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Helen Nickolson
SUBJECT: Weekly P Report
DATE: September 23, 2009

- Meeting with Adkins, Trutna—Thursday, September 17, 2009
 - Faculty Staffing Committee—The committee will go ahead with the regular process to maintain continuity and to discuss future directions
 - Need Accreditation co-chair—training meeting on November 19th
 - Budget—working on cuts to categorical funding
 - Summer session still up in the air for July
- Letter to Board of Trustees—Friday, September 18, 2009
 - In case you missed the letter, I am attaching it.
- Meeting with Harrington, Adkins, Fairchilds, Jensen Martin, Alt, J. Brown, Espinoza, T. Smith, May, Lopez, Frothingham, Trimble, Veal-Spenser—Monday, September 21, 2009
 - This was a great first step toward establishing some type of district-wide consultative committee to the Chancellor. There is definite need for district-wide issues to be discussed so that shared decision-making may take place. Chancellor Harrington acknowledged this need and coordinated the meeting. Specific issues/ideas that were discussed include:
 - **Budget**
Budget approval will take place October 14th. Employees will be told this week about elimination of jobs. VC Alt will meet with the unions this week. Over the next two weeks, specific line item numbers will be inserted. The Allocation Model that has been used thus far has been a model based on expenses. There was discussion about refining or redefining this model. Reserves are around 7% but the Board doesn't want to use because of possible future cuts.
 - **Brainstorming regarding what the group should address:**
Membership (size and true representation)
Name
Budget
Enrollment Management
Uniform Method of Making Enrollment Decisions
Allocation Model
District SLOs
Being a District Communication Body—Share Information Place
Shared Governance Process
Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
Clear Charts of Roles and Responsibilities and Lines of Interaction
Evaluations—Especially Administrative

Rumors and Clarification
Planning
ARCC Report and Impact of Information
Accreditation Information
Relying on Resources Already Available
Fundraising
Connection with Board Members
Communication Back to Constituents
Think Tank
Mass Advocacy Efforts
Hiring Committees
Academic Calendar
EEO
Next meeting will be scheduled in a couple of weeks

- College Council meeting—Tuesday, September 22, 2009
 - Farrell and Cupp had two requests from the BSI Committee: 1) to change BSI activities to fall on the actual convocation day, and 2) to request a specific speaker. They will give a BSI report to the Senate on October 1 and will also inform the Senate about the two requests.
 - Deans, classified staff, and ASYC would like more representation on the new consultative committee to the Chancellor
 - The Management group is considering furlough and paying \$100 per month toward health benefits
 - Trutna went through the Accreditation Follow-Up Report, which he will do again at the Senate meeting. This report does not require Senate sign-off and is for information only.
 - Summer Session was discussed from the standpoint of weighing the pros and cons of having a session versus not having one at all. College Council needs feedback from the Senate. Issues raised were those of equity for all students and not just one group, delivery methods such as using primarily Distance Education and asking all sites to contribute funds, the effect on fall FTES, etc.

Vice President's Report - **Tim May**
Sept. 23, 2009

- I attended the first All District Council Meeting on Monday afternoon, the eve of the layoffs. Dr. Harrington chaired the meeting. Seven administrators and four faculty attended, along with the student trustee and the CSEA President. Dr. Harrington was good enough to thank me for attending, even though the Senate VP's were not invited. (Harrington, Alt, Adkins, Fairchild, Espinoza, Lopez, Trimble and YCFA Pres and VP, Senate Presidents, Student Trustee, CSEA Pres were invited.) The institutional and budget crisis were briefly discussed; very little information was forthcoming. The meeting was ad hoc/ improvised. We hope it will develop into the bona fide shared governance council where substantive information is shared and recommendations are advanced for Board consideration.

- The first mentor meeting is taking shape for December 9. I will be promoting it as a palliative for much of what ails us these days. The meeting will focus on the role of humanities in our professional and personal lives. David Wheeler will be discussing Moliere's "The Miser," the fall production of the theater department. Robert Mathews will talk about his plot to take over the campus with his peaceful warriors, a small army of guitar-playing students. We are hoping that faculty will attend opening night of "The Miser" later that night at the Arts Council Theater in Marysville. More details to follow.

- It appears the Academic Standards Committee could indeed take over the adjudication of student grievances. As we suspected, Academic Standards only meets several times a year and the handful of student grievances could be easily handled by that committee.

- I will be attending the State Senate Area A Meeting on October 30 in Sonora. Also the State Plenary Session in November. It is vital that I continue the contact that Helen has made with Jane Patton, State Senate President and Scott Lay, League President--good resources both who will continue to be valuable in the resolution of our crisis within a crisis at Yuba. (Things are bad all over; they are worst here.)

- Evaluation meetings of instructors have begun. It is important to emphasize to faculty and mid-managers that everyone on the committee must attend all meetings, including the initial meeting where classroom visits are divided up and time lines are set in place. Some irregularities have already occurred. The integrity of our evaluation and tenure process is at stake, and it is our responsibility to protect it.

- In our leadership meetings, we are emphasizing the Senate's role as stewards of instruction and curriculum. Instruction continues to absorb a disproportionate share of the reductions. We are a college, so it stands to reason that the cutbacks should be to management, not to instruction or services or staff--yet here and at Woodland, reductions are being announced that will directly impact instruction. Reason is of course not currently prevailing. I was here for the Prop 13 crisis in 1978, the institutional Budget crisis of 1994, and the state budget crisis in 2003. This crisis makes those pale in comparison, and it has been exacerbated by a lack of leadership, by a lack of respect for instruction and curriculum, and by budgetary and governance secrecy-- a crisis within a crisis. It is crucial that all faculty attend the Shared Governance colloquium here at Yuba on Friday, October 13. All Senators should definitely plan on attending.