

Academic Senate Meeting (Tuesday, March 8, 2022)

Generated by Vanja P Velickovska on Monday, March 28, 2022

1. Opening of Meeting

Procedural: 1.1 Call to Order

- The meeting was called to order by Sarah Frid at exactly 3.00 pm

Procedural: 1.2 Roll Call

- **Present:** Anjela Bavaro-Ricci, Timothy Bolin, Adrian Casas, Sergio Cano, Christopher Cardona, Richard Castillo, Derek Copple, Kim Dieu, Kevin Eoff, Jennifer Faux-Campbell, Sarah Frid, Michael Gale, Maria Gamez, Jeanette Garrett, Lukas Gunderson, Chaminda Hettige, Laura Kramer, Esmeralda Lopez, Maria Lopez, Rene Lopez-Roedel, Sandra Loureiro, Cesar Lozoya, Lorenzo Lujano, Rosa Martin, Jorge Martinez, Peter Martinez, Juan (Carlos) Medina, Graciela Milke, Ilona Missakian, Nidhi Patel, Scott Peterson, Sarafina Redwine, Dana Rethwisch, Paul Shibalovich, David Silva, Juliette Singler, Gregory Snider, Brian Thieboux, June Turner, Vanja Velickovska
- **Absent:** Michael Calabrese,
- **Guests:** Theresa Becker, Alejandro Clark, Nancy McClure, Maria Kehl, Tod Larsen, Biju Raman, William Smith, James Thomas, Leslie Watkins,

Action, Procedural: 1.3 Unanimous Consent

- A motion was proposed for unanimous consent. Unanimous Consent is a manner of expedited voting where only those who oppose a motion will speak when that has been brought to a vote. If no one opposes, then the voting item is "passed". If a single person opposes, that will trigger a roll call vote.
- Paul Shibalovich moved
- Kevin Eoff seconded
- Objections: None
- The motion carried

Action: 1.4 Adoption of Agenda

- A motion to adopt the agenda
- Juliette Singler moved
- Dana Rethwisch seconded
- Objections: None
- The motion carried

Action, Minutes: 1.5 Minutes from February 8, 2022

- A motion to adopt the minutes
- David Silva moved
- Paul Shibalovich and Jennifer Faux Campbell seconded
- Objections: None
- The motion carried

Minutes: 1.6 Minutes from March 1, 2022

- A motion to adopt the minutes
- Jennifer Faux Campbell moved
- Carlos Medina seconded
- Objections: None
- The motion carried

2. Public Commentary

Procedural: 2.1 Public to Address the Senate on Agenda Items

The public (non-senators) is welcome to address the Senate about items on the agenda only. Each speaker has a time limit of five minutes. While a speaker has the floor, Senators will refrain from comments, questions, discussion, and call for action.

Pursuant to the Brown Act Government Code Section 54954.2(a): "No action or discussion shall be undertaken on any item not appearing on the posted agenda, except those members of a legislative body or its staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by persons exercising their public testimony rights under Section 54954.3."

Public Commentary: None

3. New Business

Action: 3.1 Academic Standards - Institutional Set Standards

Institutional Set Standards are set on an annual basis through shared governance discussions regarding institutional data. This is the first time PVC is engaging this dialog, it won't be perfect - but the intention is to hold annual discussions to make improvements on how we set our standards and stretch goals to facilitate appropriate growth for our institution.

What is a Standard?

Standard – The measurement (count or percentage) that we expect the aggregated data across **all** programs and all student cohorts calculate at.

- Major student cohorts
 - Community students
 - Instructional Service Agreements for Fire Science
 - Rising Scholar's students
 - PVHS Concurrent Enrollment
 - Demographic groupings
 - Student involvement groupings (athletics/Umoja/Puente)

How do we use these Standards?

Standards are a mechanism for us to identify opportunity gaps within specific programs and/or student cohorts. Whether we are meeting, exceeding, or missing the Standard – this numerical value is simply a place to start a conversation about what the data mean.

- Program Review
 - Course Completion Rates (all instructional reports)
 - Licensure Exam Rates (only some CTE programs)
 - Transfers (Student Services report)
- Various grants
- ACCJC Annual Report due each 4/8
- Also, we can use them wherever else we find these data useful

Standards are not to be used, absent other relevant data, to determine deficiency of any kind. Just because we are not meeting a standard does not mean that the standard should be changed, or that we are necessarily doing something wrong.

Recommendation from Academic Standards Committee to Academic Senate for Institutional Set Standards:

STANDARDS		Where did the initial calculation come from?
Course Completion Rates	70%	past three years average for which the data is available
Certificate Completions	39	past three years average for which the data is available
Degree Completions	240	past three years average for which the data is available
Transfers	39	past three years average for which the data is available
Licensure Examination Rates	75%	Required State Average by LVN
Employment Rates	73%	Perkins Core 4 Data Used

EMPLOYMENT RATES

Explanation of Perkins Core 4 Data - For CTE programs with 10 or more completers, PVC gets employment data from the Chancellor's Office (MIS data). The past three years LVN, Welding & Business met this criterion.

Calculating the Standard at 73% - The percent of CTE students who have earnings the following year (as found in the unemployment insurance base wage file) or are in an apprenticeship program, or the military.

Job Placement Rates	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	3-year average STDEV	3-year average + 1SD	
Business Admin 0505.00	0.00%	26.32%	23.08%	16.5%	11.7%	28%
Automotive 0948.00	54.17%	50.00%	59.09%	54.4%	3.7%	58%
Welding 0956.50	39.13%	57.14%	45.00%	47.1%	7.5%	55%
LVN 1230.20	60.00%	100.00%	50.00%	70.0%	21.6%	92%
Standard	73.00%	73.00%	73.00%			

Considerations:

- We do not have to use this calculation or Perkins Core 4 Data. This is just an expedient way to determining a Standard for the moment. Some reasons not to use this data:
 - Perkins Data doesn't capture all employment data for students – just CA data. Many welders (and/or other CTE completers) find employment in AZ.
 - We need to report employment data for more than just Perkins – we have to track employment data for the Guided Pathways funding formula. It may be appropriate to use a completely different formula.
- This is institutional data – so it's combining the near 100% employment rate for LVNs with the very low employment rate for Business (because almost all these completers remain incarcerated).
- Once we get an Institutional Researcher, we will be able to break down this data more completely – to have employment rates by student cohort, program, etc – so that it gives us information on taking practical, intentional, impactful action.
- We can either go ahead with this employment rate calculation as is OR we need to come up with a new calculation. The deadline for the ACCJC report is April 15th. It is important for us to consider if we have a reasonable timeframe prior to the deadline.
- This Employment Rate is NOT something that we currently parse out by program within the Program Review Committee.

What is a Stretch Goal?

If a Standard is the benchmark, then a Stretch Goal is where we'd like to be in the future. It should be achievable and realistic.

STRETCH GOALS		Where did the calculation come from?
Course Completion Rates	76%	mean + 1 standard deviation of existing performance
Certificate Completions	60	mean + 1 standard deviation of existing performance
Degree Completions	280	mean + 1 standard deviation of existing performance was a little too high for a realistic goal. So, this is between the mean & the mean +1 SD.
Transfers	52	mean + 1 standard deviation of existing performance
Licensure Examination Rates		This is still outstanding
Employment Rates		This is still outstanding

Recommendation from Academic Senate Committee to College Council for Institutional Set Standards:

- A motion to accept the Institutional Standards and Stretch Goals (with exception of the Licensure Examination Rates and Employment rates from the Stretch Goals Table), as presented
- Kevin Eoff moved
- Brian Thieboux seconded
- Discussion: Questions on how the degree completions have been estimated, clarification on the proposed numbers of the employment rates
- Objections: Peter Martinez objects on setting the 73% employment rates as a Standard goal as it seems very high, as the source for this estimate is not clear. Clarification is needed on how the employment rates have been obtained and why this number is suggested.
- A roll call has been instigated:
 - **29 Yes votes:** Anjela Bavaro-Ricci, Timothy Bolin, Sergio Cano, Christopher Cardona, Richard Castillo, Derek Cople, Kim Dieu, Kevin Eoff, Jennifer Faux-Campbell, Sarah Frid, Maria Gamez, Jeanette Garrett, Laura Kramer, Esmeralda Lopez, Maria Lopez, Rene Lopez-Roedel, Sandra Loureiro, Lorenzo Lujano, Rosa Martin, Jorge Martinez, Juan (Carlos) Medina, Graciela Milke, Ilona Missakian, Nidhi Patel, Sarafina Redwine, Dana Rethwisch, Juliette Singler, Gregory Snider, Brian Thieboux,
 - **5 No votes:** Michael Gale, Cesar Lozoya, Peter Martinez, Scott Peterson, Vanja Velickovska
 - **6 Abstained:** Adrian Casas, Lukas Gunderson, Chaminda Hettige, Paul Shibalovich, David Silva, June Turner,
- The motion carried
- A motion to calculate the License and employment rates for the stretch goal table as the examples above in the table (Mean + standard deviation)
- Brian Thieboux moved
- Jennifer Faux Campbell seconded
- Discussion:
 - Scott Peterson pulled the MIS data from the Chancellor's office and our Negotiated Employment for our College is 37.68%. Our District negotiated employment rate is 37.68% (misweb.cccco.edu/perkins/Core_Indicator_Reports/Forms_All.aspx)
 - Averaged employment numbers from the table to less than 50%
 - 73% for employment rates seems unreasonably high
 - Labor Force for California estimates drop to 60% for employment rates in the next 10 years.
 - Establishing a standard will not affect us negatively
 - Not meeting a standard will not get us in trouble
 - Keep in mind that this is not determined only by Faculty, College Council will review the recommendations
 - The motion is for a year, we will be discussion these every year
- Objections: none
- The motion carried

3.2. Course Cancellation Policy/Procedures:

Senate addressed in Guided Pathways:

1. We should be using data to inform our schedule and have a goal for the # or % of cancelled classes. The idea would be that we build a schedule that the data tells us will yield little to no cancellations.
2. Only modality with major cancellations this term has been face to face.
3. What else should we be considering around course cancellations? What else do you want me to bring forward?

Initial Faculty questions:

- What are PVC guidelines for cancelling courses: time frame?
- Are students informed in advanced that their courses will be cancelled and are they provided any options?
- Students may need the course to graduate. Is this taken into consideration.
- Students may be on Academic/Progress Probation and need to repeat course to replace the F, D or W grade
- How are students informed?
- Transfer—The student may need the course to transfer.

Open for Discussion:

- There is a promotion for face-to-face course in order to encourage the students to come back to the campus, but when the classes did not fill out, the classes were canceled which can be interpreted as mixed messages
- There is Cancellation Policy in our catalog as of today
- The accent should be on how to schedule face to face classes as to avoid the massive cancellation at the beginning of the semester
- How will students react to newly introduced face to face courses
- Currently there is a survey out for the high school students, suggestion to adjust or resent survey for the students to see what classes there will be more likely to take
- Ask our current students what classes they would prefer taking (Online, Correspondence, Face to face)
- Utilize Canvas to present students with surveys, starting next Spring semester

3.3 Credit for Prior Learning

- CPL Board Policy and Administrative Procedures are going to the Board tonight for a first read.

- CPL is different than Credit by Exam. Credit by Exam falls under this umbrella, but it's much more complicated.
- Has ACCJC, CCCCCO, and Title 5 implications.
- Requirements include documenting the following FOR EACH COURSE
 - Is CPL appropriate for this course?
 - If so, what type of CPL is appropriate? (there are 9 types)
 - Complete a CPL Crosswalk for each course
 - If a portfolio or industry cert is appropriate, then a rubric needs to be developed based on the COR/CLOs
 - Ensure the CLOs are written to accommodate CPL
- Requires a lot of outside-the-contract work from faculty to get it up and running. I am working with administration on developing a list of appropriate duties and scope of work, then we will turn it over to CTA to work with the District on appropriate compensation.
 - CPL Faculty Coordinator
 - Extra duty Discipline Faculty Expert task list
- Still need to iron out process & forms - those will come through Academic Standards first, then brought to Senate for a vote.

Open for Discussion:

- If division or a group of experts in a particular discipline comes to a conclusion that there is no way to accept prior credit learning, would that be acceptable? Yes

3.4. Rising Scholar's Program

Associate Dean/DLO scheduled 3 meetings regarding CDCR CE.

- February 8th
- February 10th
- March 1st
 - **Items to be brought to Senate from CDCR PSCEs**
 - PSCEs are highly concerned that some students are being penalized for things outside of their control (lack of educational staff, late mail, quarantining, etc).
 - If you are not able to be flexible with a student's request (e.g., late work/reinstatements), please communicate clearly and directly as to why.
 - Tone is important in our communication to students. Some faculty are responding to requests with clipped responses and it is leaving students and PSCEs feeling demoralized and frustrated.
 - Is it possible to have the first assignment of the term not be from the text? This may resolve many of the no show/reinstatement issues.
 - However, it would add an 8th contact, instead of the 7 contacts that we have in our policy.
 - PSCEs are interested in emailing directly with faculty to resolve specific student issues, rather than routing everything through the DLO, as this can cause an unnecessary delay.
 - **Senate advised PSCEs of**
 - **reinstatement protocol by faculty**
 - individual discretion of each faculty member based on whether the student is poised to complete the course successfully.
 - The factors of success vary based on timeframe of first work received by student, pace of syllabus, late work policies, and subject matter.
 - **accepting late work due to COVID (or other reasons)**
 - faculty are not obligated to accept late work outside the provisions of their syllabus, even if it is COVID related (same as f2f students)
 - COVID issues related to CDCRs
 - SUPER late incoming mail to the facility
 - delayed mail exiting the facility
 - staffing inconsistencies
 - **Textbook editions**
 - faculty determine textbook and compose all assignments/assessments, 3 to 6 months in advance of the course.
 - getting a request to use a totally different textbook 2 or 3 weeks into the semester doesn't work for most instructors
 - textbook issues are valid, but asking the instructor to allow whatever text the student has access to is not an ethical or sustainable solution.

Discussion on these meetings:

- outstanding issues?
- recommendations from Senate?

Open for Discussion:

Some faculty have been specifically told not to talk to the PSCE directly. It would be nice to have a list of PSCE in case faculty should need to contact them directly

It is best to contact the students directly instead through their PSCEs

Contacting the PSCE can severely reduce the time for feedbacks

PSCE scanning homework? The role of PSCE varies widely to how many students they are responsible for

FERPA concerns if going through the PSCE. No need as PSCE also falls under the umbrella

Reinstatement should be automatic. No as there are under the individual faculty discretion if the student poised to successfully complete the course

No standard answer as it depends on both the student and the faculty

PSCE emailing faculty directly; PSCE are not paid by the college so if they want to be involved that is to be encouraged

Sometimes PSCE can be forceful in their tone, especially if the instructor is not willing to admit late work/reinstate students late in the course, and it is important to keep open mind and improve communication

The policy is for at least 7 contacts, but if there are more than 10 contacts might be too much.

Making the syllabus contract as the first assignment as it gives more time for the students to get around and get their assignments and textbooks.

This is an ongoing work

We need to work as an institution to make the system more functional and not to fall into expecting faculty to do every single accommodation

3.5 PVC COVID Safety Plan

Formal input from Senate requested for

- District Safety Plan
- Instructional Faculty notification message to students for COVID exposure in class
 - Procedure has changed so that this notification comes from faculty and not Irma

Most recent draft presented: notify Sarah or Richard if you have any recommendations, notes, concerns, etc.

4. Reports- Senate Leadership & Committees

4.1 President Sarah Frid

- Role of Shared Governance Representatives
 - Main contact for faculty to bring items of concern to the associated committee
- Dean of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness Job Description is going to the Board tonight
- Update on SSSP/Turnitin
- **Turnitin**
 - Have quote
 - Silvia Lainez will enter it into Galaxy
 - Date of software acquisition is undetermined, but we are on a path forward

SSSP

- Requested quote from vendor, Stephanie has not heard back from them yet.

4.2 Vice President: Rosa Linda Martin

Update on mailboxes, students used the mailboxes from Albertsons

4.3 Secretary: Vanja Velickovska

Nothing to report

4.4 Curriculum Co-Chair: June Turner

Legislations is coming AV 705
SEC and Chancellor's office
The common numbering system update

4.5 Articulation Officer: Jennifer Faux-Campbell

New revisions to the Sociology
The reviews are backlogged, push the new upcoming courses to begin in the spring of 2023

4.6 Academic Standards: Rosa Linda Martin

The committee will be meeting this upcoming Monday, will work together with student services on practices to give to the students to avoid violating PVC academic honor code

4.7 Equivalency: Sarafina Redwine

Nothing to report

4.8 Flex: Sarafina Redwine

Nothing to report

4.9 Faculty Handbook Task Force: Richard Castillo

Handbook draft coming up

4.10 Online Teaching Council: Richard Castillo

- Approval seeking still ongoing

5. Information Items from Shared Governance Committees

Procedural:

5.1 Benefits and Professional Development- S. Loureiro

Nothing to report

5.2 Budget- B. Thieboux

Nothing to report

5.3 Equal Employment Opportunity Plan P.Martinez

Nothing to report

5.4 Foundation- V. Velickovska

Nothing to report

5.5 Facilities & Safety- C. Lozoya

Nothing to report

5.6 Guided Pathways- S. Frid

See the submitted form

5.7 Program Review- T.Bolin

See the submitted form

5.8 Student Learning Outcomes- P.Martinez

Nothing to report

5.9 Student Success and Equity- J. Singler

Nothing to report

5.10 Technology- C. Hettige

Nothing to report

6. Open Forum

From SCA, the courses that are below college level, the Chancellor office will require proof of it. Faculty utilizing data to justify why we are offering these classes

7. Announcements

- Upcoming choir concert: "JOY" on April 27th, Wednesday at 7 pm.
- Celebrate our Brian Thieboux, he will be playing violin
- Tickets are \$15 per person but will enable you to enter a contest for \$500 (Reason for it need to raise \$4,000 so students can experience Honor Choir in San Diego this fall)

8. Adjournment of Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 4:57pm by Sarah Frid Academic Senate President