

PALO VERDE COLLEGE
Academic Senate Meeting
Tuesday, December 10, 2019
3.00 p.m.
One College Drive, Blythe, CA — CS 123/124
(ITV held at 725 West Broadway, Needles, CA)
President: Hortensia Rivera
Vice President: Sarah Frid
Secretary: Nidhi R. Patel

MINUTES

Members Present: T. Brown, A. Casas, R. Castillo, D. Copple, I. Dagnino, A. Davis, S. Frid, V. Hernandez, D. Lilley-Edgerton, M. Lopez, C. Lozoya, L. Lujano, R. Martin, J. Martinez, C. Medina, N. Patel, J. Rinaldi, H. Rivera, R. Robertson, S. Sher, P. Shibalovich, D. Silva, J. Singler, W. Smith, G. Snider, S. Stoeckle, B. Thieboux, J. Turner, and V. Velickovska.

Members Absent: A. Bavaro-Ricci, J. Boire, J. Campbell, K. Eoff, M. Gamez, M. Gaubeca, C. Hettige, P. Martinez, G. Milke, S. Peterson, and K. Redwine.

Guests: B. Raman.

1. Opening of Meeting

1.1 Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by Academic Senate President H. Rivera.

1.2 Pledge of Allegiance

The salute to the American flag was led by D. Copple.

1.3 Public Commentary

Biju:

- Will be reviewing the syllabi for next semester and providing feedback.
- Encouraging instructors to go to ISP and CVSP, especially IBN class, education network of online classes for prison system.
- Also, invite all faculty in graduation ceremony at CVSP and ISP, June 2020, get security clearance, very moving and touching ceremony.
- CSP Solano memo stated that they will only proctor midterm and final, logistical issues, two things: either stop CSP Solano or cognizant of the fact that midterm and final will be proctored. They will not change. If we lose CSP Solano students we can make up from ISP and CVSP.

2. Adoption of Agenda

2.1 Adoption of Agenda

Amendment to the agenda:

- Added Correspondence Education Standards pdf file.
- Last meeting we had mentioned for you to take a look at it.
- Attachment was on the BoardDocs, so you had a chance to retrieve it and review it.
- We are going to be voting on it.
- It is under 4.4-7. Academic Task Force for Correspondence Education.

Action: Add this item to the agenda

Motion by D. Lilley-Edgerton, second by V. Hernandez

Final resolution: Passed unanimously

3. Old Business

3.1 AP 2510

- Discussion with state senators and the administrators regarding the language was due to interpretation to certain extent.
- Right now it's "rely primarily" and it's going to stand that way until we agree upon what is on the AP.
- It is on Board agenda, however it has not been mutually agreed upon yet.
- H. Rivera will take back the message whatever we decide to do. Will meet with S. Bauer (VPI&SS) today or tomorrow to let him know the outcome today.
- Conversation with the state senators was about the interpretations of the language between the BP and AP.
- "The Board further recognizes that, under Title 5, it may choose to "consult collegially" through the option of "mutual agreement" or the option of "relying primarily on the advice and judgment of the senate" when adoption policies and procedures on "academic and professional matters."

The Board chooses that the District Governing Board shall develop policies on "academic and professional matters" through its designate, the Superintendent/President, and representatives of the Academic Senate which shall share the obligation of reaching "mutual agreement" by written resolution, regulation, or policy with the Governing Board effectuating such recommendations."

- BP being policy and AP being procedure.
- It does require mutual agreement and as of right now no mutual agreement has been agreed upon.
- Recommendation from the Senate will be taken back.
- State senator said that one paragraph in BP states that it recognizes and the following paragraph then says it chooses, which is somewhat ambiguous.
- BP was approved at a certain date and AP was approved at a certain date, both are official.
- 1st paragraph in AP 2510: PHILOSOPHY OF COLLEGE GOVERNANCE
 - Use "mutually agreed upon," if regarding academic, wasn't sure about what professional matters mean.
 - Use "mutually agreed upon" because the first sentence says it's a process that involves faculty, administrators, classified staff, and students...
- The notion seems to be that's trivial language, it's not. Rely primarily means that in academic and professional matters related to teaching or counseling, the Board and administration rely primarily upon faculty guidance unless there is a real good reason not to. Mutually agreeing means the Board and administration come up with a plan, take it to faculty, and make the decision themselves. Rely primarily includes mutual agreement, mutual agreement does not include rely primarily. If you change that language, you are seeding to administration and the Board the right to decide virtually everything about Senate business. That is not trivial language, it has legal import. Mutual agree sounds like well of course we should talk things over and of course we should, but that language is specific and has legal force.
- When the Academic Senate officers spoke with S. Bauer with reason why, he said AP needs to align with BP. AP is not something that gets voted on by the Board. It goes to the Board as an informational item. We really shouldn't worry about it because we can change it any point and it can go back to the Board multiple times. State senators said that this is muddy, doesn't seem clear cut, looks like it is positioning to weaken the faculty voice, be cautious about moving forward in this way. When BP was written, Title 5 language was different. Now, Title 5 has been updated, while BP mirrors old Title 5 language. There are some nuances here is important. Academic and professional matters is al the 10+1 stuff, it is directly related to faculty purview, it is directly related to academic senate purview.
- Make-up of Curriculum Committee: green is new language.
 - Reading the Membership paragraph from AP 2510 redlined document.
 - Curriculum co-chairs has to be one of the division chair.
 - It is in the CTA contract, W. Smith confirms.
 - Two new administrators added to be voting members.
 - Current process in Curriculum Guide is voting members are faculty and the VPI&SS.
- Are we okay with two new administrators being added?
- We weren't following the CTA contract. We were doing whoever volunteers to be curriculum co-chair. It is hard to find people to be curriculum co-chair.
- One of the reason why it is like this is because all the faculty that participates has a vote and if you have faculty member who is chairing the committee but is not the division chair, then the concern becomes that you have two people from one division that are voting. This was in our discussion with the administration. Don't know as faculty we share that concern.
- Usually, the VPI&SS co-chair was there to break the tie when even number of faculty vote and there is a tie.
- Since there are seven faculty voting members, adding even number of administrators as voting members would still have odd number of voters so tie would not be an issue.
- One thing to remember if we have administrators as the voting members, we may have a quorum even when not all faculty members attend.
- Favor seven faculty members voting and two or four administrator voting.
- There are nine faculty members, seven from each division and two include a Librarian and an Articulation Officer.

- What does the CTA contract specify?
 - CTA doesn't specify who the members are, it specifies that they get paid.
- It is a faculty driven process, why have any administrator as member. If AP does not specify "non-voting" that means that member is a voting member. S. Bauer wants it to be specific on who is voting and who is non-voting member.
- It is a lot for a division chair to also be the co-chair of curriculum, division chair can designate somebody else to be co-chair.
- When the Academic Senate leaders spoke with S. Bauer, he didn't specify about why we need the admin votes. The way that it's been working is that its only faculty voting and if this is a faculty area of purview and this is a faculty driven process, and we are primarily responsible for curriculum as stated in Title 5 that the Board is primarily rely on us then we would need a compelling reason to add administration. We can understand why they are asking for it, but we haven't seen any reason behind it.
- After doing some research, we have found that there are good deal of colleges that have only faculty vote. There are few that have one admin as well as one student representative voting. It is all over the map.
- The co-chair, whether admin or faculty, he or she (THEY) will still be part of the Curriculum Committee. The debate is whether co-chair admin will be voting or not?
- The VPISS has proposed that he will not be voting, but he will still be co-chair.
- It is prudent to have an administrator on the committee, regardless of mutually agree or rely primarily, there is still some mutuality and a dialogue that takes place between administrator and faculty member.
- The dialogue takes place regardless whether the admin is a member or a co-chair or a non-voting member.
- When talking about when curriculum is actually discussed and presented and approved, there may be legal issues that arise that faculty may or may not be aware of, that administrator would be useful to have there.
- Strongly favor having an administrator on the committee and as a co-chair as well. It should stay that way. Further, advocate for at least two more administrators, whether we approve that or not, striving toward a odd number of grand total to avoid of vote.
- Board meeting is this Friday, what should we take back to S. Bauer? Possibly ask to be pulled because nothing has been mutually agreed upon as of yet from Academic Senate. We should propose our changes and after that work with that because at this point it is on the Board agenda.
- So, should we pull it?
- The Board actually is not going to approve this.
- Correct, it is an informational item, and we need to find out what does it mean, it is in the agenda as a draft.
- The president is going to make the final decision. So, we can take it off the agenda put it wherever, it does not really matter, the Board is not going to vote, they are going to vote on their policy.
- But, it has to be mutually agreed upon and it hasn't.
- Back to the Academic Senate, at the state level, there is language that is elected to rely primarily and it's under quotes, on the advice and the judgment of the Academic Senate under which the Curriculum Committee shall provide policy recommendations to procedures and list those out. Obviously, we are subjecting to ourselves to cool that language there. It is not coinciding with Academic state-wide Senate, so it matters there. Whether this was a deliberate action or is this an adjustment parallel with leadership, keep it consistent with the state. That is, obviously, removed in red.
- It is not clear from BP. Read both AP and BP. It should be faculties' votes not administration.
- It shouldn't be just co-chair but the division areas. Should not be just seven faculty members but should have designee, so it is well-rounded representation.
- Discussing, whether to have two motions or one.

Action #1: Leave the language in AP 2510 as is, keep rely primarily language in the first paragraph
Motion by R. Robertson, second by P. Martinez

Action #2: Curriculum Committee to include administrators as non-voting member
Motion by R. Robertson, second by P. Martinez

- Asked to review the changes made to Equivalence Committee to suggest a 3rd motion.
- Changes were made to the AP 2510 draft from our last meeting to this meeting.
- The language has changed from October meeting to November meeting.
- R. Robertson would like to withdraw the two motions and make an alternative motion.

Action: Leave the language in AP 2510 as is until the administration provides us in writing with the rationale for any of the changes because it is impossible to keep track of the changes.

Motion by R. Robertson, second by P. Shibalovich

Discussion/comments:

- This is unfortunate because this is a concession by the senate to say do whatever you want to do. They are never going to come back with a written statement. This is a statement of giving up,

okay make the change, even though we are saying don't change it, there is no detail, no rigour in the discussion, nothing is being address, the administration is going to change it.

Final resolution: 18-Yes, 4-Nays, 5-Abstentions, motion carried.

3.2 Associate Dean of Instruction and Student Services

- We are going to discuss the items and concerns that Academic Senate did and the feedback we received from the December 4th meeting with the administration. These items are listed in the Specific areas of discussion for new Associate Dean Position document that is attached with the agenda.
- There was a lot of work under the job description that fell solely under student services and not instruction. So, they added student services to the job title.
- After reading the table in the document, Academic Senate members are asked the answer the questions following the table in the document.
- Q2:
 - It is typical to have a division of labour between instruction and student services for typically community colleges. It is unusual but not totally unusual. We combine the two. It might harder to find someone with equal experience and background in those two areas but not impossible. Probably someone's going to have some instruction and a little bit of student services or the other way around. So, recruiting might be a little bit more challenging, but it is still possible.
 - Counselors, what do you feel?
 - The main problem about correspondence being overloaded and little has been done to suppress or compress the issue down. Counseling is a huge component of that and many people may not be aware of that, and they are not taking into considerations. People working in CE are overworked, and they need the support not continue the same process and not have solutions to these.
 - Student services is just not counseling, is financial aid, etc. So, we need to have somebody that has the knowledge and understanding of that side of the house. We are lacking that right now in the student services because we don't have a lot of administrators experience with student services especially counseling, financial aid, CALWORKS, etc.
- Q3:
 - We had that issue, Carina Lynn (spelling?) was reporting to Instruction and rest of us were reporting to Student Services and it just left her out of the loop.
 - It doesn't really work.
- Q4:
 - How does this go to Child Development?
 - That was there originally when the initial job description was proposed. We don't know the data, how they aggregated that data, why need, etc. that was not shared with us.
 - Is this the only job description that we were given to look at or does this include potential changes in both the dean and the manager's job?
 - The Academic Senate officers reviewed the job descriptions of the current job right now, of the Instructional Manager, and then we review this job, the previous version and this version.
 - Do we know if that Manager's job is going to go away?
 - The understanding is that they are going to take the Instructional Manager job, add these additional responsibilities to it and it's a promotion for this person. So, the manager position will go away is the proposal. This is on the Board agenda right now.
 - We voiced our concerns during our last meeting with D. Wallace and an hour later we received an email with the new job description, which was attached to the Board agenda. Some of these changes seem pretty significant for them not to be going back to College Council, which is why this question is being asked here to our body.
- Q5 & Q6:
 - Student services side has been neglected for a long time. Propose a Student Service Dean strictly?
 - No, we do not need another administrator.
 - No need for a third level of ISS administration. Our opposition started was with the whole issue of CE. Why do they need three different people supposedly all doing the same administration of the same areas.
 - Someone is not doing their work.
 - It makes more sense to have someone with a psychology degree, so they can deal with issues with counseling or whatever the student services need more than another administrator, more specific.
 - Don't understand how this helps DE, which is where the primary problem is right now. Don't understand how the rationale for this position. Don't understand the procedure that took it to College Council and beyond.
 - Ask the people working in CE how they feel. Are they getting the support?
 - We have. They need staff and they need a counselor. That is their recommendation, not another administrator.
 - In 2011, we were top heavy and now we are doing the same thing. Would like to move to do away with this position and hire a counselor.
 - Is it even kosher to tailor a job to a specific person?

Action: The Academic Senate vehemently opposes Associate Dean position

Motion by I. Dagnino, second by R. Robertson

Comments: None

Final resolution: 25-Yes, 1-Nay, 0-Abstentions, motion carried.

- Feedback for Q1:

1. We were warned about being top heavy in 2011 and here we are going in that same direction.
2. Duplicating these job duties from the VPISS and the Dean of ISS. Now we have three people doing the majority of same duties.

3. Not solving the correspondence matter.
4. Additional counseling in correspondence not additional administrator or manager.
5. Need knowledgeable and experience in both instructional and student services.

- Can't we put G. Milke in an oversight position on correspondence with some authority? Should we recommend that specific of personnel decision?
- This falls under staff and counselor dedicated.
- She needs more power. She can't oversee staff.
- Right now so much of CE is piecemeal, but there is not anybody that is really like a custodian over the entire program. G. Milke does a lot of it, but she can't supervise anybody. So, the people she is trying to work with in CE, they are reporting to someone else. This job description does not even address that. It is still being approached in a piecemeal way. This person shouldn't be bogged down with a bunch of other job duties.
- This is where two-thirds of our FTES come from. CDCR is a difficult monster to work with. The same concerns remain.
- The two positions that were hired recently under a year ago, the advisors, weren't they assigned to that area originally?
- No. That was the idea. The Senate and the union sat in and worked on that. They hired them, and they gave them all these duties that didn't direct attention to CE.
- Same thing will happen again. Why spend money on something that is not going to correspondence?

Action: Table everything else on the agenda until the next meeting.

Motion by R. Castillo, second by R. Robertson

Final resolution: passes unanimously

4. Reports

4.1 President

President's report is tabled until next meeting.

4.2 Vice President

Vice President's report is tabled until next meeting.

4.3 Secretary

Secretary's report is tabled until next meeting.

4.4 Standing, Ad Hoc, and Special Committees

Reports from these committees is tabled until next meeting.

4.5 Representative Committees

Reports from these committees is tabled until next meeting.

5. Open Forum

5.1 Open Floor for Discussion

Comments are tabled until next meeting.

6. Announcements

6.1 Open Floor for Announcements

Announcements are tabled until next meeting.

7. Adjournment of Meeting

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.