



ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MINUTES
Friday, February 3, 2023
11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
DLC 04

Convened at 11:05

In attendance: Tyler Knudsen, Patrice Thatcher-Stephens, Jayne Turk, Ann Womack, Andrea Craddock, Ron Slabbinck, JT Tarantino, Char Perlas, Matt Donaldson, Dave Vigo

1. OPEN SESSION

2. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the December 2, 2022, meeting were unanimously approved.

4. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

- a) Updated Program Review and Annual Report Template – Dr. Mark Fields and John (JT) Tarantino
- Program review webpage has updated links for program review forms and past reviews, where available. The Program Review Manual was updated to include page numbers and a “close the loop” question was added to the annual update form.
 - A fillable pdf was created for annual updates, and a question regarding number of FT and PT faculty and staff was added. It was noted that faculty may not know how many PT instructor there are and would have to do research to include this data.
 - It was also noted that the manual went through the participatory governance process. Making changes and then asking for approval does not honor that process. The intention is to honor the participatory governance process going forward, but there are currently time constraints due to the accreditation process.
 - Faculty do not always receive information on whether CQIPs were approved, making it difficult to address the “closing the loop” questions.
 - The Program Review Manual asks for Institutional Research to do an annual survey about the process. The survey has been created and will be distributed soon.
 - Institutional Research is committed to being a valuable and available resource for program review.
 - A request was made to add a space to the form to note when the Program Review was reviewed by IPB. This will be added to the form for review by the full Academic Senate.

- All changes to the manual and form are draft changes presented with the full intention of going through the participatory governance process.
- b) Status of Emergency Conditions Recovery Plan (Hold Harmless) – Dave Vigo
- 2021 Budget Act extended existing revenue through 24-25 (hold harmless). In the future, our 24-25 budget will be the ceiling if we want to stay on hold harmless. We can opt out of hold harmless if FTEs + COLA get us a bigger budget. While on hold harmless, we will continue to receive COLA, but it will not compound.
 - There is not a fiscal cliff, it's a plateau. We still need to increase enrollment in order to see budget increases. It isn't likely the state will continue to fund us at current levels for another 10 years unless we increase enrollment. We can use simulations to determine growth targets.
 - Emergency Conditions Recovery plan is being prepared for submission to the Chancellor's Office. It is being developed based on the strategic enrollment plan. This is first year where this progress report was requested, and it is expected to be required in future years.
 - There are three formulas that determine college budgets (when not on hold harmless) including FTEs, supplemental allocation, and success allocation.
 - It was suggested that we could use "stay interviews" for students to acquire information about what people need and what would encourage them to stay at COS.
 - We need to be realistic about the size the college can be. The Educational Master Plan will take a deep dive into this.
- c) New Board Policy that allows certain employees to work remotely - Dr. Char Perlas
- There is a need for more flexibility in remote work with certain positions, and there is increased expectation for this since the pandemic. This policy will help us recruit talent to the college.
 - The policy applies to fulltime, permanent, non-faculty positions including future and current eligible employees.
 - The AP reflects the application including definitions, eligibility, etc.
 - The District will not be responsible for internet, phone, or other costs associated with remote work.
 - Remote work agreements will be reviewed annually.
 - The hiring manager seems to get a lot of discretion in the decision is whether the position is eligible for remote work and the proportion of remote work time versus on-campus. There is potential for equity issues if favoritism drives decisions. There are processes in place to deal with inequity or favoritism in applying this policy. Additionally, there is no area for justification on the form.
 - This process does not replace accommodation requests.
 - How will the application of this policy impact what students see on campus? We don't want empty student/public-facing offices. It's about the nature of the position. This policy is probably not appropriate for public-facing positions except for limited times/circumstances.
 - The administration is open to developing a similar process for faculty.
- d) Collaboration between Technology Services and faculty on classroom/lab technology – Matt Donaldson
- The Classroom/Lab Improvements project has 3 parts:
 1. Define terms – Define classroom/lab. Classrooms are any space where instruction is delivered, including in-person spaces or online environments (e.g.

Canvas). Computer labs are any place where computers are provided to students for doing academic work.

2. Define needs – What service is Tech Services providing? What technologies are required to deliver service? We need to define standards and then have system to deploy them.
3. Meet needs – This includes technological refreshes of network switches and classroom technology.

- The funding source for this work is a Physical Plant and Instructional Technology Grant.
- Tech Services wants faculty and others to help define services and standards and to prioritize technology refresh service.
- Tech Services will establish a refresh cycle to ensure campus technology is current. Tracking of funding sources with inventory is needed to help with planning funding for refresh cycles.
- Regarding video conferencing to remote classroom locations – Tech Services has purchased equipment to refresh remote conference sites, but many MOUs for the spaces have expired.
- The Academic Senate will form a taskforce to assist with this project. We can't use the Technology Advisory Committee because faculty representation is not broad enough, and we don't want to add more faculty because a lot of the committee's work is not relevant to this project.

- e) ChatGPT & AI Technology – Impact on plagiarism/cheating

We want to make sure faculty are aware about potential student use of this technology, and initiate a discussion about possible inclusion of AI policies in syllabi or need for modifications to the conduct code.

- f) Meet & Greet with Board Members

A board member has expressed a desire for more interaction between the Board and the Academic Senate. The Exec team is open to having an informal get-together. It was noted that if a certain proportion of Board gets together in a place, it's a meeting, but this is ok if official business does not take place.

5. OFFICER REPORTS

- a) President

- i) Academic Senate agenda

- (1) Remind faculty about the amendments to the Brown Act (Rubio, 2022)
- (2) New faculty need mentors
- (3) Faculty representation on Instruction Council – Patrice is Academic Senate Representative. This leaves an open space for a CTE faculty member.

- b) Vice-President

- c) Secretary

- d) At-Large

Adjourned at 12:10?

It is the policy of College of the Siskiyous not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex or disability in its educational programs and its employment practices.

(<https://www.siskiyous.edu/humanresources/nondiscrimination.htm>
and <https://www.siskiyous.edu/mainfiles/titleIX.htm>)