

Academic Senate Draft Minutes April 17, 2023

Joint Academic Senate Meeting De Anza College

Roll call (assisted by Voltaire)

Matthew Litrus
Allison Meezan
Mona Rawal
Jordan Fong
Robert Cormia
Che Menese
Carolyn Holcroft
Tracee Cunningham
Mary Thomas
Amy Edwards
Leticia Serne
Stephanie Chan
Rosa Nguyen
John Fox
Mayra Palmeron (remote)
Katy Ripp (remote)
Rita O’Laughlin (remote)
Kathryn Mauer (remote)
Kathy Perino (FA)
Robert Cormia

Sheryl Baum De Anza Academic Senate President presided over the meeting

Kathryn Mauer (District Academic Senate President)

District business: J1 tools in the next contract. FA and administrators came up with a rating system to replace 1, 2 and 3 in the J1. New recommendations include two on the positive side, and two on the “needs development” and unsatisfactory side. The standard that we’re going for is “meets expectations” but there was an addition of “exceeds expectations”. There was concern on the Foothill side that the new “exceeds expectations” becomes the new expectation. Kathy shared that “at the table”, we are assured that “meets expectations” is the desired outcome. For advancement through probationary (tenure), or PAA (F/T) or REP (P/T), attainment of “exceeds expectations” isn’t required. We plan to have a discussion today, and try to reach a consensus as to advice for FA. Voltaire shared that at Foothill, we want to acknowledge that faculty have gone above and beyond, and why can’t that just go into the narrative of the evaluation? Mary Pape commented for De Anza, that there are other mechanisms to document performance above and beyond what is expected, and that faculty might feel “slighted” if they didn’t get an “exceeds expectations” rating. Rosa commented that a faculty shared with her that fewer rubrics

lead to more reliable outcomes, and lesser opportunity for bias. Matthew commented that he had just completed the tenure process, and when we think about how this tool might be used, not to think about how it's used in the majority of cases, but how it might be used in borderline cases. Sheryl Baum commented that she's hearing a lot of "compliance" in the comments coming from this discussion, and that the evaluation process should be a "growth process" (less punitive). Is the lens that we're using continuing to be a compliance tool, or turn this into a growth process? Carolyn commented that we should acknowledge excellence, but the evaluation process doesn't provide visibility for that excellence to be shared. Foothill College has a culture of excellence, and it has created a culture of "expectation of excellence" that disproportionately affects probationary faculty. Excellence needs to go somewhere else, and disconnect it from the evaluation. A Foothill faculty commented that tenure processes can be challenging, and that it can feel like a "hazing", and that "exceeds excellence" can only make it more challenging.

Che's further commented, where can we put the "excellence", in a more inclusive platform? Specifically, "exceeds expectations" could lead to intellectual elitism. There was a comment by a De Anza faculty that there is a culture that only accepts the best as "acceptable", and the "exceeds expectation" adds to that culture. A comparison was made to corporate evaluations, where "excellence" is the only acceptable rating to maintain employment and achieve salary increases. An additional comment was made that there is a lot of "trauma" around the tenure process, and that needs to be separated from the J1 evaluation. Kathy Perino suggested that if the body desired, we could bring the topic of excellence into the narrative. Tenure and review teams might also be thrown into tension if the "exceeds expectations" becomes standardized in the evaluation process. Kathryn Mauer commented that if there is no motion today, advice is shared with FA, but the body could make a motion to keep the "exceeds expectation" in the new J1, or make a motion to remove it. Kathy also reminded the body that the J1 instrument is used for every faculty evaluation, probation, part-time, and full-time (3 yr eval).

Mary Pape made a motion to remove the "exceeds expectations" from the proposed J1, there was additional comment to create a place in the J1 narrative for "excellence". Carolyn Holcroft seconded. After the roll call vote (DA 16 Yes, 3 No, 2 Abstain) Kathy commented that coming out of this process was a strong sentiment that the evaluation process is (can be traumatic) and that if faculty have ideas to bring to FA. There was a motion to adjourn the District meeting (Donna first ?, Rosa Nguyen second).

The joint meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. Next meeting at Foothill College is May 1st

Roll call vote to remove rating language from the J1 “exceeds expectations

Matthew Litrus	Y
Allison Meezan	Y
Mona Rawal	Y
Jordan Fong	N
Robert Cormia	Y
Che Menese	Y
Carolyn Holcroft	Y
Tracee Cunningham	Y
Mary Thomas	Y
Amy Edwards	(FA)
Leticia Serna	Y
Stephanie Chan	Y
Rosa Nguyen	Y
John Fox	A
Mayra Palmeron	(remote)
Katy Ripp (remote)	Y
Rita O’Loughlin	(remote)
Kathryn Mauer	(remote)
Kathy Perino	(FA)
Voltaire Villanueava	Y

DRAFT