Language Arts Department Meeting  
Friday, December 5, 2014

Present: Robert Barclay, Libby Young, Lance Uyeda, Audrey Mendoza, Akiko Swan, Laurie Tomchack, Tim Cubero, Susan St. John, Desi Poteet, Jeanine Buckley, Karyl Reynolds, Janine Oshiro and Jenny Webster.

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 11:40 a.m.

Approval of the Minutes: Minutes from 11/14/14 meeting were approved.

Guest: Chancellor Doug Dykstra

Committee Reports:

Vice Chancellor's Academic Affairs Advisory Council—(Robert) no report

IEC—(Robert) no report

Planning and Budget Council—(Robert)

Master Plan Advisory Committee—(Lance) no report

Curriculum Committee—(Janine)

The Curriculum Committee met on Nov. 25, 2014.

They approved a new course: SOCS 225, Statistical Analysis for Social Sciences. This course will help students who are interested in majoring in the social sciences. We approved the modification of a course: ICS 105, Introduction to Computing Skills. This course will replace IS 50. It is for students with very limited skills, just like IS 50, but students will earn college credit.

They approved the experimental course: ENG 197, Supplemental Instruction. This is the supplemental course for students who place high into ENG 22 and take ENG 100 with Jenny.

They approved the modification of a course: SOC 231, Introduction to Juvenile Delinquency. The proposer made minor changes to make the description and SLOs more relevant.

Faculty Senate—(Jenny)

Jenny reported that the Faculty Senate is seeking feedback on the following issues:

1. Is the department interested in maintaining the “N” grade for all courses on campus?
2. Is the department interested in maintaining the renewal policy / semester forgiveness issues?
3. We are seeking volunteers to participate on the Accreditation and Strategic Planning, Policies and Procedures Committee

The department is in support of retaining the “N” grade for all courses. The department finds no need for a renewal or semester forgiveness policy. Finally, the department unanimously suggests that when it comes to the Accreditation and Strategic Planning, Policies and Procedures Committee, Jan should be required to write an executive summary that is readable and discernable by the Faculty Senate. Thus, there were no volunteers for the Accreditation and Strategic Planning, Policies and Procedures Committee.

Distance Education Committee—(Lance)

Old Business:

1. Update on MJ memorial: Desi thanks everyone for their support in our department's fundraising effort to honor MJ. She had all members who were present sign the thank you cards for those who donated to MJ’s cat condo. Furthermore, she pointed out that we are still collecting money and future donations can be given to Lance.
2. Janine requests that instructors for English 22 and 23 give her a sample of an “A” paper and a “C” paper to be used at the system Dev Ed Committee meeting.
3. Robert reported that the MQs for the new English position (Janine’s position) are unclear. There was a discussion about changing the MQs from a Masters in English to a Masters in Education. For DQs, the department would like to request that the candidate have experience working with students with learning disabilities, along with cognitive, emotional and behavioral issues. Robert requests further suggestions for the DQs to be sent to him from department members.
4. Robert also requests some feedback on how to put in a request for tutors for the remedial classes. Besides requesting tutors, one option might be to hire an intern, a person besides the instructor, who can work in the room and help those students who are in need. There was a discussion concerning whether or not we could use education majors in the classroom who need to complete their student teaching requirement. Nevertheless, Robert will craft a memo and sent it to the VC that request an intern who can assist instructors in the classroom with remedial students.
5. There was a discussion on the probability of remedial students using the services available to them. It was suggested that we invite the peer mentor coordinator to our next meeting to discuss options. It was suggested that we meet with the counselors to discuss a more holistic approach to dealing with our remedial students with special needs.
6. Finally, there was a discussion considering whether or not is it our responsibility to help everyone through college or to help students find alternative tracks toward success that might not include college.

New Business:

Chancellor Dykstra recapped the Dean Richardson situation. He pointed out that we have a culture that goes beyond simply teaching classes but that we have a culture of collegiality that includes faculty being a part of making decisions. Still, he insisted that we must understand that we need to have a culture of confidentiality as well. All departments must balance these cultures every day.
At the faculty level we have power to review dossiers and contract renewals and decide what applicants get renewals. Doug insisted that the admin goes to faculty first and considers their recommendations, and while successes are always celebrated, when someone is being let go, there will never be an announcement, for “it would be humiliating.” Doug insisted that the confidentiality of our reviews must not be breached. Only an administrator may review the fact of his or her dismissal including what is written on his or her 360 reviews. In fact, the chancellor may not announce the dismissal of an administrator outright.

On the topic of administrators and their evaluations, Doug reported that the culture of collegiality is still a part of the system. When new administrator positions open up, Doug insists that he will not consider hiring anyone until we have an open forum for all top candidates. This gives all faculty and staff a chance to evaluate the candidates and provide feedback. Likewise, he pointed out that all administrators serve at the satisfaction of their supervisors. The 360 evaluations give the faculty a chance to participate in the evaluation of administrators. Doug pointed out that he participated on a taskforce that evaluated the 360s and helped to add a drop-down menu to elucidate on the low scores so that the 360s would provide further detail on how or why an administrator is receiving low scores.

Doug reported that system-wide, about 30% of people asked to complete 360 evaluations do so. At WCC, we have about 50% of people completing these evaluations.

Doug pointed out that it’s up to the chancellor to decide how to implement the 360s. Doug stated that he has gone out of his way to make sure that administrators didn’t simply cherry pick the constituents who reviewed them by expanding the minimum number of people who must respond with a 360 review. The minimum number is as follows:
- Peers- (10+)
- Subordinates- (5-10)
- Constituents- (all of them)

Everyone is free to add people from outside their department and from the non-credit side of campus. There is no minimum number of adjunct faculty that can fill out the 360 reviews.

The names of people who will receive 360 reviews come to Doreen and Doug checks them. The reminders go out to everyone who have received a 360 report whether or not they have completed their 360s or not. Doug stated that he will never knows which individuals fills out the 360s.

Doug reported that whatever the return rate on the 360s, they are simply contributory and not determinative. He stated that the dean’s job is neither an elected job nor are the deans are the representatives of the faculty. The deans and vice chancellors are the chancellor’s cabinet and all serve at the satisfaction of the chancellor. The faculty is not privy to the tasks of deans, nor are they privy to the attitude of an administrator while carrying out their tasks. When Doug receives 360 reviews on any administrators, he stated that he always brings the 360s to the administrator, the administrator must write a report, and in fifteen years, Doug has not let an administrator go until now. He reported that dismissing Brian was an important decision and it was not taken lightly. The chancellor has four categories by which he must evaluate an administrator and report to his supervisor: outstanding, superior, satisfactory and unsatisfactory.
There was discussion on whether there are ways to make the 360s more transparent so that faculty may know more about what tasks the administrators have so that faculty can see their progress. Also, there was a question about mentoring an administrator. Doug stated that if a problem is intractable and serious enough and the administrator cannot make progress to improve on his or her own, Doug will often talk to that person’s superior and request that that administrator be mentored.

Doug was asked if there was a reason why an administrator’s goals and objectives are not known? If so, that would help faculty write more informed 360 reviews. Doug admitted that it was a constructive suggestion and that it could be incorporated into the unit review. A question was posed to the chancellor as to whether or not it would be possible for faculty to give feedback on the goals or projects of administrators as a way to capture a fuller picture of a dean’s participation in collaborative projects that he or she is working on and how his or her participation affects programs and faculty outside his or her constituency. Dykstra responded that a cacophony of requests might make it hard to aggregate extensive feedbacks; however, the place for feedback to be given is to go through existing channels such as taking issues to our departments and asking them to take concerns up the channels to Academic Affairs.

There was a discussion concerning the problem that some reviewers can be identified on the 360s simply due to the fact it’s easy to identify someone on this campus because it is so small. Doug said that if someone is ever approached and received a “talking down” by someone that he or she has ever reviewed, Doug would like to be told, for that is “low-level extortion that is not acceptable.”

On the issue of the sense of fear that exists on campus, Doug’s advice is to not have fear when doing 360s. He stated that his job is to recognize any low-level extortion and it’s our responsibility to report it to him. Doug stated that it is also anyone’s right to go to court if he or she does not get a promotion or tenure and wishes to fight it. According to Doug, “No chancellor wants the report of a hearing officer or program review panel to reveal any flimsy logic behind a blatant effort to retaliate against someone who was up for tenure or promotion.” Thus, on the 360s, there may be some level of fear, but Doug’s message to us is that he would not tolerate any extortion on behalf of an administrator.

On the issue of moving forward and trusting in the process, Chancellor Dykstra was asked how something like Dean Richardson’s removal could be avoided in the future. Since Brian was let go during the summer, it startled much of a faculty and staff who came back in the fall and found out that he was let go. Additionally, the chancellor was asked why Brian was removed from campus when he began receiving letters of support from faculty and staff. Doug did not know that there was an obligatory 6-month time period given to any administrator who is being let go. Doug stated that the only way for someone to finish out his or her 6 months left on campus would be to make it clear that he or she supports the chancellor’s decision; otherwise, he or she would not have a good chance of moving up or laterally in the system. The chancellor stated that when Brian did not stop the support coming in from faculty and staff, he sent the message that people should keep it up and put pressure on the chancellor’s office to keep
him on campus. Doug saw that as “leaving a mess behind.” Doug also pointed out that he was advised by Morton to remove Brian from campus.

On the issue of the timing of 360s and the removal of administrators, the chancellor insisted that he sends out a reminder to all faculty and staff about when the 360s come out. President Lassner decides when the 360s come out and he wants them uniform across the campuses. Still, Doug stated that it is possible that Lassner would willingly take another look at the timing of the 360 reviews. However, because supervisor reports are due in late May and because administrators should have at least a full year of service by which to be reviewed, it may be difficult to change the timing of the reviews. Likewise, if there is a dismissal, it must correspond with June 30, the end of the fiscal year.

On the ethical concerns that came up in the removal of Brian, the chancellor stated that he had never heard of any complaint that was filed with the Ethics Committee, and if one was filed, it would certainly have been brought to him.

In sum, Doug agreed that it would be a good idea to post the goals and expectations for the Dean II administrator, or all administrators, so that when faculty is asked to do 360 reports, we’ll be more informed and make better assessments.

There was concern among members of the department as to whether or not Faculty Senate will be collecting and discussing feedback after Doug’s tour of the campus. Jenny will take this concern to the Faculty Senate.

**Announcements:**

Libby announced that we have been preauthorized to use Grammarly, an online grammar program through the Spring 2015 semester. We are invited to try it out and bring feedback to the department. It was also noted that there are two grammar errors on the flyer. Nobody was impressed.

Janine requests that instructors for English 22 and 23 give her a sample of an “A” paper and a “C” paper to be used at the system Dev Ed Committee meeting.

**Jenny motioned to approve Akiko’s drawing boards. Desi seconded. All approved via voce**

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.