

**Academic Senate
MINUTES
Special Meeting
October 1, 2008
3:00 - 5:00 p.m. BC214**

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcón (Chair), Jessica Aparicio, Armando Arias, Barbara Bell, Susan Broderick, Stephanie Durfor, Jack Friedlander, Tom Garey, David Gilbert, Kathy Molloy, Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, David Morris, Mimi Muraoka, Dean Nevins, Kathy O'Connor, Jan Schultz, Ana María Ygualt, Oscar Zavala

Members Absent: Curtis Bieber, Cathie Carroll, Esther Frankel

1.0 Call to Order

2.0 Information Items

2.1 Student Senate Representative to the Academic Senate

Jessica Aparicio, Associated Students Body Public Relations Officer, is the new Student Senate representative to the Academic Senate. Jessica is taking Camila Avendaño's place at our Senate meetings due to a scheduling conflict. Jessica announced that currently, the Associated Students' main concern is the vote on the MTD fare increase. This vote is expected to take place later in October.

2.2 Contractors Recognize Construction Academy

On September 30, the Santa Barbara Contractors Association presented its annual President's Award to Santa Barbara City College's Construction Academy. The recognition honors an organization that has made significant contributions to the advancement of the construction trades. SBCC's Construction's Academy, which will celebrate its third birthday this spring, now offers 18 courses a year, including classes at local high schools that participate in the college's Dual Enrollment Program. The majority of classes are taught by industry professionals.

3.0 Action Items

3.1 College Plan 2008-2011

Ignacio Alarcón announced that the recommendations for Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and the changes submitted by Oscar Zavala regarding the Transfer Center have been submitted to President Andreea Serban. There was also a modification for ESL. The Jack Friedlander explained that the ESL department had asked for an increase change from 3% to 2% over a three year period.

Kathy O'Connor reported that the Committee for Online Instruction (COI) did not have an opportunity to discuss 1.2 and wanted to know if it would be too late to make any adjustments to the projected numbers of online class completions. CPC members responded that they would take the COI recommendations to the CPC meeting on October 7.

Kathy Molloy described that one of the recommendations to the Senate in the report of the Partnership for Student Success to be presented on October 8, is to separate out funds that were originally approved for online instructional aides. The proposal is for more supplemental instruction and tutoring. The guidelines state that OIAs are not to be used as readers. Kathy O'Connor said that she saw a problem with this. When the funds were originally approved there were no stipulations. The number of online

classes kept increasing and there was no money for OIAs. When OIA positions were initiated, we combined the roles of readers and tutors and went through the same process as with readers but combined the two job descriptions. Online aides often do tutoring sessions but their activities are varied.

Kathy Molloy reiterated that the original proposal stipulated contact with the student. She said that Darla Cooper believes that we can separate everything out this way to analyze whether increased instructional aide improves student success.

Jack Friedlander said the PSS dollars given to the Online College is only a subset of all the different plans used for Student Improvement in the College Plan. Regarding PSS money using OIAs in a certain way, ours was an experiment, and no restrictions were suggested.

Kathy Molloy said that the PSS funds are an augmentation to develop different ways of interacting with students.

Kathy O'Connor asked how we were supposed to evaluate that section of the OIA that is tutoring and this effect on the outcome versus anything else that they might do. If one person does several activities, how do we separate that out?

On a different item on the College Plan, Susan Broderick brought up a concern from Janet Shapiro. Susan said that it is important that the College develops a plan to address ADA compliance in more detail. It was suggested that Janet Shapiro be at CPC on October 7.

M/S/C To endorse the changes the Senate has proposed with the added language in 8.4 "To develop and initiate a plan to bring facilities to ADA compliance" (Molloy/Garey) 1 abstention

3.2 Program Review Procedures

Ignacio and Jack have worked on incorporating into our Program Review Procedures the Riverside CC model for instructional and educational support.

It was asked what the status was for those departments that are scheduled to complete their program review. Should they wait until this is finalized and approved? The consensus is that they ought to wait, although the templates for planning are not changing and departments could be working on them.

The expectation for the College regarding Program Review is that we ought to be at the highest level, the 'sustainable continuous quality improvement' level of the accreditation standards. In order to be in compliance we will need to add those items that are missing based on the *Accreditation Notes* "What Accreditors Expect from College Program Review" (from April 2003.) What has been missing is a clear integration between the program review processes and the planning processes and the mission of the college.

Tom Garey expressed that we may be overreaching. He asked if we had an idea about what the minimum requirements are that we would need to meet? Do we need to be exemplary in our program reviews or should we not be exemplary as an institution, which we have always been? What was a three page narrative with several checklists approved by the Senate three meetings ago has now becoming a master's thesis. Tom Garey expressed that Program reviews are an academic professional matter.

Ignacio mentioned that he personally didn't think that the proposed procedures are too onerous. We do have new information based on the accrediting agencies training of visiting teams that both Andreea and Darla have been part of that we need to use to update our procedures.

Kim Monda asked if the templates that have been proposed are also turned into a narrative? We seem to be adding a lot more writing, making it even more difficult to integrate into the institutional planning process. Nothing tells us where this all goes, except to the Superintendent/President and the Board of Trustees. This doesn't address institutional planning. For example, it is not clear how Planning and Resources Committee would be involved. Is it enough to say 'will be used in the college's planning process' and not explain how? Planning and Resources Committee has had difficulty getting the information soon enough to be of value in the shared governance process.

It was requested that the senators have the opportunity to review the document before going through it item by item. A suggestion was made to elaborate a list of the major changes and their rationale regarding their value to us at SBCC.

Kathy O'Connor said that she saw a lot of value in the proposed changes. For example, the curriculum piece of the program review was never explicitly requested, which has been part of the reason why we are not in compliance. The State Academic Senate site provides guidelines for a program review, which includes regular curriculum review.

3.3 Faculty Job Descriptions/Faculty Responsibilities Checklists

Jan Schultz presented the updated checklists for contract and adjunct faculty and educational support contract and adjunct faculty. Academic Policies has streamlined the wording and incorporated the SLO procedures into the checklists and the content is now aligned with the faculty job descriptions.

Tom Garey mentioned that the Instructors' Association board has reviewed the faculty job descriptions and the checklists and they have no objections to the modifications.

There was a discussion about adjunct faculty and their responsibilities around SLOs. Adjuncts can be expected to assess established SLOs, and to participate in department's discussions that make use of the collected information to improve student performance on SLOs. Adjuncts are not expected to develop SLOs.

M/S/C To move to action approval of the faculty job descriptions and the checklists (Garey/O'Connor)
Unanimous

M/S/C To move to approve the faculty job descriptions and the checklists (Garey/O'Connor)
Unanimous

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Process for replacement positions

The deadlines are coming up for writing the proposals. There is a growing concern, namely: is the Senate going to hear and rank replacement positions? This concern has appeared after President Serban's meeting the senate on September 24.

The process for the last couple of years, for departments seeking replacement positions, if the WSCH and enrollment data, etc., was consistent enough we have waived hearing and ranking for replacements.

Are we seriously talking about looking at departments that are not doing well and not replacing positions? The deadline for submitting notes of retirement is this Friday. Two weeks from then the proposals are due. The week after that we are ranking. Are we ranking new and replacement positions together?

Tom Garey mentioned that deadlines are driven by the schedule for hiring new faculty and if the Full Time Faculty Obligation is an unprecedented negative number we will not going to be hiring any new faculty positions. We shouldn't be putting department chairs through an elaborate process if the data in their department shows robust enrollments until we know we're going to have to cut positions.

Kathy O'Connor suggested that Jack Friedlander, the department chairs, and the deans review the replacement positions and data, and at least initially we could agree not to ask for elaborate documentation to be submitted unless the department is facing a decrease in enrollment. The only departments that would need to put together a full proposal would be those departments showing a decrease in enrollment.

Jan Schultz said that the only reason she could see for full proposals for replacement positions would be if new and replacement proposals were to be considered equally. In the past the Senate's consensus has been that once a department is established, a streamlined process has been in place.

David Morris said that from the senate meeting with Andreea on September 24, it could be implied that while retiring faculty would be replaced, it could be the case that they are not replaced in the same department if there is a greater need in another department. Is that what we are to understand?

Oscar Zavala said that it would be demoralizing to have to fight for a replacement position when there is tremendous growth and in a department where different measures, not WSCH, are used.

Ignacio said that on Friday, at the time of his standing weekly meeting with Andreea he will discuss all of this with her.

Tom Garey said that this discussion has come up periodically and the one principle that has emerged in all those discussion is to recognize that we have departments that need additional faculty, a need to grow, but that we are not going to grow departments by cannibalizing other healthy departments in the process.

M/S/C To send a recommendation from the Senate emphasizing that we believe in the philosophy that we have established over the years; that we reiterate that unless there is a major change in the department replacement positions should be replaced in all departments (Molloy/O'Connor)
Unanimous

5.0 Reports

- 5.1 President's Report
- 5.2 Liaisons' Reports
- 5.3 EVP Report

6.0 Adjourn