Academic Senate
M I N U T E S
October 8, 2008
3:00 - 5:00 p.m. BC214

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcón (Chair), Jessica Aparicio, Armando Arias, Barbara Bell, Susan Broderick, Stephanie Durfor, Esther Frankel, Jack Friedlander, Tom Garey, 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, David Gilbert
Guests: Paula Congleton, Pam Guenther, Tina Kistler, Kenley Neufeld, Alice Scharper, Sheila Wiley

1.0   Call to Order
1.1   Approval of Agenda – so approved with amendments
1.2   Approval of Meeting Minutes Sept. 24, 2008 (w/attch)
M/S/C To approve the Academic Senate meeting Minutes of 9-24-08 with attachments
(Molloy/Frankel) Unanimous

2.0   Information Items
2.1   College Plan 2008-2011 at CPC
Most of our suggestions were incorporated to plan discussed at CPC. College Plan will go to the Board Study Session on October 16. Objective 8.4 language from the senate motion on October 1 has not been incorporated. Kathy O'Connor asked if COI could still talk about Objective 1.2. Ignacio said that the target numbers have already been reduced from previous version. Susan Broderick asked if we were going to vote on the recommendations and changes that we have suggested. Kim Monda said that the College Plan 2008-2011 was an action item in our last meeting, but no action was taken. She asked if we could move this item back to Action. Susan Broderick said that even if we do that, the issue of Objective 8.4 remains. Janet Shapiro has been away at a conference, and Susan feels like she should have the opportunity of reviewing the Objective 8.4 suggested at CPC on October 7. Tom Garey mentioned that at CPC it was explained that the language we had about "bringing facilities to ADA compliance" could actually be interpreted as achieving less that what we would want.

M/S/C Move College Plan 2008-2011 back to Action (O'Connor/Bell) Unanimous
M/S/C To approve College Plan revision pending Janet Shapiro's review and input of item 8.4, and COI input and review of item 1.2 (Molloy/Garey) Unanimous

3.0   Hearing and Discussion Items
3.1   Partnership for Student Success Year 2 Report
Ignacio announced how PSS has made us proud again. Kathy Molloy handed out an award announcement from a recent "Student Success" Conference where the Partnership for Student Success received the Hewlett Award, as a "Hewlett Leader in Student Success." She explained the college did not apply for the award; the Hewlett Foundation people researched the data on basic skills student success rates among the 109 California community colleges. These are the selection criteria for the award: "Demonstrate promising and innovative approaches to success in basic skills. Their purposeful efforts yield coherent, structured, and systematic activities with investment in assessment and actual improvement in basic skills. And the key elements are: Curriculum aligned and organized for

effectiveness; learner-centered classroom practices; integration of academic support and student services; equity, pursued by assessing learning and progress rates by cohort; institutional leadership and support, reflected in mission, planning, evaluation and investment."

SBCC was one of four community colleges in California that have been recognized for making significant progress in basic skills education. The colleges that have won this award offer inspiring models of institutional commitment to basic skills in mission, planning and practice. Hewlett determined the winners by tracking the success of three recent cohorts of students in basic skills math and English where the standard of success was the percentage of students who progressed through pre-collegiate classes to transfer-level coursework. The analyses took into account the racial, ethnic and socio-economic differences of student populations as well as the distinct profiles of the colleges, for example, urban or rural, large or small. The Hewlett Leaders program asked the 27 colleges with the strongest data to give three examples of strategies they use to increase success of basic skills students because data alone cannot give a complete profile of a schools' work. A two-person visiting team then observed classrooms and labs, interviewed faculty and administrators.

After presenting at the panel discussion that followed the award ceremony, Kathy Molloy observed that SBCC had the only faculty driven initiative and the only comprehensive program of the award winners.

Kathy Molloy gave a short background on how the initiative began at the Academic Senate in 2005 with a task force from across the disciplines, involving faculty from each division, administrators and students. Proposals from across the campus were reviewed by the task force and brought to the Senate. The Senate used these proposals to develop a Student Success Initiative, which was then sent on to CPC and the Board of Trustees for approval. This became the Partnership for Student Success, which was then instituted in 2006.   The Senate also recommended that the PSS be evaluated every year to make sure that the programs were proving effective. Recommendations for changes would be made based on the results of these evaluations. Last year the report was only five pages, and this year's report has grown to is 23 pages because we are collecting and analyzing more data on the programs.

Kathy Molloy asked each of the leaders of the Partnership programs to give a brief program overview and answer any questions from the senators. Ms. Molloy filled in for Jerry Pike at the Writing Center. The ESL Curriculum redesign project was added because it was a major recipient of the ESL/ Basic Skills funds, and Priscilla Butler would attend at 4:45 to answer any questions. (Note: She did attend, but the Senate was engaged in a discussion and didn't raise any questions.)

Academic Achievement Zone: Paula Congleton reported that tutors are in the Achievement Zone for every hour they are open. They have served 153 'at risk' athletes and 1600 students. Students who attend the AZ have a much higher success rate in their classes than students who do not attend. The complete report can be found on page 14 of the "Evaluation Report on the Partnership for Student Success: Year Two."

Math Lab: Pam Guenther reported there are now Directed Learning Activities for nearly every math topic available for teachers and tutors. Students who use the Math Lab regularly have a much higher success rate than student who do not use these services. The complete report can be found on page 12 of the "Evaluation Report on the Partnership for Student Success: Year Two."

Gateway: Sheila Wiley reported they have hired a full time Gateway Coordinator.   Use of the Gateway Center has increased substantially, and students in Gateway classes have a higher success rate than

students in non-Gateway classes, and basic skills students are succeeding at the highest rates. The complete report can be found on pages 3-7 of the "Evaluation Report on the Partnership for Student Success: Year Two."

Writing Center: Reporting for Jerry Pike, Kathy Molloy explained that the Writing Center's mantra is the 'don't give them a fish; teach them to fish' approach. The have developed a DLA for students to complete before seeing a tutor, and this is helping students assess their work and take responsibility for the tutoring session. They have seen a huge increase in student use of the WC, and students who use the WC regularly have much higher success rates than those who do not use the WC. They also have hired a full time coordinator to assist students in the WC. The complete report can be found on pages 8-11 of the "Evaluation Report on the Partnership for Student Success: Year Two."

Tina Kistler reported on the Communication Department use of OIAs to support students in online Communication classes. Kenley Neufeld explained the PSS recommendation that the $20,000 allocation ($10,000 from the SSI and $10,000 from the ESL/Basic Skills funding) be allocated separately for instructors using OIAs for student support as originally intended. This will allow us to separate out this cohort and evaluate the effectiveness of various uses of OIAs for supporting students in online classes.

A presentation of the evaluation report will be made at the October 30th Board of Trustees meeting.

M/S/C To make a motion on behalf of the Academic Senate commending all of the faculty involved in this project that Kathy Molloy spearheaded and in winning the Hewlett Award; and commending EVP Jack Friedlander and former President/Superintendent John Romo for ensuring the administrative and financial support for Student Success Initiative and Partnership for Student Success (Garey/O'Connor) Unanimous

4.0   Action Items
4.1   Textbook and Course Materials Adoption Guidelines
M/S/C To approve the Textbook and Course Materials Adoption Guidelines w/amendment to #2 (add: tradebooks) (Molloy/Schultz)

4.2   Program Review Procedures (p 17-21 and 22-26)
Ignacio and Andreea discussed how doing a full program review every two years may not be adequate now that we are making such significant changes to what will be required. It makes sense to tie the program reviews to the College Plan. A full program review would be completed by the end of the spring of the year when the College Plan is finalized. There would be no staggering and all programs would have to do a full review the same year.

Tom Garey asked if this represents a big follow-up problem with deans and Executive Vice President having to meet with all departments in one semester.

Jack Friedlander said that the reality would be that the program reviews would be completed during fall and spring of the year when the College Plan is finalized, thus the program review meetings would not all fall in one semester. There could be even cases when some meetings would not happen until the fall

Ignacio talked about what the annual updates would include. In the off years, the narrative would be minimal, including only an evaluation of the previous year, goals and objectives for the following year,

and the planning templates in those cases when you new staff, new faculty, or new resources were needed.

Oscar Zavala asked if replacement positions would be considered a new resource? Ignacio responded that they would not.

Kim Monda asked what section of the College Plan is addressed by the new section "Outreach Activity". Jack Friedlander said that this would be Goal 3. There may be a need to explain this better in the document. The Outreach Activity should tie to dual enrollment, mission, and transfer, for example. Kathy O'Connor said that this would also address Objective 3.2, regarding Enrollment Management plan.

Esther Frankel said that the timeline for the program review needs to be better laid out. Jack Friedlander said that full program reviews are proposed to be done by the end of the academic year. This is truly new and it is good to engage in these questions to make the procedures clearer.

Esther asked about status of those who went through Program Reviews last year?

Ignacio said that we are proposing to change from program reviews being staggered to having them be done the same year. The Policy and Procedures need to be updated. This is all happening due to the new information we have received about accreditation teams training.

Tom Garey thanked those for working on the revision. The proposed procedures are a superior product from the previous one. Can the narrative points be addressed as bulleted items? This would make it less onerous. After accreditation and going forward this could be done on a lottery/rotation basis.

It was suggested that a portion of the next Steering Committee meeting would be devoted to more clean up of the documents. Any more modifications and suggestions ought to be submitted to Jack and Ignacio.

4.3 Replacement Positions

Ignacio reported on his conversation with Andreea about replacement positions and the College's Full Time Faculty Obligation. Andreea provided Ignacio with a memo to clarify what she discussed with the Senate on September 24. Her memo states that replacement positions and full time positions would not be competing with each other within the ranking process. The memo also states that proposals for replacements should be a condensed version with statistical information that can be obtained from Melanie Rogers to indicate stability or growth in enrollment. Only new positions proposals need to be comprehensive, as has been the practice in recent years.

Jan Schultz suggested that in future years, details of hiring process are determined much earlier before an enormous amount of time and effort is put forth that may not be needed or considered. The Senate should create formal procedures for replacement and full time positions. It may be necessary to revisit procedures for exceptions, and for extraordinary events and conditions (such as resignations, or retirements out of deadline.)

It is important to inform department chairs of what they are required to do for replacement positions: (a) Cover memo requesting replacement, (a) Substantiating data from the Office of Institutional Advancement, Research and Planning.

Jack Friedlander mentioned that there is a total of 13 or 14 retirements or unfilled positions from previous retirements. The best case scenario for new positions is six growth positions. We may not know until January 2009

Ignacio mentioned that the System Office has submitted an appeal to the Full Time Faculty Obligation to the Board of Governors, that they will be hearing in November. It could be that the Board of Governors doesn't act on this until their January meeting. Proposal hearings on October 22; ranking on November 5.

M/S/C Move agenda item 2.2 to action – no full review/hearing on replacement positions (Garey/Zavala) Unanimous
M/S/C To approve that replacement positions do not need to go through the full hearing process – cover memo and substantiating data only (Nevis/Schultz)

5.0   Reports
5.1   President's Report
        Ignacio expressed his acknowledgment of Jack Friedlander's commitment to the revision of the Program Review Procedures. Ignacio indicated that in the last ten days alone, he and Jack had spent more than twenty hours working together on them.

5.2   Liaisons' Reports
5.3   EVP Report

6.0   Adjourn