Academic Senate
M I N U T E S
February 13, 2008
3:00 - 5:00 p.m. BC214

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcón (Chair), Susan Broderick, Cathie Carroll, Tom Fitzgerald, Jack Friedlander, Tom Garey, David Gilbert, Kelly Lake, Ray Launier, Linda Lowell, Kathy Molloy, Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, Elida Moreno, Mimi Muraoka, Dean Nevins, Kathy O'Connor, Jan Schultz, Dan Wrentmore, Ana Maria Ygualt, Oscar Zavala
Members Excused: Armando Arias
Guest(s): Rhys Alvarado, Mark Ferrer, Joan Galvan, Wendy Peters, President John Romo, Karen Sophiea

1.0   Call to Order
     1.1   Approval of Minutes 12-05-07 with attachment
     M/S/C To approve the meeting Minutes of December 5, 2007 (Garey/Schultz)
     1.2   Approval of agenda

2.0   Information
     2.1   Elida Moreno has been elected to substitute for Barbara Bell as English/English Skills Senator during Spring 2008, due to Barbara Bell's Study Abroad assignment. Welcome Elida!

     2.2   ISLOs approved by Board of Trustees, January 28.
Ignacio Alarcón announced the BOT had approved the proposed Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. The Board expressed high appreciation for all the work involved in creating this important document.

     2.3   Two-Year College English Association (TYCA) Outstanding Program Award.
Kathy Molloy announced SBCC's Gateway Program had received the prestigious award. The focus of this national award is to recognize outstanding programs that succeed in meeting the needs of developmental students.

     2.4   Jan Anderson will retire at end of academic year. News was received over the break that Jan Anderson was retiring. The senate was asked to weigh in this and a consensus was reached to approve her replacement with an ADN full-time tenure-track position effective Fall 2008.

     2.5   New President/Superintendent search. The selected candidates to be interviewed have been contacted. Interviews will be held February 22, 23, 25, at an off-campus location.

     2.6   Co-Chair for Accreditation (Summer 08 – Fall 09).
Ignacio Alarcón has been in contact with Darla Cooper about the Accreditation Co-Chair position needed for accreditation. Ms. Cooper and the EVP will finalize the definition of the scope of this position and the release time required.

2.7   Board Policy 3430 Prohibition of Discrimination/Sexual Harassment modification
        required by the Office of Civil Rights.
The office of the Civil Rights has requested the addition of the 'notification of allegations'
change to the policy.

2.8   Joan Galvan, SBCC's new Public Information Officer and Rhys Alvarado, Managing
Editor of the Channels were recognized and introduced by Ignacio Alarcón.

2.9   Added item: Ana Maria Ygualt and Petition
Ms. Ygualt asked to be heard delivering an informational item, as an addition to the agenda.
She explained the developer of the Santa Fe condos would be prepared to build four more
affordable condos adjacent to the condos that are currently under construction. The property is
now zoned as agricultural and would require rezoning. The developer could build two large
houses but is asking for support to build more affordable housing instead. A petition is
available for signing in support of rezoning.

President Romo asked to comment about the petition. He explained that while he has a great
deal of respect for what the developer has done thus far for SBCC, he does not recommend
endorsement of this new petition for rezoning at this time.

3.0   Hearing/Discussion
3.1   President John Romo attends.
John Romo gave an update on the Bond Measure with a handout of previously emailed
materials and the BOT resolution. Of note: there is now a "Measure V" information link on the
SBCC webpage.

President Romo talked about this exciting opportunity for the college. The passage of this bond
of 77 million dollars could leverage up to 92 million dollars from state funding. The projects
included in Measure V are core infrastructure maintenance, deferred maintenance, seismic,
ADA compliant projects, the sports pavilion and sports field and track, the Physical Sciences
wing, the Drama/Music project, the renovation of the Schott and Wake Centers, and the new
SOMA building. Measure V focuses on key educational programs to maintain a high standard
of education. Given the financial situation at the state level, it is critical to the health of the
college that the bond measure succeeds. Good news: primary opponents of our previous bond
measure are supportive of Measure V.

The impact of the bond measure is $8.50 per $100,000 of assessed value. The median assessed
valuation of homes in the south coast is $368,000.

Dean Nevins remarked it is important that voters realize how passing the bond is not a $77
million obligation per se. The obligation would be capped at $77 million, and incurred
incrementally, contingent on the actual undertaking of the projects.

3.2   New SBCC Website (Karen Sophiea).
Ms. Sophiea displayed the new design proposal for the College's website and highlighted the
key navigation focus. She received positive feedback and some suggestions from the Senators,
e.g.: make tours/orientations more prominent, as well as considerations of the web page size.

3.3   Faculty Recognition Committee's recommendation for Stanback-Stroud Award.
Kelly Lake announced the Faculty Recognition Committee's decision to nominate Dina
Castillo for the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award. The Committee worked during the recess,
receiving nominations up to January 16, and completing and submitting the nomination packet
by the January 31st deadline. The Committee is requesting approval of the nomination after its
submission. Ignacio expressed appreciation for the work of the committee, given the tight
schedule that followed the call for nominations. Ignacio mentioned how Laura Welby, chair of
FRC, will plan to complete nominations for these annual awards early in the academic year,
even if the call from the statewide senate has not been made. It is the committee's intention to
avoid making this kind of request. Oscar Zavala commended the committee for their choice of
nominee to the award, given his personal appreciation of the work of Prof. Castillo.
M/S/C To move the FRC nominee for the Stanback-Stroud Diversity award to action
(Garey/Molly) unanimous
M/S/C To retroactively approve the nominee Dina Castillo for the Stanback-Stroud Diversity
Award nomination (Molloy/Garey) unanimous

3.4   Partnership for Student Success recommendations.
Kathy Molloy reported the amount of the augmentation for the revised FTES should be
changed from $50,000 to $30,000 in the fourth paragraph of the first page of the packet with
Partnership for Student Success recommendations. This is credit's share of the augmentation to
our 2006-07 Basic Skills allocation. In addition, we have unused funds for DLAs in the 2006-
07 Basic Skills allocation. These are one-time funds. For 2007-08, there are no additional
proposals for ongoing funding. This leaves $92,000 in unallocated Basic Skills/ESL funds for
2007-08. There are approximately $42,000 in one-time requests.

For 2008-09, there will be $146,000 unallocated ongoing funds available. The Partnership for
Student Success committee is proposing that the ongoing funds be used to supplement the
Gateway tutor budget to provide tutors in basic skills and ESL summer classes and to create
two single classified positions for Gateway and the LRC. Single classification positions may
be terminated if funding is lost and the personnel in them have no bumping rights. The
suggestion for the single classification designation came from HRLA. Dean Alice Scharper,
Sheila Wiley, and Jerry Pike are working with HRLA on the job descriptions. The governor's
proposed budget includes an 11% reduction in all categorical programs funding. The PSS
committee recommends setting aside at least this amount from unallocated one-time funds to
cover the possible cut. Ms. Molloy requested senators to review the proposals being
recommended for approval. Representatives from the groups making all of the proposals will
be at the next Senate meeting to answer any questions.

It was clarified that the recommendations for single classification positions don't need to
go through College Planning Council approval, because these are categorical funds that
are not available for other uses. This will go to CPC as an information item.

The $30,000 for the student success grants that FPDC recommended recently are ongoing
funds, part of the original SSI. Our ongoing Basic Skills/ESL allocation is $340,000
ongoing.

Senators commented that they are glad about this recommendation that some categorical funds are set aside to prepare for possible funding cuts.

3.5   SLO process oversight.
The SLO website will be up March 3 after implementing inservice recommendations. Mark will send campus-wide email when website is available.

There have been several complications. As an example, the two-unit course limit previously set has created a problem for many departments. Those restrictions have now be taken off, and all courses offered by a department will be available for planning. Departments will select those items that will be part of their plan, and not every course will have to be considered in plan.

Mark provided a description of a possible division of responsibilites regarding SLOs.

Departments would have their approved course SLOs as an addendum to the course of study outlines. These addenda can then be reviewed, edited and adjusted without needing to go through CAC approval process (similar to textbook updates). Departments will continue to work directly with Mark when developing their course SLOs. There was a question to Mark: will there be a recommended process for departments on how they can evaluate their course SLOs, since they are the ultimate responsible for them? Mark is developing a rubric with this purpose. The EVP expressed how this approach seems more natural and efficient than having a specific review/certification committee. The ambitious effort in training all departments will result in good quality control being shouldered by departments. Continuous monitoring of SLOs through program reviews and ongoing discussions within departments are expected to suggest modifications and improvements. Ignacio, Darla, Mo and Mark will continue to be available for departments' ongoing discussions as they complete the development of course SLOs.

Our proposed course-embedded assessment will be used for program and institutional SLOs assessment as well, thus avoiding separate assessment. We will need to decide soon how to address the development of program SLOs, for approximately 60 departments, including how they relate to the institutional SLOs.

Program SLOs development will begin Fall 2008. Mark clarified that a department may have several programs, and they would need different program SLOs. For now, the college is to concentrate only on state-approved certificates and degrees. Other programs, like Skills Competency Awards, may have to be postponed.

We also need to have a plan to look at the institutional data collected and ways to improve achievement of ISLOs. CTL's charge is to collect and disseminate best strategies for teaching. One possible approach is that CTL could be in charge of dissemination of best practices around program SLOs and how they address ISLOs. CTL will be discussing their possible involvement in the SLO process.

Regarding programs that are not degree/certificate related, such as programs in Student Services, the EVP offered Counseling as an example of a program. In Student Services, a rule of thumb to decide what constitutes a program may be cost center designation.

3.6   College Plan 2008 – 2011 and Goals and Objectives
Kim Monda reported that the Planning and Resources Committee wanted to know the purpose of the major overarching challenges and priorities document as related to the College Plan. The EVP explained how, at CPC, the overarching challenges and priorities document was used as a basis for developing the College Plan draft. The core document is the College Plan, and the Major Overarching Challenges and Priorities document can be regarded as an internal document that is instrumental to produce the College Plan.

A pertinent question is: do program reviews refer to the College Plan or address our department goals based on some of the challenges and what we are doing in some of those areas?

Program reviews have not normally been tied to the College Plan. In the current program reviews being conducted, departments are asked to address Goals and Objectives. At this moment, there is no reference to the College Plan since the new one is in development. It is appropriate to look at the challenges/opportunities/college plan depending on your focus. The idea is not to force a link between the program review and college plan. The question that needs to be addressed is: are we using program reviews in our planning process? In the past we, like most schools, have stopped at the end of the program review process. Now, in our analysis of requests and planning process the outcomes of the Program Reviews need to be incorporated.

To have a program review be integrated with the college plan, the most natural venue is the Planning and Resources Committee. As an example: one of the objectives in the college plan being proposed and in the current college plan is that we will continue to meet our FTES targets. Each program has talked about FTES generating strategies. As we develop a planning process we need to think through how to incorporate this.

The program review report lends itself to being put into play into the college planning process. It would be a worthwhile effort to experiment with the process of having P&R carry out this task. This will also help with our vocabulary about what is going on at the college.

It would be useful if the EVP provides P&R with some examples of program reviews and use P&R as a sounding board for how to examine the program review outcomes and in what format they can get incorporated into the college planning process.

This may be an interesting process as we begin the new program review cycle: P&R would receive an outcome page from each completed program review and the program review report all through the planning process, not just the year when we are developing a new college plan. We would be mapping the outcomes to items in the college plan. If no mapping can be done, this could be an indication of omissions in the college plan. This process can aid in the writing of the college plan itself, as an ongoing process instead of a single event every two years.

There is a perceived added benefit: this can create a feedback loop of departments' activities to the Senate through P&R. The information flow can become significantly better as related to what kind of planning departments are doing and what resources they need. That would give P&R a central role.

It's a positive way of learning what everyone is doing. Using the outcomes and mapping them to the college plan showing how the programs connect. This would facilitate the discussion of resource requests, and would have the college respond to the new accreditation standards. A large number of schools have had difficulties with this. Our proposed process could be a very good and efficient response.

Once a semester P&R could make a brief report that synthesizes ideas or trends arising from the outcomes of that semester's program reviews

3.7   Advanced Placement Course Credit policy (Laura Castro and Wendy Peters).
Ms. Laura Castro and Ms. Wendy Peters summarized the current policy for the award of college credit to students who have taken Advanced Placement exams with scores of 3, 4, or 5, and their proposal for a policy change.

Advanced Placement Proposal

Part I – Changing the AP Policy – Current AP policy allows students to request that their AP scores be posted on their SBCC transcript to reflect credits and course equivalency received at SBCC. This creates confusion among students since not all institutions of higher education award the same credits and course equivalencies for AP   scores of 3, 4 and 5. However, when students see their AP credits on the SBCC transcript, they assume the credit shown on their transcript correspond to their "AP college credit" awarded. In addition, transfer reports generated from SBCC's Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS) currently capture AP credits from the SBCC transcript and apply them to UC/CSU transferable unit calculations. This results in an inaccurate computation of the total number of transferable credits.

Proposed Action: Eliminate the current option of allowing students to petition that their AP scores be reflected on their SBCC transcript. Instead, treat AP scores as an external transcript to be evaluated for each of the following purposes: SBCC credit, SBCC GE applicability, SBCC course equivalency, UC transferable credit and CSU transferable credit, IGETC credit, and CSU GE credit.

Part II – Changing SBCC Credit Awarded for Advanced Placement Scores – Refer to the "Proposed Advanced Placement Chart" attached to the minutes (proposed changes appear shaded). There are currently 3 ways that Advanced Placement scores of 3, 4, or 5 can be counted toward SBCC credit:

As the equivalent of an existing SBCC course – This is decided by each individual department.
Proposed Action: No change is proposed to this procedure.

As satisfying a General Education requirement for SBCC degree programs – Currently, passing AP scores (3, 4 or 5) for some exams count toward satisfying General Education requirements while others do not.
Proposed Action: To align our acceptance of these AP scores as General Education requirements with current practices at UCs and CSUs as shown in attached chart.

As satisfying elective units for SBCC degree programs (minimum of 60 degree-applicable units) – Currently, some AP scores (3, 4 or 5) for some exams count toward satisfying elective units while others do not.
Proposed Action: To align our acceptance of these AP scores as elective units with current practices at UCs and CSUs as shown in attached chart.

Both Academic Policies and Matriculation support the change proposed in Part I and defer changes to Part II to the Academic Senate.

3.8 Free Speech policy (Ben Partee/Jack Friedlander).
There was no discussion about the proposed modifications to the Free Speech policy, attached to the agenda.

3.9 Instructors' Association - Academic Senate Liaison Agreement
Tom Garey requested that Senators/Divisions review both the proposed Liaison agreement for renewal and the old agreement.

4.0 EVP: An LVN probationary instructor, Joe Herring, resigned from college late in the Fall 2007. This is another request for authorization of a replacement with a full-time tenure-track faculty, out of the Human Resources timeline. This is a similar situation to the ADN position. There would be undue hardship on those departments to be able to find qualified personnel who would consider a temporary contract.

It was expressed that it is important to insist to departments about the importance of observing the HRLA timeline. This is a reminder of the urgency of creating an ad-hoc subcommittee to develop some guidelines about when exceptions to the timeline may be granted.

M/S/C Move to the request to Hearing and Action (O'Connor/Molloy) 2 abstentions.
M/S/C To approve the exception that the LVN department can go forward with the offer of a full-time tenure-track faculty contract for this retirement position (Molloy/Monda) 2 abstentions

4.0   Reports
    4.1   President's Report
    4.2   Liaison Reports
    4.3   EVP Report

5.0   Adjourn