

Academic Senate  
**MINUTES**  
**February 9, 2005**  
 3:00 p.m. - BC214

Members Present: Blake Barron, Barbara Bell, Susan Broderick, Jim Chesher, Esther Frankel, Jack Friedlander, Tom Garey, Peter Haslund (Chair), Mary Lawson, Tom Mahoney, Petra Malinova, Kathy Molloy, Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, Elida Moreno, Kathy O'Connor, Peter Rojas, Jan Schultz, Sheri Shields, Laura Welby  
 Guests: Cecile Binmoeller-*The Channels*, Keith McLellan

**1.0 Call to Order**

1.1 Approval of Minutes – December 8, 2004  
 M/S/C To approve the Minutes of the Academic Senate, 12-8-04  
 (Monda/Lawson)

1.1 Approval of Agenda – so approved

**2.0 Information**

2.1 CAC Chair Selection status

There are two applicants interested in serving as chair of the Curriculum Advisory Committee. The committee will review the two candidates and report back to the Senate their recommendation for approval.

2.2 Committee Chairs Meeting, 3<sup>rd</sup> Friday of each month at noon.

The Academic Senate committee chairs and Senate president have scheduled informal monthly meetings to coordinate committee work and exchange ideas.

**3.0 Hearing/Discussion**

3.1 What should we place on our plate for the Spring semester? Develop a process/calendar by which our tasks can be accomplished.

At our spring semester inservice an agenda was presented by the Senate President identifying what the Academic Senate should have a serious look at for the remainder of the semester. A copy of the "Issues and Process" and "Reflections on the Fall Semester" was included in a notebook prepared for the Senators which also contained the following: Senate Roster; Spring 2005 meeting schedule, Academic Senate Committee Chairs and membership roster and the committee's charges, and the four commissioned reports: 1) Academic Integrity, 2) Academic Calendar and Scheduling, 3) Examination of Existing Academic Committee Structure, and 4) Contract Instructional Faculty Job Description.

3.2 College's deadline for submitting the Student Equity Plan to the Chancellor's Office. The focus of the plan is on the process for developing the plan.

A draft of the Student Equity Plan summary was handed out. More than a decade ago the Chancellor's office required each college to submit a Student Equity Plan.

"A student equity plan is a written document in which a district's student

population is analyzed and specific result-oriented plans and procedures are set forth for ensuring equal opportunity, promoting diversity, and achieving expected representation of qualified members of all population groups". The "population groups" are: American Indians or Alaskan natives, Asians or Pacific Islanders, Blacks, Hispanics, Whites, men, women, and persons with disabilities. The plan objective is to identify the success rates of these populations, and show what the institution is doing to bring a degree of equity between the populations in terms of performance rates. The five indicator areas are; access, retention, degree and certificate completion, ESL and basic skills completion, and transfer. These components can be grouped into four broad categories: (1) research, (2) goals, (3) implementation, and (4) evaluation.

A student equity plan workgroup was formed and reviewed all the programs we offer. Those with successful components and common themes were identified. Two major student success initiatives evolved from this review that would meet the needs of both the Student Equity Plan and our College Success Program. The Success Program would incorporate all of those components that work throughout the varied successful programs and coalesce them into a comprehensive whole, with a structured curriculum component and also an integrated support services component. The second part of the equity plan would include the ESL Institute. These would be the two major strategic areas to be developed for the Student Equity Plan.

Action is needed by the next Senate meeting to go to BOT for approval the following day.

The Academic Senate should focus on the following:

- Identify the student body that is described.
- To what extent are we serving their needs?
- To what extent are we serving their needs well?
- To the extent we are not serving their needs, what should be done?

There are two issues: to approve a document we can support for the purposes of meeting a deadline and to see this as a living document that will guide us to help this population.

### 3.3 Student Success Initiatives: a review of the need and initial ideas for increasing student success. (Jack Friedlander)

With respect to the Student Success Initiatives and the Student Equity Plan the common goals and strategies are one and the same: identify all the things that are already working and the common threads that might inform the approach to take. The suggestions could be complimentary to what already exists.

#### 4.0 Action

There were no items sent to action.

#### 5.0 Reports

##### 5.1 President's Report

###### A) Report from UCSB's IV Action Group

The final meeting was held Tuesday, 2/8/05. The final report of the Action Group will be available to the public once it is approved. The Action Group was formed in response to the death of an SBCC student in Isla Vista.

###### B) Senate Liaison Assignment

Due to Tom Mahoney stepping down as the P&R liaison, Jan Schultz has been appointed to serve as liaison to the Planning and Resources committee for the remainder of the Spring 2005 term.

###### C) Joint Senate/IA Grievance Policy Task Force: Appoint Senate representatives

The Steering committee has decided to take on the task of reviewing the Grievance Policy and it shall be comprised of three members from the Senate and three from the Instructors' Association. Thus far the members of the committee include Jan Schultz, Tom Mahoney, Kathy Molloy and Tom Garey. Peter Haslund will convene.

###### D) That Parking Problem...

A parking sub-committee headed by Judy Meyer is being formed. Send any comments/questions/suggestions you may have to her. Under consideration by the Business Services VP, Joe Sullivan, is a traffic pattern study and also a parking plan.

###### E) Added Item – Establishing a sub-committee

A sub-committee of the Committee on Teaching and Learning has been established dealing with Student Success. There are various groups on campus with successful programs. For example: Running Start, The Gateway To Success, TAP and EOPS to name a few. The sub-committee will ask each of these groups to identify what have they learned about student success, where is the common thread and what is unique about their approach.

It was suggested that a "faculty success committee" be established.

Response: many ideas are currently coming out of the Student Learning Outcome groups. They are exciting and productive and deemed a great success by learning from each other and enabling each other to teach better.

There is also an online seminar for new faculty on Teaching and Learning. Professional Development learning circles with interdisciplinary members would be an excellent way to share strategies that better enable students to succeed.

## 5.2 EVP Report

- A) Spring Semester enrollment update – no report given
- B) Update on the process for selecting the college’s new Student Information System – no report given
- C) Initial discussions about pursuing a bond measure – no report given
- D) Accountability Framework mandated by AB 1417

Last year AB 1417 was passed requiring a statewide accountability system for community colleges and individual district performance. State funds have been allocated for districts that provide accountability. A handout was presented to the Senators to review for the next meeting pertaining to incentives within the new and required accountability system for community colleges.

## 5.3 Student Development/Counseling

- A) Major Selection in the Transfer Process: Keith McLellan  
The need for addressing timelines in choosing a major is becoming increasingly urgent. This need is primarily for transfer students; however, choosing a major and its importance to success and retention is relevant to all students. The new reality is students need to engage in a structured process and commit to a major and choice of transfer institution sooner than has been normally acceptable in the past. Not choosing or leaving their major to chance may impact transfer students negatively. From a placement standpoint, not every student will have a seat at their first choice campus. UCSB, UCLA and Berkley campuses are impacted and have, or are reaching, their target enrollment caps. Screening for given majors may be occurring at more schools within the next three years, and sooner than anticipated, where entrance will be based on the number of pre-major courses a student has completed relative to their chosen major. This can/will severely impact those students who have not prepared for the major. Currently this screening applies to Biology/Biological Sciences. The GPA guaranteed transfer requirement has been increased from 2.4 to 2.8 and may in the next few years go up to 3.0/3.2.

In addition to all these challenges, UC is also enforcing a “ceiling of units to graduation” policy. A transfer student, must have a minimum of 60 units and a maximum of 70 transferable units (this limit has always been in place) and whichever comes first, the student will have only 9 quarters or a total of 216 quarter units including their “transfer in” units to earn a degree. (The approximate minimum quarter units needed for graduation= 180 quarter units and up to 200-210 quarter units depending on the major - leaving very little wiggle room for exploration-indecision-or changes in major)

Students can be at risk of hitting that ceiling and not being able to graduate if they are still searching/choosing/exploring while attending University.

CSU's are not as transfer-impacted. However, Longbeach and Northridge are even more impacted than the top 3 Universities and it is expected they too will assume a similar "ceiling" policy.

This impacts SBCC's enrollment management goal. Too many of our students are not engaging in the process of exploration toward choosing a major. Our purpose as educators should be to help the student engage in a much more structured and timely process of exploration and selection of a major. Our students will also need guidance in choosing their transfer institution preference.

Studies show that a student who has completed 30 units without determining a major is in jeopardy of dropping out and not continuing with higher education. Faculty can be effective and influential in how a student should go about making decisions of such importance.

Question: How can we minimize the impact/effect these unit limits will have on students?

Suggestion: pass a resolution stating this approach is a "disaster" and forward it to the State Academic Senate.

The CSUs are systematically defining a lower division prep for the major package in all primary transfer majors, resulting in a common core of lower division classes. There will be a 15 unit individual core per institution/campus. This parallels the State Academic Senate program IMPAC, which is examining: "what establishes a common core?"

The transfer student may meet the GE and GPA requirements and proceed accordingly. However, if the campus/program the student wants to transfer to becomes impacted, then these requirements may not guarantee transfer at the impacted institution.

The controversy lies in the short amount of time a student needs to declare. However, anything taken in High School does not apply toward the "ceiling" because the clock starts at the time the student graduates from High School. Therefore, dual enrollment students have the advantage of greater flexibility for exploration before declaring a major.

## **6.0 Adjourn**