

Academic Senate
M I N U T E S
February 14, 2007
3:00 p.m. - BC214

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcon, Blake Barron, Barbara Bell, Eric Borlaug, Susan Broderick, Dixie Budke, Cathie Carroll, Esther Frankel, Jack Friedlander, Tom Garey, David Gilbert, Kelly Lake, Ray Launier, Linda Lowell, Kathy Molloy (Chair), Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, Elida Moreno, Kathy O'Connor, Jan Schultz, Sheri Shields, Oscar Zavala

Member(s) Excused/Absent:

Guest(s): Homer Arrington, Tom Fitzgerald (Student Senator), Joey Large (*The Channels*), Ben Partee, Jessica Schley (Student Trustee), Alexandra Wilcox (*The Channels*), Marsha Wright

1.0 Call to Order (3:00-3:05)

1.1 Approval of Minutes – Dec. 6, 2006

The meeting Minutes for December 6, 2006 were approved without objection.

1.2 Approval of Agenda – so approved

2.0 Information (3:05-3:15)

2.1 Budget timeline

The EVP stated that the 'resource request rankings' from Fall '06 (funded/not funded) will be reviewed at the next CPC meeting. Critical resource needs proposals for immediate budgeting consideration will also be heard at that time.

2.2 Banner implementation timeline (handout)

President Molloy announced that Dan Watkins would be available at the March 14 meeting to answer any questions.

2.3 Fee increase for out-of-state and international students

Associated Study Body President, Eric Borlaug, read the Associated Students' "Resolution on District Compliance with AB 1725 and Education Code, Title 5, Section 51023.7" and part of a handout that included 1) a section of the California Education Code addressing policies and procedures that provide students the opportunity to participate effectively in district and college governance 2) Ed Code section 76140 (d) where the fee timeline for the governing board of each community college district is set.

This Ed Code section addresses clearly the provision that "...the governing board shall not take action on a matter having a significant effect on students until it has provided students with an opportunity to participate in the formulation of the policy or procedure..."

The Channels reported that Student Trustee had not voted in favor of the increase at the BOT meeting because the due process compliance had not been followed.

President Romo responded at the BOT meeting things could have been done better and in future he would make sure these types of issues would go through the consultative governance process with both the Academic Senate and the Associated Student Body.

2.4 Other

3.0 **Hearing/Discussion (3:15-4:40)**

3.1 President Romo: EOPS/CARE position

Ms. Molloy began by explaining how the EOPS/CARE position request had not been a part of the hearings held last fall because of the understanding that categorically funded positions do not need to go through the ranking process and would not count towards the district's Full-time Faculty Obligation. President Romo was invited to explain his position and answer any questions about why he is considering making a categorically funded position into one that would be counted towards the Full-time Faculty Obligation.

President Romo began by stating that he had not reached a final decision and would report to the EVP and/or Senate President when he has or if preferred report directly to the Academic Senate. Counselors can be counted towards AB1725. He has checked with Ed Code Title 5 about whether counselors can be counted. He has checked with membership of the CEO Board, and of the CEO Board member presidents, all count EOPS/DSPS positions. He thinks that SBCC is already counting one counselor in EOPS/DSPS. His reason for considering it at all is it is legal and it is making progress towards the statewide 75/25.

Comment: It is not what we can do but what we should do. The Full-time Faculty Obligation is not moving us towards a 75/25 ratio. When the growth of non-resident/international students is considered we are actually moving in the opposite direction of the 75/25 because of the way non-resident/international students are calculated/factored in our enrollment. These students make up 10% of FTS, and they are not counted in determining our Full-time Faculty Obligation.

Comment: Historically categorically funded positions have not been counted. It was an understanding that, if categorical funds were no longer available, those positions would also be lost. This year, we only had four full time faculty positions, and one of those was agreed to last year. If we change how we count categorical positions, these positions would then need to go through the ranking process and compete with regular full time positions

President Romo: Does not plan on making retroactive changes or changing any historical positions. The state has determined that EOPS/DSPS categorical funds are to be ongoing funds.

The Senators expressed many of their concerns about the process of future faculty position hearings and rankings. Making this change would pit categorically funded positions against critical classroom instructional needs. Ranking faculty position needs is already a very difficult process because there are so few new positions and so many critical needs.

3.2 AP report on the committee's review of the evaluation policy and job descriptions

Senator Schultz reported that the cross checking has been done in both directions where everything in the instructional job description has been cross-referenced with what is called for in the Evaluation Policy. The job description is very specific.

EVP asked where the new SLO accreditation requirement would fall in the evaluation.

Language suggestions: pg 9, 3d. begin sentence with complies. Pg 10 after V.I.E Final Interpretation section change supplemental materials to instructional materials. Concern: pg 11 Criterion C #2 removing the sentence “is receptive and respectful....” Response: There is a section on the Student Evaluation form that provides the student(s) an opportunity to address that question (student evaluation responses then become a part of the faculty evaluation).

Observation: would like to have the Faculty Responsibilities Checklist parallel to job description. Response: Checklist is specific for department chairs.

3.3 Transcript evaluation procedure

The various options were presented for how a department might choose to approve courses to meet the department’s requirements (see the work flow handout). Each department would choose how petitions (transferable courses for degree, course substitutions) and enforcement of pre and co requisites would be reviewed. Petitions are time sensitive. Note: Prerequisites over and above what are now in effect are not to be activated until a year from now.

Suggestions: 1) add “working/school” days for when the petition submittal clock starts for pre and co requisite enforcement 2) option #3 change opportunity to review to automatically make available/send review (in particular close decisions). EVP to have articulation office send to department chairs all non-routine decisions/reviews. EVP: articulation to create a check type form for department chairs to identify which option their department would be using.

Senators were asked please have their divisions review and comment.

3.4 Dept. Chair Job Description

The ad hoc committee will be reconvening to review all feedback received.

Feedback/Comments: 1) no mention of the department chair’s responsibility to find office space for adjuncts 2) no mention about conducting departmental SLO reviews 3) why tenure-track and not tenured for department chairs? Answer: Some department chairs are not yet tenured.

3.5 Proposed Program Review Policy revision

Senator Barbara Bell distributed the ~~strikeout~~ copy and explained that the ad hoc committee focused on separating policy and procedure and eliminating implied or unnecessary information. The EVP appreciated the consolidation and requested that language be added to 4175.2: “SLOs to be reviewed on an ongoing regular basis...” President Romo wants a statement: 4174.3 b. when there is a substantial/significant data change, there should be a review to analyze/evaluate data and to respond.

3.6 P and R: Recommendation for finals schedule

Adjunct representative, Marcy Moore, was opposed to the proposed schedule. Changing the regularly scheduled meeting day for the finals would create a hardship for many students and adjunct faculty.

Senator Ray Launier distributed a handout that addresses other possibilities. The EVP recommended that finals be taken during same time classes are scheduled. Senator Tom Garey

suggested that the practice of giving English 110/111 and Math 100 finals on the same day may be outdated and should be reviewed.

3.7 AB 1417 Accountability Report and SBCC response

EVP brought a draft of SBCC's response to the AB 1417 Accountability Report that measured the college's performance on six measures. Senators were asked to send any feedback/comments about the draft to the EVP.

3.8 SLO Report

To be discussed at the next meeting.

4.0 Action

5.0 Reports (4:40-5:00)

5.1 President's Report

5.2 Liaison Reports

Kelly Lake reported on the following committees:

Sabbatical Leave Committee is working on reading/reviewing returning faculty reports. Homer Arrington was invited to speak on the I.A. negotiation efforts and progress to secure more funding for faculty leaves.

Committee on Teaching and Learning invited Tina Kistler to speak on the OIA student success initiative. The committee also plans to explore pedagogy online vs traditional classroom instruction.

Faculty Recognition Committee is busy reviewing candidates/nominees for the next major state award.

Faculty Professional Development Committee reviewed/discussed the In-Service comments received. "Writing Across the Curriculum" instruction was on the agenda. Individual flex requests were reviewed, and there was an update on the grants.

Kim Monda reported that at a Division meeting President Romo addressed Sabbatical Leave funding suggesting that there were other channels, not only I.A. negotiations, where increased funding can be achieved. Ms. Monda would like the college to pursue those other channels. Senator Monda continued with her report on the **Planning and Resources Committee** stating that P&R plans to look at a previously proposed/written policy for consultative process involving facilities planning and continue to explore/research policies on processes and procedures involving facilities planning.

Jan Schultz reported that **Academic Policies Committee** has completed the instructional evaluation revisions. The next project would be to look at the Educational Support evaluation.

Ms. Schultz asked Senators for comments/feedback/suggestions from their Divisions.

Ms. O'Connor announced the proposed changes to the Disciplines list will be voted up or down at the April 2007 Plenary Session. Please review the proposed changes and forward your comments. She also announced that Banner will be going live April 16 for summer 2007 registration.

5.3 EVP Report

6.0 Adjourn