

Academic Senate  
M I N U T E S  
April 25, 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, Kathy Molloy (Chair), Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, Elida Moreno, Kathy O'Connor, Jan Schultz, Sheri Shields, Oscar Zavala

Member(s) Excused/Absent: Linda Lowell

Guest(s): Allison Curtis, Tom Fitzgerald (student senate), Karolyn Hanna, Joey Large (*The Channels*), John Romo, Marilynn Spaventa

**1.1 Call to Order (3:00-3:05)**

1.1 Approval of Minutes – April 11, 2007 (pgs 2-5)

The meeting Minutes for April 11, 2007 were approved without objection.

1.2 Approval of Agenda – so approved with the added 3.7 hearing/discussion item.

**2.0 Information (3:05-3:15)**

2.1 Report from the State Plenary Session

President Molloy reported on the State Senate Plenary Session held last week, which she and four others attended, with Kathy O'Connor and Laurie Vasquez both leading breakout sessions. The following conference topics were especially relevant for SBCC.

**Basic Skills Initiative:**

Impetus for this came as a result of the Senate's approval of increased math and English requirements for degrees. The Senate wanted to increase standards, but also increase skills of students who may have difficulty meeting those standards.

Next year's budget will include 33 million for colleges: target is increasing success of Basic Skills students; annual action plan to be filed with Chancellor's Office. **IMPORTANT:** Goal is to implement programs more broadly, not create "boutique programs." There is a "moral" mandate for colleges to develop student success programs. SBCC has a two year head start in this!

A major research report was compiled by the State Senate, and findings were highlighted by a panel of faculty and administrators who worked on the project - including Laura Hope (Chaffey) and Bruce Smith (SFCC). Among the points they highlighted:

- Faculty planning and development and admin. support are the key components
- Staff development needs to be ongoing and faculty directed

- Academic support needs to happen before students fail; what is good for underprepared students is good for all students
- Need to be teaching skills that all students need to succeed, not just underprepared students
- Efforts need to be interdisciplinary, highly coordinated, with integration of academic and support services
- Mandatory assessment and placement essential; early completion of remedial work increases success. Board of Governors seriously considered requiring completion of basic skills work first; MALDEF doesn't object to requiring basics skills courses before college level courses; no law – it's a local decision.
- Prerequisites are not that difficult to validate; when students take college level courses without the necessary reading and writing skills, teachers sometimes drop writing requirements and base lectures on the text. Result: even students with the reading skills learn that they don't have to do the reading!
- Caveats: improvement is incremental!! We're changing the culture, and that takes time. We need to be in this for the long haul. Rewards: higher completion and retention rates, improved skills and higher grades for students, and increased FTES for the college.

### **Presidential Search:**

A breakout session was held on the hiring of senior administrators. Senate presidents were surveyed last year. Survey results: Over 60% respondents have an open forum with the finalists. Just from the breakout session, we collected names of 23 colleges that have forums, and the list includes "benchmark" colleges Cabrillo and Glendale.

Good example of the process: Glendale where faculty had a strong voice in the process, good consultant, positive outcome.

Bad example of the process: Mira Costa where faculty had no voice; consultant and Board made the selection. Two years later, vote of no confidence in president and Board and 75 articles on the situation at the college in the local newspaper. (There is a similar situation now at Rio Hondo.)

There are 40 openings for presidents; currently there are 13 interim CIOs and 18 interim presidents/chancellors. This is a national trend; people are retiring, not moving on to other positions.

Conclusion: As always, the more faculty participate meaningfully in all phases of the hiring process, the more likely that faculty perspectives, concerns, and opinions are incorporated into making the important choice of a senior administrator.

**SLOs:**

Other colleges have caught up and in some cases surpassed us in developing and implementing SLOs (mainly because of accreditation deadlines). Model is faculty SLO Coordinator, working with the Senate, supported by administration. We are moving in the right direction.

**Uniform Assessment:**

Chancellor is backing away from Mar. 2007 Board of Governors' motion to implement a common assessment; he has stated that assessment and placement are academic and professional matters. Senate proposing a Consultation Assessment Task Force with broad representation to discuss issues of concern that led to the Board of Governors' motion.

**Proposed Legislation on 75/25:**

The State Senate "strongly supports" proposed legislation to require all CCCs to increase hiring in order to achieve the 75/25 fulltime/part-time faculty ratio.

2.2 Dates for Summer Senate (3:00p.m., 7/18/07) and Fall Retreat (8/22/07)  
The summer senate (BC 214) and fall retreat (St. Mary's) dates were announced.

2.3 Student Senate Recommendation for the LRCCP (pgs 6-7)  
Eric Borlaug reported the suggestion for the expansion of the original Long Range Capital Construction Priorities recommendations came about from the suggestion of a BOT member.

2.4 New system for adding classes: Allison Curtis  
Ms. Curtis gave an overview of the student "add" process for Banner once a class closes or after the semester begins and added that the blue add/drop cards are no longer to be used. All old "add" processes (online and traditional) have been revised. Faculty will be given "add authorization codes" that have been randomly assigned by Banner via Admissions and Records office. Students will be given an "add authorization code" with information on the web about how to get the code (contact instructor directly or via email).

Ms. Curtis's handout included a sample of the new "add authorization codes" format and explained that the instructor issues the student a number from the list and then immediately enters that student's name and date. Note: The total number of 'add codes' issued per class would not require the instructor to assign all of the numbers.

2.5 Recommendation for Commencement change  
The proposed change is to have someone to sing the star spangled banner in place of the pledge of allegiance. Ms. Molloy reported that since the college president, EVP, AS President, and she had all been consulted, Steering recommended putting the change in commencement plans on the agenda as an information item.

Question: Why not have both pledge and anthem?

Ms. Molloy suggested that, if there were any concerns/comments on the commencement changes, senators should email her, and she would forward them to Ben Partee.

## 2.6 Other

2.6.1 Tom Fitzgerald, President-elect Associated Students was introduced by Eric Borlaug, the outgoing Associated Students President.

2.6.2 Ms. Molloy asked everyone to please review the P & R document to be discussed at the next meeting.

2.6.3 Ms. Molloy announced the SLO Task Force may need to change meeting days to Wednesday, Thursday and Friday and then meet again the Tuesday of the following week.

2.6.4 Anyone concerned/interested in policy issues is invited to attend Steering next Wednesday when Sue Ehrlich, Darla Cooper and Lana Rose discuss the process and problems with getting policies online.

## 3.0 Hearing/Discussion (3:15-4:30)

### 3.1 Report from President Romo

President John Romo, announced that the SoMA building was approved by the Coastal Commission. He gave a report about the approval process at a BOT Study Session, and in that report he focused on the broader issues and implications that came out of the process for the campus, not just SoMA.

John Romo felt that it was important for him to speak to the constituency groups personally about his thoughts on what was discussed because there are some significant implications, and important to hear them from him and ask questions to try to mitigate against/avoid any rumors.

Some background: the original proposal for SoMA was submitted in 1999. The Coastal Commission required that the SoMA building be submitted along with the overall long range plan of the college. The primary items at that time were a few major deferred maintenance items (have already been completed or are to begin this summer) and have been in the queue a long time (Physical Science and Drama/Music). Included in that long range plan was SoMA, and far out into the future, two additional classroom buildings in anticipation of further growth in the credit enrollment program. The Coastal Commission of 1999 rejected everything except the renovation projects.

The reason the Coastal Commission rejected SoMA and the two classroom buildings was their concern about the adverse impact of growth by allowing these buildings to proceed.

The process began again by separating SoMA from the two classroom buildings. The point was made that SoMA was not for growth; it was basically consolidation of existing departments in a state of the art facility but not for growth. The state is allowing less and less growth for us. And we expect in the next year or two, if things continue the way they are in our southcoast community, that we will be receiving the statutory lowest level that they must allow which is 1%. We are at 1.33 this year. The reason is families are leaving and enrollments are declining in local schools. Local district enrollment, even though enrollment is coming from all over, is the basis for the formula. That was our argument: SoMA was not for growth.

Discussions began with the Coastal Commission staff. They gave us a lot of direction on what we needed to demonstrate before they would talk to us in substance. This went on for a couple of years. They were mainly looking at what we have been doing and if we were to go with SoMA separately, we needed to show them that actions are in place to mitigate against the problems in parking and traffic. The college has been working on this a long time: getting students out of cars; alternative transportation; some surface parking. We've been collecting data. We have increased bus ridership by 30% over two years; the harbor parking permit program; extra parking. The Coastal Commission was impressed and said we were getting closer and we should keep working on it. The bond passed and then the big money crunch began. Now with the bond passed it released the 32mil in the bond for SoMA, and we needed to move quickly or we could lose the bond money. So we pressured the Coastal Commission, and it took a while for them to accept the fact that we needed to move quickly.

President Romo explained that dealing with the Coastal Commission was surreal. It is the first public sector agency that he has dealt with that has absolute authority. You cannot appeal what the Coastal Commission says; you can only sue them. The Coastal Commission does not take any action unless there is consensus. We worked with the Coastal Commission staff for months developing the proposal. The Coastal Commission had conditions that went on and on. There were some local politicians that came in at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour to undermine us in a very self serving way. We continued along and set a hearing date set for 3 in the afternoon. The day of the hearing at 2 p.m. we were still in negotiations. Commissioners came out of their chairs while other items were being presented and said they would not approve this. The conditions they have set will cost us money. During the slide show, even during the presentation, a commissioner said: "I'm not voting for this." He was worried about the oaks on the bluff over Pershing Park; it's a protected habitat and he felt that this building had no set back based on the slides. JR said the slide didn't show reality; the slide showed an existing temporary building – the security office. We confirmed that we have at least a 20 ft. set back.

Our approval consists of 45 conditions. Many conditions related to parking, traffic conditions, access to the campus. Others involved things required to do during

construction. Originally there were 95 additional parking spaces. The Coastal Commission does not want more parking; they want people getting out of their cars. They made us reduce the number of parking spaces on the west campus and put that money towards remodeling the bus stops. They made us share with Caltrans and MTD the cost for remodeling the bus stop on the other side of Cliff Dr. We are also required to hire a botanist, who will be inspecting the entire construction process to assure that they do not damage the roots of the oaks on the bluffs. We are required to hire a bird specialist approved by the director of the Coastal Commission because one of the commissioners felt there is likely evidence of raptors/hawks in those oaks. The plan is to begin construction June 2009. That winter we are to bring in a bird specialist to check on any evidence of raptors, and if there is any evidence of nesting, we would have to delay the start of construction and the same needs to happen for year two. We need to move three oaks and one is in a planter. The Commission required us to plant 10 more oaks for every one removed and even wanted a condition where to put the additional oak trees. And the seeds from the removed oaks need to be used. We have already planted over 300 oaks on the campus. The Commission staff said we've done a great job, and then a commissioner said we can't have a mitigation take place before we take them out.

With the approval of SoMA, the Commission reaffirmed the rejection of the two additional classroom buildings for growth. They are to be removed from our long range development. They also made very clear that they would not accept anytime in the future the construction of a parking structure. We finally convinced them to like our harbor parking permit pass (the city likes it). At first the Commission felt we were denying access to the coastal area. The Commission wanted a pass issued that could only be used during the week. The only way the Commission would even consider allowing us to build a parking structure is if there is evidence after we carry out a parking study, and if the city concurs with the need to build more parking. The reason the 95 spaces were in the plan, and we discussed a parking structure, is that the staff of the Coastal Commission previously said we had to build more parking spaces. And then everything changed in the last few months of negotiations. We will not be going back in the near future with a proposal to build a parking structure. We will continue to carry out the Penfield and Smith study of the whole general area. We do have other issues such as safety issues; access issues; traffic control issues; parking issues.

There will be no construction of new buildings except to replace temporary buildings. The Coastal Commission at one point said they would set an enrollment cap. We explained that we were different than UCSB. Then they wanted to set an enrollment cap on the credit campus. They didn't do that but their actions basically said to the College that the enrollment on the campus now is as far as it should go. There is a specific condition/requirement in the approval that states all of our enrollment growth should be in online instruction, dual enrollment, the professional development center and in generating FTES at other

college facilities and locations throughout the community and during times of low impact hours.

That's a very important message. As far as our long range planning, both from a perspective of facilities and enrollment, this is a new very significant factor. We have a lot of land at the Wake Center and there is the possibility of a center in Carpinteria. We are looking at those two centers as higher education centers, not adult education, and would be programming more and more credit activities at those facilities. Carpinteria has gone through a school closure process, and they have approached us to see about offering higher education courses with us. Side note: This is important because they are going to start the Milpas Overpass and closing lanes – and also the freeway project construction will be underway then increasing commuter implications.

The Board is considering going out for a local bond possibly in 2009-2010 as part of the College's Centennial.

What will happen to the existing parking funds?

No decision has been made. Because of the escalated cost of construction for the SoMA building, we will be talking to the state for approval to downscale the SoMA construction plans and asking for a possible extension on the beginning of construction deadline. If we could get to a \$45 mil building with Foundation fundraising that may raise a few million and with additional district money, we could do it.

There are those on campus who don't like SoMA. Knowing what is happening to the economy in our southcoast area, SoMA is a good fit. Regionally having a center between the Bay Area and L.A. would be extremely attractive, not only to our southcoast students but statewide.

The Coastal Commission has given us lots of praise for the progress and processes we have in place to get people out of their cars. One point to note: Once you go to the Coastal Commission, and they identify your existing impacts, they hold you to the mitigations related to the existing impacts whether you continue with your project(s) or not.

### 3.2 Proposed residency policy for Degrees, Certificates and Skills Competency Awards (p 8)

Senator Ignacio Alarcon explained that the proposed policy would require students receiving a degree, certificate or skills competency award to complete at least 20% of the department requirements in residence at SBCC.

### 3.3 Request to form a Personal Development Dept.; replace Personal Development Coordinator with a dept. chair: Keith McLellan (pgs 9-10)

The recommendation came out of the Committee for Non teaching Compensation. It began with a request for stipend and that prompted a review. It began to look like a department due to its size. Currently the dean is the chair of the PD curriculum development, and it is a major impact/time consuming workload. Should that be a dean's role?

Benefits of a department: as the program grows compensation would be automatically built in. PD courses will be under one department chair someone in charge to carry out evaluations.

Concerns: What it means for the future - creating a new faculty position. This would require a better understanding of what PD classes are and all the ramifications of this request.

Questions: What is the difference between a department and a program, and what are the benefits to being a department? Program coordinator vs Chair? Are there guidelines for how something becomes a department? Are there strong objections to opposing this recommendation?

#### 3.4 Faculty Lecturer nominee

Ms. Molloy announced, on behalf of the Faculty Lecturer subcommittee, that Don Barthelmess from Marine Diving Technology has been selected to be the next faculty lecturer.

M/S/C To move the Faculty Lecturer subcommittee nominee to action  
(Barron/Moreno) Unanimous

M/S/C To approve Don Barthelmess as the next faculty lecturer (Alarcon/Frankel)  
Unanimous

#### 3.5 Calendar recommendation

A recommendation has been put forward for a default calendar to be put into place that would have the Spring semester at SBCC begin the Monday following the Martin Luther King holiday.

#### 3.6 PSS: One time funding requests

Ms. Molloy contacted Paul McGarry, and he reported that the majority of the ESL department supported the request. Ms. Molloy also spoke with Jerry Pike, who explained that the DLA request is across disciplines and the quote was for an outside amount. The project could be done incrementally. It was decided that he should speak to Steering about the request.

#### PSS: MESA portion only - the Coordinator

To position SBCC for the MESA grant, funding was provided through the Foundation. The Foundation match for the MESA portion will end soon. Since MESA does not fit the new requirements set forth under the Basic Skills funding criteria, it is urgent that the MESA coordinator be included on the CPC critical needs request list for their consideration.

M/S/C To move the MESA section/portion to action (Zavala/Barron)

M/S/C To add the MESA section/portion to the existing CPC list  
(Zavala/Alarcon)

### 3.7 Teaching Excellence Award

The Faculty Recognition Committee nominations are:

Susan Broderick, Health and Wellness Program; Dolores Howard, ESL;  
Maryellen Kelley, Continuing Education; Fred Marschak, Earth and Planetary  
Sciences; Jody Millward, English; Patty Saito, Biological Sciences.

M/S/C To move the Faculty Recognition Committee nominations for the  
Teaching Excellence Award to action (Lake/Frankel) Unanimous

M/S/C To approve the Teaching Excellence Award nominees (Lake/Frankel)  
Unanimous

## 4.0 Action (4:30-4:45)

### 4.1 Proposed FSA revisions (p 11)

Ms. Karolyn Hanna explained that FSAs are required only if there are to be  
layoffs of full-time faculty. The proposed revisions are due to new State Senate  
approved disciplines; new departments; and general clean up.

If there are any further concerns/questions/recommendations, please notify  
Karolyn Hanna or Kathy O'Connor.

### 4.2 Distance Education Plan

Ms. Kim Monda recommended the following changes under the Student Support  
Section item #5: “and ~~encourage~~ require students to complete the assessment.”

Ms. Monda would like to exchange encourage with require or use “strongly  
encourage” students to take the assessment tool for online learning readiness.  
And, under Faculty and Staff Professional Development Support and Initiatives,  
add #9 for ongoing faculty training because online classes are a unique challenge  
in terms of technological changes/advancements and revisions to the type of  
pedagogy used. Add #10: move towards a uniform platform for delivery of online  
classes.

Ms. O'Connor added that COI , ITC, and CTL are still gathering comments and  
recommendations at this time.

## 5.0 Reports (4:45-5:00)

### 5.1 President's Report

### 5.2 Liaison Reports

Ms. Kim Monda asked the Senators to please take a look at the work that has  
gone into a very important document - the recommendation for BP 4560:

**IDENTIFYING COLLEGE PRIORITIES IN FACILITIES PLANNING.** This is the  
proposed policy from the Planning and Resources Committee that memorializes a

process for facilities planning in accordance with Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

### 5.3 EVP Report

Facilities committee of the Board gave approval for the Associated Students' request for a scrolling marquee. Eric Borlaug wanted to remind the EVP of his promise that once the scrolling marquee proves to be successful, he would make one available on the west campus.

**Basis Skills Funding:** Based on the expectations of what colleges need to do to apply for and to receive Basic Skills funding, the EVP has asked Darla Cooper to be a part of the workshops on student success and basic skills training. Dr. Friedlander explained that the categorical funds need to be tied to ESL and Basic Skills and an action plan would need to be in place and submitted by December for funds to be allocated Spring 2008.

## 6.0 Adjourn