

Academic Senate
M I N U T E S
May 9, 2007
3:00 p.m. – Off Campus

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcon, Blake Barron, Barbara Bell, Eric Borlaug, Susan Broderick, Dixie Budke, 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: Cathie Carroll

Guest(s): Tom Fitzgerald (Student Senate), Gerry Lewin, Mimi Muraoka, Dean Nevins, Geoff Thielst, Laurie Vasquez, Dan Wrentmore, Ana Maria Ygault

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

1.1 Approval of Minutes – April 25, 2007

The meeting Minutes for April 25, 2007 were approved without objection.

1.2 Approval of Agenda – so approved

2.0 Information (3:05-3:15)

2.1 Basic Skills workshop Sept. 14 at Hancock College

Attendees will learn about the process for receiving Basic Skills funding – Basic Skills monies won't be available until Spring 2008.

2.2 Dates for SLO Task Force: May 23-25 and 29, 9-12.

The agenda will go out a week from this Friday.

2.3 CPC approval of resource rankings and priority maintenance items
Approved resource rankings and priority maintenance items. The EVP reported that as part of the 2007-2008 development process John Romo would be requesting that the BOT approve all CPC requests and includes the MESA position.

2.4 Distance Education Plan postponed until Summer Senate

2.5 Request to form Personal Development Dept. withdrawn
President Molloy and the EVP announced the problem had been resolved without the need to create a new position; the accommodation that was made was agreeable to all parties (the committee on non-teaching compensation and other departments). The result: responsibilities have been divided up and the counselor for the particular area will provide leadership (including class evaluations). The EVP, after review, explained that PD 100 had a faculty member to provide leadership for the PD 100 courses and that all other PD classes were supported by a special program department with full-time faculty counselors, e.g. EOPS and

PE/Athletics have a full-time counselor assigned to the Personal Development classes. The EVP and the Committee on Non-teaching Compensation, in particular G. Carroll and K. Hanna, have devised a way of calculating the compensation for the PD 100 coordinator.

2.6 Other

2.6.1 Health fee increase

The Chancellor's Office notified the college that the "implicit index for purchases of goods and services had increased by \$1"(the COLA marker for the health fee). The fee increase will begin Spring 2008.

Ms. Broderick has received approval from the Associated Students and the EVP noted this would be an information item for the BOT because they had authorized the increase at a previous Board meeting.

The total Health Fee will be \$16.00; this provides the following services:

1. Medical Services – a nurse practitioner, physician's assistant or physician available everyday
2. Lab Services - prepackaged pharmacy – medication charged at cost
 - Infection control/monitoring - TB testing, HIV testing
3. Psychological Services - short term counseling
 - Smoking Cessation
 - ASAP (alcohol and substance awareness program)
 - Peer Health Education Program
 - Health Education Program

2.6.2 Meeting at steering with Sue Ehrlich

Ms. Molloy reported that Lana Rose, Darla Cooper, Charles Grogg also attended. It was an interesting meeting and the situation, although positive, is still in flux. Ms. Molloy informed the senators that Lana Rose had sent/forwarded to her all 4000 Board Policies. To be continued.

2.6.3 Status of Board and Subcommittee for hiring

Trustees Desmond O'Neil and Joe Dobbs have been on vacation and weren't present at the last Board meeting when Ms. Molloy gave a report on the State Senate Plenary Session, and this included statewide information on presidential searches. The information was emailed to the absent Board members. The subcommittee on the presidential search is scheduled to present its recommendations at the next Board meeting. It is uncertain whether any outside representatives will be invited to participate in a meeting before that date.

2.6.4 Steering for PSS

Ms. Molloy met with the Partnership for Student Success steering group, and they have decided to keep the same representation from each of the major institutional areas: Sheila Wiley, Jerry Pike, Pam Guenther, Marsha

Wright, Alice Scharper, Tina Kistler, Paula Congleton and Ms. Molloy, who will continue to chair.

2.6.5 Introduction of new Senators

Esther Frankel introduced Dan Wrentmore, returning representative for the Business Division; Elida Moreno introduced Ana Maria Ygault, representative for the ESL/SoML Division; Sheri Shields introduced Mimi Muraoka, representative for the Health Technologies/Human Services Division; Blake Barron introduced Dean Nevins, the representative for the Sciences Division.

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

3.1 Proposed policy draft from P and R: BP 4560 Identifying College Priorities in Facilities Planning (pgs 12-14)

Ms. Molloy began by stating that there are concerns from the President and the EVP about the policy. Ms. Molloy has a meeting with President Romo and will be hearing more about the specifics of their concerns/objections at that time.

President Romo said he would address the summer Senate on this if necessary - he considers CPC his consultation group because it has faculty and staff and administration representation. The EVP added that each of the VPs had serious concerns about the proposed policy and not enough time was available to have a discussion on any of the specifics.

Ms. Monda began with some history and also how and why P&R believed that there should be policy language that would allow feedback into the process much earlier. There is a timeline built into the process, and P & R felt that they were consulted too late in the process, and that they should legally be involved - legally and morally. Hence, the proposed policy based on Title 5 and a document from the state Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.

J. Schultz - It's not that CPC can't speak and represent faculty – it is the shared governance process part, the consultation process with faculty that is at issue. If there is something on the CPC agenda and consultation is warranted - and if CPC is to represent faculty, they would need to go back to faculty for discussion. That slows down CPC's process. That is what the Academic Senate is for; it is the consultative body.

T. Garey - The proposed policy puts into discussion a number of issues that get overlooked and added some suggestions. #3 sub section 1 – recommended that a representative from DSPP be part of the actual planning process. #6 sub section 2 – the timeline. Where is the timeline for getting the state funding and the division that takes place? E.g.: Initial project proposal, final project proposal with conceptual plans, preliminary plans which build authorized working drawings. Where is P and R envisioning that in this process?

Ms. Monda- I don't think that is built into this. By the time you are building, that's another process.

EVP – Tom's question is a good one. The best time to have any kind of process like this is when we identify what it is we are submitting initially to the Chancellor's Office before consideration, before the ranking process and the three stages. That's a critical period – that's what drives what we are asking for going forward. What drives a lot of this is the Master Facilities Plan. That's what we have been working on this year, updating the Master Facilities Plan. When the MFP is being updated or when there is discussion about something that is not in the MFP that we would like to submit for funding consideration, that's when the three-step loop Tom is talking about should take place.

There are three submittals to the State – three stages of submissions to the state; some of it is not applicable to the IPP process and very informal, e.g. we've got an idea, we think we need this much square footage to solve/address these TOPS needs. All TOPS coded and not based on site and design, all based on increases of assigned square footage to see if the state will approve. And then if/when the state grants money for an FPP, that is where your initial planning happens (hire an architect).

EVP the first step is all PROGRAM driven. That is where the discussion needs to take place because once it's on the list and the state comes back and says they like it and request preliminary plans, everything is already in motion. At that point the state is inviting it.

T. Garey - at that point it becomes an FPD.

The critical period is where you want to have influence into what initially gets any type of consideration, so it gets invited back to the State.

What you have in your hands (the proposal from P&R) needs be divided up: these things should happen at the LRD (long range development) process; these things should happen prior to IPP being submitted; these things should happen prior to FPD being submitted.

K.O'Connor - The original/initial idea was to have a process by which departments could start that thinking as a department, before any FPDs, etc., that Tom is talking about. Unless you know the process, how would you know how to get the process started? This would/could provide the framework for departments to start planning. What should be the deadline?

T. Garey - Again it depends on where the state due process is. The FPP for Drama/Music we generated between Memorial day and the first of July.

K. Monda - The FPP - by then you're good; you're building.

K.O'Connor - At that point you're beyond the consultation process on campus. That's what has been missing, the consultation process. When PE submitted the recommendation for remodel, they went directly to the Administration. There was no consultation process. There was no Senate process, no P & R process to take our project to or through. All these types of projects/proposals should go through our consultation process and then through the other stages.

T. Garey - you're right in terms of original brainstorming. We can/should divide this up. It's a two-tiered thing. One is whatever is going to the state, the other local issues not going to the state.

How do they do this at other colleges? EVP: some colleges have a master plan.

4.0 Action (3:30-4:00)

4.1 Proposed residency policy for Degrees, Certificates and Skills Competency Awards

Discussion: The department defines the major whether it involves/includes/affects one or several departments. On a college wide basis: 20% of the major units as defined by the department to be completed in residence and a department may make additional requirements as to what proportion of those units need to be taken in the department itself to satisfy the requirements

People are getting degrees from Santa Barbara City College without ever taking a course in their major at the college.

What if there is a course requirement? Sometimes the degree requires something outside the field – you could still satisfy 20% of a degree requirement without ever taking a course in the department/major. Units or number of courses? UNITS. Departments can choose a higher qualification by submitting their request to the Curriculum committee.

Zavala – this is a good start and very important – Now there is nothing in place. If students get a degree/certificate after taking just one class at SB, it is a misrepresentation of the value of the degree.

Per request from J. Romo: To go to Ed Policies Committee in June.

In principal, we're in agreement – why don't we adopt it and then wordsmith it.

M/S/C To approve the proposed [residency] policy 3141.6 (Garey/Monda) 2 nays

4.2 Proposed FSA revisions

To be brought back to the Senate summer session.

4.3 Calendar recommendation to make the default Spring Semester start date the first Monday after the MLK Holiday

The proposed default calendar will be brought forward to the Senate each year. If any Senator has a concern about the annual calendar, a discussion will be held.

M/S/C To adopt the default Spring Semester schedule commencing on the Monday following Martin Luther King day as the first day of class and a four-day weekend in February and spring vacation the first week in April. This will be the default calendar brought to the Senate on a year-to-year basis (Garey/Barron)
Unanimous

4.4 PSS One time funding requests

The handout outlines the revised request from Jerry Pike for development of DLA's (Directed Learning Activity). Note/Clarification: This is for a one time only request to establish a library of resources and not intended for ongoing funding; however, if successful, this may return as a separate request for another one time funding allocation. The remaining one time funding requests are from Gateway for a conference and the Math request to work on coordinating student success specifically with DSPS. Alice Scharper is working with ESL to revise the ESL proposal.

The funding would come from a combination of roll over basic skills funds and John Romo's funds.

Evaluation component: This is in place via PSS steering for the ongoing funding requests. Suggestion: to have an evaluation added to the DLA and/or all one time funding requests.

M/S/C To approve all three and the DLA request with the condition that the DLA project return to the Senate (Summer Senate) with an evaluation component added (Garey/Zavala) 3 nay

5.0 Reports

5.1 President's Report

Ms. Molloy handed out the year-end reports from all Academic Senate committees.

5.2 Liaison Reports

5.3 EVP Report

6.0 Adjourn