

Academic Senate  
**M I N U T E S**  
**July 18, 2005**  
 3:00 p.m. - BC214

Members Present: Susan Broderick, Jane Brody, Jim Chesher, Esther Frankel, Jack Friedlander, Tom Garey, Ed Inks, Kelly Lake, Kathy Molloy (Chair), Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, Elida Moreno, Kathy O'Connor, Peter Rojas, Sheri Shields, Laura Welby

Members Absent: Blake Barron, Peter Haslund, Jan Schultz

**1.0 Call to Order**

1.1 Approval of Minutes – May 18, 2005

M/S/C To approve the Minutes of the Academic Senate, 5-18-05  
 (Frankel/Chesher) 6 abstentions

1.2 Approval of Agenda – so approved

**2.0 Information**

2.1 Joint meeting with the Board of Trustees Oct. 12

This planned meeting would give the Academic Senate and the BOT an opportunity to engage in a discussion about issues and interests concerning SBCC.

2.2 Increased costs for textbooks (up 7% F. 2005)

Bookstore will be sending out information about reducing costs. In spite of all the efforts to keep textbook costs down they continue to go up.

2.3 Seven townhouses (2 bd., 2 bath) to be offered for purchase by faculty and staff with qualifying income (handout)

The units are in development and will be made available to SBCC full-time faculty and staff by lottery. There has been no official announcement about the townhouses located in the vicinity of Cliff Dr. & Santa Fe. The official notice (available soon) will specify all criteria and guidelines such as income requirement and contact information and when the lottery will take place.

2.4 Contract with SCT/Banner (handout)

At its next meeting, the Board will be asked to approve a contract with Sungard SCT to replace the college's Student, Human Resources and Finance computer programs with one that fully integrates each of these functions. An electronic copy of the implementation timeline will be sent to all senators.

2.5 Hiring status: Vice President of IT (formerly IRD)

Beginning July 29, Paul Bishop has been hired as the new IRD, now IT (Information Technology) vice president.

2.6 Beginning discussions on 3-4 week summer session (handouts)

The handouts illustrated the potential configurations for two summer sessions that ranged from 3 to 6 weeks. The senate was informed that a number of schools are using the intense 4 week summer session format. Senators were also informed

that in order for SBCC to capture the necessary funding for the coming year that there would be a real need to offer two summer sessions and that the planning discussions should begin as soon as possible. Summer session #1 would count towards the current year's FTE's and summer session #2 would count towards next year's. A request was made that a guideline/reference be created to show how the courses might be offered within the 3-6 week range.

#### 2.7 Introduction of New Senators

The new senate members were introduced: Kelly Lake (replaces Tom Mahoney) from Health Technologies and Human Services Division; Ed Inks, a second senator for the Fine Arts Division; Educational Support Division representative Oscar Zavala (replaces Mary Lawson); and from the English Division, Jane Brody in for Barbara Bell, who will be on sabbatical this fall.

#### 2.8 New Foundation Executive Director

An announcement will be made soon about the new executive director hired for the Foundation for SBCC beginning in September.

#### 2.9 Cosmetology Academy

Effective immediately Jane Craven will be in charge of the Cosmetology program.

### 3.0 Hearing/Discussion

#### 3.1 Agenda for Senate Retreat

It was announced that all Academic Senate committee chairs have been invited to join the senators for lunch and will stay for the afternoon session. Some of the items to be discussed with the committee chairs: Communication issues and committee charges for the next school year.

The discussion then focused on the agenda for the morning session. Some suggestions:

- Develop an agenda for the October 12 co-meeting with the Board of Trustees
- College Plan
- IT Plan
- Master Plan and bond measure

The Senate President suggested that the major part of the morning should be focused on the Student Success Initiative Task Force that met this summer to establish a where to next plan. Ms. Molloy felt that since the Student Success Initiative will be the Senate's main focus for fall 2005 as well as during in-service, the time would be well spent. Senators will also be asked to focus primarily on the Student Success Initiative at the division meetings.

#### 3.2 Contract implications for adjunct faculty teaching lab sections

The ratio of TLUs to lab hours changes at .67 (with a TLU for every lab hour) and in the first year, Fall 2005, this becomes .72 and then increases to .75 next Fall 2006 with the ultimate goal of reaching parity. Example: 2 lec hrs and 3 lab hrs per week, currently 4 TLUs, become 4.12 TLUs and next fall become 4.2 TLUs.

In terms of compensation, it is not a huge bump. How would this limitation affect adjuncts and their ability to teach? It could put some adjuncts at or above the 60% clause as soon as Spring 06. Department chairs are to be informed immediately.

### 3.3 Proposed revisions to Grievance Policy, District Policy 1700 – Probation and Tenure (pgs 6-23)

Per I.A.: The I.A. information (provided for reference only) should be struck from the copy. There was a question about the accuracy and currency of the information.

- Language on pg 8 in section C #5 the term “accused” sounds harsh

The I.A. believes the District version is still too complicated and inconsistent. Example: Contract version states the hearings are to be closed; District Policy states hearings are to be open unless one of the parties objects (DP pg 8 section C #6 and I.A. Section III. #6.2.2). The original goal and direction was to make both the District and I.A. policy and procedure consistent with each other in principle.

Areas that need work:

- Terms and definitions
- The section on tenure
- Privacy and confidentiality should be addressed and maintained
- During the “process” the use of special mediators should be mentioned as a recommendation
- Objections were raised about students participating on a grievance involving faculty and a personnel issue.
- Procedure(s) for complaints are different when filed by a faculty a member or a student. I.A. requests more faculty input on procedure.
- Provision needed for notifying I.A. about a grievance filed against a faculty member and at what point should I.A. be notified of a grievance. What happens in the event a faculty member files a grievance against someone else including a student? What happens formally and informally?
- State somewhere that faculty has the right to representation and a right to refuse representation.

### 3.4 College Plan – Draft (handout at meeting)

Esther Frankel, a CPC rep, explained how every few years the college puts together a plan that includes overarching concepts such as: student success; economic, cultural and social contributions to the college. Jack Friedlander, who chairs CPC, also spoke about the college plan draft and how changes have already been suggested. The object was not to focus on previous areas of emphasis or achievement. Included in the report are measures of achieved institutional effectiveness, and measures of the new state accountability requirements that the college is being held to. The focus of the plan was on what we should and need to be doing rather than what we are already doing well.

How do we get the information to the college constituency and how do we get feedback from them? The goal is to have the consultation process completed this fall. Ms. Molloy suggested that P&R and CTL should have a look at this and also distribute it electronically to all divisions/departments. A request for data from the previous college plan was made to allow for a more informed evaluation of the goals and objectives that were achieved, goals that were not met, and those not yet realized with regard to the new goals and objectives in the proposed "College Plan" draft.

#### **4.0 Action**

##### **4.1 Faculty Job Description (pgs 24-29)**

IA feedback: Tom Garey

Tom Garey reported that the instructional job description was approved and forwarded to the Instructors' Association. It is the Educational Support job description that has not been approved. Mr. Garey also reported that with the exception of agenda item #6 on page 27 under "Instructional Responsibilities" the I. A. liked the job description. It was the phrase "of a priority nature" that presented a problem. Outcome: the phrase is to be omitted from the sentence.

M/S/C To approve the document as altered:

1. Remove "of a priority nature" see 4.1 above
2. Remove "contractual" agenda item #9 pg 29
3. Add footnote about asterisks \*These items do not apply to adjunct faculty

(Garey/O'Connor) Unanimous

Discussion also focused on adjunct faculty office hours and if required what the requirements and compensation specifics were and where this information could be found. It was suggested that the information cannot be found in District Policy nor in the contract specifying the one hour per seven (which was in theory the basis for the 12.5% differential); however there may be something alluding to it in the faculty manual.

#### **5.0 Reports**

##### **5.1 President's Report**

A) Senate Task Force on Student Success (handout)

Ms. Molloy reported that the Task Force was a fantastic group. A rough draft report was handed out and contained information on:

- the next steps to be taken
- obstacles
- proposed solutions

The objective is to have this initiative be faculty driven. The task force is also requesting ideas and suggestions from all college departments. This is a chance for everyone to get involved. An important message for Senators to bring to their divisions is that the initiative is not suggesting that faculty are not doing enough or that they need to improve. This is to elicit suggestions about how the college

can support faculty and make their jobs easier while increasing students in their classes.

The deadline for departments to submit proposals will be December 2, 2005. The goal is for the Senate to endorse and present the final initiatives and rationale to Superintendent/President John Romo at the beginning of the Spring 2006 semester.

## 5.2 EVP Report

### A) Results of Spring 2005 Student Survey (handout)

The survey collected data to determine the level of student satisfaction with various aspects of college life and to determine those characteristics not available from data collected through the student information system. The EVP noted that there is an executive summary of initial findings included at the beginning of the report with additional data analysis and findings to be made available upon completion.

## **6.0 Adjourn**