

Academic Senate
M I N U T E S
September 14, 2005
3:00 p.m. - BC214

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

Members Absent: Kim Monda, Joey Williams

Guests: John Romo, Marilynn Spaventa, Jack Ullom, Laurie Vasquez

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

1.1 Approval of Minutes –July 18, 2005

So approved – no objections.

1.2 Approval of Agenda

So approved – no objections.

2.0 Information (3:05-3:15)

2.0 Introduction of second Senator from Social Sciences:

Ray Launier, the second senator from the Social Sciences division, was welcomed back to the senate. Ray has previously served on the senate and as Vice President.

2.1 Introduction of Student Rep:

Student Representative was absent.

2.2 Timeline for hiring new faculty positions:

There are two days of hearings 11/2 and 11/9 and one day 11/16 scheduled for ranking. At this time there are only 9 new positions – and the scheduled number of meetings for hearings and ranking may not be necessary. However, any change to the meeting schedule would be determined at a later date.

2.3 E-mail addresses for all adjuncts:

Communication with adjuncts has been difficult. Beginning spring semester all adjunct faculty will automatically be assigned an electronic address.

Request: For convenience create “groups” (all adjunct, all faculty, all fulltime, divisions, etc.) to make communication with specific entities more convenient.

Still to be determined: Groupwise or Pipeline.

To further enable communication with adjuncts, the question was raised about SBCC’s capability and capacity to automatically assign voicemail to all adjuncts. The EVP responded that he would need to consult with Business Services and report back to the Senate.

2.4 Plans to mail faculty parking permits:

Beginning spring '06 parking permits are to be mailed, afterward the permits will automatically be included in the fall semester mailing with the inservice and departmental material.

2.5 Addendum item: Energy efficient lighting & movement sensitive switches
The senator from Fine Arts would like to know if departments were noticed about the installations? If not – why not? As a courtesy and as a safety issue all departments should have been informed.

3.0 Student Success Initiative Planning (3:15-3:40)

3.1 President Romo spoke about the “Student Success Initiative” and the Senate’s charge

From the perspective of our core functions in serving our students the activities going on with the Student Learning Outcomes and the Student Success Initiative are the two most important things we are doing right now. Our charge is to assess our students and their readiness for college level work and to reflect and work together on how to address the situation with our students. We also need collaboration with faculty and administration to look at what other colleges are doing and what we are doing and construct a set of recommendations.

There was much discussion by the Board after the results of the *Institutional Effectiveness Report* were read. They were alarmed by the increasing numbers of students who come to us below college level skills in reading, writing, and math, and they asked the President to present a plan for addressing this problem by Spring 2006. President Romo asked the Senate to provide leadership under a collegial environment. He is very committed to the work we are doing, and he believes that this is an especially appropriate responsibility for the Senate. The work being done on SLOs is clearly linked to student success and should be part of the Student Success Initiative.

Challenges: This will cost \$\$\$ We are looking to redirect resources and new resources are being sought. However, unlike projects funded by P4E, new initiatives will be funded as part of our core program to ensure stability.

The President asked for a short, organized report. It should be well thought out, with a good case statement, a brief summary of the analysis that took place and a recommendation.

For those requiring structure a template for proposals. It will have the three basic areas to address. 1) state the problem or obstacle that is being addressed 2) a description of the proposal 3) recommendations for assessing the effectiveness of the solution after it has been implemented. Suggestion: Add a question about resources needed in order to achieve the desired initiatives/goals.

SBCC does good things and has received state recognition with our model Gateway program, Running Start and CAP. By evaluation we have proven that these programs have had an impact. We need to look at how we can expand these programs or apply the successful elements of these programs to a larger group of students. A large number of our students are fall below the college readiness

level. ESL students at the lowest level of English language proficiency have less success in transitioning through ESL into the regular curriculum. To a lesser degree, this is also true for the lowest levels of Math and English Skills students. We need to look at how we can help these and other students meet their educational goals.

Issues related to open access and student responsibility were also discussed. We have to provide open access, but we also need to deal with the problems of students taking courses before they have the skills to succeed in them. Assessment and counseling are essential, but we may examine other ways to address this problem. Question: If students choose to take courses for which they do not have the requisite skills, can the college do anything to prevent them from retaking those courses if they have withdrawn or failed?

The Board / Senate meeting on October 12 would be an opportunity for the Senate and the Board to take part in a discussion on some very substantive issues of student success.

President Romo also spoke about Parking/Traffic/Transportation. He announced the formation of a workgroup set up to consolidate the efforts put forth by the Senate subcommittee, a student group, and from correspondence. The goal will be to establish a group to prioritize and assign areas of responsibility in order of: 1) what can be done immediately 2) what needs more study 3) what is not feasible.

There is one known: there will be a parking structure built and funded by SBCC. There will be a work plan in place by the end of the semester stating the existing projects, the planned projects and those in development.

Ms. Welby volunteered to represent the Academic Senate on the workgroup.

3.2 Division Reports on Student Success Initiative

Each Senator gave a brief report on their Division/Department meeting discussion about the Initiative.

Elida Moreno: ESL/School of Modern Language Division

The EVP has already funded several proposals that are now in progress and a report will soon be available. The ESL student proficiency in ESL Levels 1, 2 and 3 is being addressed.

Kathy O'Connor: PE/Athletics Division

The Division created a "Seek Help" information sheet that was distributed campus wide and to each student in every class. Many students do not know where to get the help they need and often wait too long to do so. The Division also developed a paper on the academic and social/economic/family obstacles to student success and a list of proposed solutions. There was also a "Teaching Tips For Student Success" information sheet developed for faculty that offered "ideas to consider" for motivation and encouragement.

The goal: To create a required study hall for all student athletes and increase the number of tutors available at a time convenient to the student athlete.

Oscar Zavala/Susan Broderick: Educational Support Division

The division has discussed the issue and all faculty, including adjunct, are being encouraged to participate in the development process and to bring their ideas to the next Division/Dept meeting dedicated to the Student Success Initiative.

Kelly Lake/Sheri Shields: Health Technology/Human Services

The Division was very consistent across departments when determining the obstacles: Lack of college skills – reading, math, language; Lack of knowledge - student support services; Lack of personal skills – motivational, management. Proposed solutions: Make the support services more visible and more available; have more tutors and peer advisors. The division has two unique departments. One is totally online and getting students comfortable with Pipeline and WebCT has been one of the challenges. A list of proposed solutions was developed for the online system. The other is the Early Learning Center with affordability and no childcare program offered during summer the obstacle. Proposed solutions: Identify and offer funding to pay for the rate differential and offer a summer childcare program.

Jim Chesher/Ray Launier: Social Sciences Division

The department chairs within the division have agreed to hold discussions with their department members. The chairs would then meet with the objective of putting together one or more proposals from the discussions. Suggestion: To offer more learning labs to supplement the classroom experience.

Peter Rojas: Mathematics Division

The mathematics division developed a wonderful Student Success Initiative. The specific obstacles were: students lacking in basic skills; effective time management; failed course repetitions. One of the more abstract obstacles would be the culture and attitude of our students; they seem to be very different from that of their instructors. Suggested solutions: institutionalize the core values of learning; be more united in academic standards; involve faculty campus wide. Specific solutions: more tutors should be available; more reader funds; offer adjunct faculty equal access to support services.

John Romo asked if statistics were available comparing the success rate of adjuncts to contract faculty and expressed interest in seeing those statistics. President Romo endorsed equal access to support services for adjuncts.

Tom Garey/Ed Inks: Fine Arts

With such a diverse division, most of the actions occur at the department level. The common threads are: many of the challenges could be met by the use of rubrics and the objectives in the SLOs. Obstacles resonant throughout would be student preparedness; general subject matter knowledge; general college level competencies; balancing work and study with production and performance. There is also the risk aversion factor / self-esteem issue – letting students know it is okay to fail – it is part of learning. Solution: Devise strategies to address the concerns stated.

Jane Brody/Kim Monda: English/English Skills Division

Obstacles: Low academic self confidence; resentment at perceived low placement; lack of awareness at the time it takes to become a successful writer; not convinced that English is important; not valuing our standards of correctness. Solutions: Explore methods other colleges use; create study workgroups within a class; communicate belief in the students' success. The English Skills department plans to form learning communities with the 70 and 80 reading and writing classes and personal development, beginning fall 2006. Increase the number of units from 3 to 4.5 units (for a 5 hr class). Students would then need to take fewer classes to maintain full-time status and enable them to concentrate on success toward a higher level transfer.

Esther Frankel: Business Division

The Business Division agreed on most of the issues and discussed the following issues:

- A definition of student success is needed. The traditional non productive grade issue needs to be fine tuned. Example: There is a sequence of classes, the student passes the first class and fails the next class in the series. Although the student succeeded in the first class was the student prepared to succeed in the second one? In order to evaluate the programs that are to be implemented a definition for student success is needed.
- If proven effective, after thorough analysis, expand the existing Gateway and Running Start programs.
- The 16 week semester and concerns about students being able to complete the heavy content driven classes and the need to be concerned about reading and writing over the curriculum. Instructors commented on not having enough time to cover the existing material and how it would be impossible to also teach reading and writing.
- The Division would like to know if President Romo has any specific goals for this initiative?

John Romo: These are matriculation issues. Students are unprepared for college level work. The focus of the Initiative issue is matriculation: To go through the system. The definition of Student Success is course completion and program completion. It is meeting stated educational goals. The objective of the project: To have everyone submit a set of concise recommendations and evaluations that can be worked on together. The Task Force and the Senate will review these and prioritize them and make a recommendation. A commitment will be made to go forward with some of the recommendations. Adjustments may need to be made: what works, what does not.

Marcy Moore: Adjunct Faculty Representative

To ensure the success of the Initiative, adjunct faculty must be involved. All departments should reach out and encourage their adjunct faculty to get involved. To be effective teachers, adjunct faculty must have office space available to meet with students.

Laura Welby: Technologies

A suggestion from an adjunct: Make students aware from the first day of class how much time it will take to be successful: time in class and outside the class. Include in the syllabi where students can get help.

Students are not equipped to handle all the technical reading that is required. Some type of assessment would be beneficial.

Most students in the Technologies division have a career goal and are very motivated. Suggestion: Technologies Division could have an open house and invite students from English and math where they could participate in an informed discussion about careers in technology.

Jan Schultz/Blake Barron: Sciences Division

The Division meeting focused on what Departments were already doing. Physics has the NC program where (for credit) students meet with an instructor on the assigned homework. Organizing more Math and Chemistry support groups was discussed. The majority of the Division supports the MESA proposal where there would be multi support across many disciplines.

4.0 Hearing/Discussion (3:40-4:20)

4.1 Senate priorities for 2005-06

Ms. Molloy reported that the discussion at this meeting would be the focus and priority of the Academic Senate this year. Committee charges:

- P&R to look at the schedule for two summer sessions and survey questions and the college plan.
- Sabbatical Leave to explore the issue about funds not meeting the needs for the required percentage of designated leaves. What would they recommend to address the problem?
- AP to look at the Job Description and how it relates to the Evaluation policy; how to generate awareness of the existing policy and establish compliance; the salary class transfer issue; review the Grievance Policy when available.
- FPDC – to look at offering, as a professional development activity, a continuation of the Inservice discussions during the semester and when could this be scheduled.
- CTL to look at the proposals/recommendations from the task force; research successful programs at other colleges; submit a proposal of their own.

Also, the task force will remain in effect to evaluate all of the proposals. A proposal template will be sent via email to senators and by request an implementation and ongoing cost estimate section will be added.

4.2 Agenda for joint meeting with the Board

The EVP commented: At the Educational Policies committee the Board expressed great interest in discussing the Student Learning Outcomes; the Student Success Initiative; and the *Institutional Effectiveness Report*. The Student Survey

Summary was suggested as a discussion item. To be continued at the next Senate meeting.

4.3 Grievance Policy: Administration recommendations
Move to the next meeting.

4.4 Proposal for two summer school sessions (2007) handout at meeting.
The EVP reported that a second summer session would not be implemented until summer 2007. This should allow enough time for discussion. The handout represents six options for two six week summer sessions. They are for example only. The number of weeks and number of classes can be configured in any number of ways. A course could span both summer sessions. The pros and cons from the Admissions perspective have been provided. Option two is preferred and allows for a greater break between terms.
Suggestion: Offer one similar to option 2 with a one week break between the summer sessions and the second summer session ending later than Aug. 11 and before fall semester starts.

4.5 Midterm Accreditation Report
The report is ready for Board approval.

5.0 Action (4:20-4:35)

5.1 Steering Committee 2005-06

Members of the Steering Committee were announced and so approved. They are:

President – Kathy Molloy

Vice President – Esther Frankel

Past President – Peter Haslund

EVP Educational Programs – Jack Friedlander

Liaisons

P & R – Jan Schultz

AP – Jim Chesher

CPC – Tom Garey

CAC/ITC/COI/Matriculation – Kathy O’Connor

FPDC/CTL/Sabbatical – Susan Broderick

5.2 Non-Instructional Faculty Job Description (pgs 28-30)

The BOT Educational Policies reviewed the Instructional Faculty Job Description and suggested that the part about outside employment be removed. They felt that this should not be part of the job description. They were referring to: item #9 “Other Professional/Academic Responsibilities” of the generic Faculty Job Description.

Ed Policies: The outside employment section should not be in the job description. It is a policy and not required as part of a job description.

Senators/IA: If it is in Policy it needs to be in the Job Description. The purpose of the generic Faculty Job Description was to reflect all the institutional expectations of faculty members in particular when faculty are expected to conform to college policy and need to know exactly what the policy states. It is essential that there be

one document that states what is expected. It is not reasonable to expect that everyone should know policy; where to find it; and how it is to be applied. It should remain in the document until such time that Policy language changes.

6.0 Reports (4:35-5:00)

6.1 ITC Report – Laurie Vasquez

Ms. Vasquez reported on the following:

The Instructional and District Technology Committees have drafted a three-year college technology plan scheduled to go through shared governance consultation this fall. The ITC is working to request dollars for new technology related initiatives. Any future faculty proposals for such initiatives would have to match the planning goals stated in the draft college technology plan. ITC continues to work on retaining technology renewal cycle funding in order to meet critical instructional needs.

6.2 Liaison Reports

Jan Schultz reported that P&R would like faculty to view the proposed 2007 summer session from a pedagogical point of view and questions have been formulated similar to those previously proposed for the six week intersession.

6.3 EVP Report

6.4 I.V. Commission Report

6.5 President's Report

7.0 Adjourn