

Academic Senate
M I N U T E S
December 7, 2005
3:00 p.m. - BC214

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

Guests: Ignacio Alarcon, Darin Garard, Mary Gibson, John Lorelli, Patricia Stark

1.0 Call to Order

- 1.1 Approval of Minutes – November 16, 2005
M/S/C To approve the 11/16/05 Minutes (Launier/Monda)
- 1.2 Approval of Agenda – so approved

2.0 Information

- 2.1 There was discussion about revising the Academic Senate meeting calendar for the Spring 2006 semester.
The result:
 - Steering would be held via email
 - There will be two consecutive senate meetings February 1 and February 8, 2006
- 2.2 Adjunct faculty will be receiving their Spring parking permits by mail. The permits will be included in the In-Service mailing in January. Marcy Moore will notify adjuncts about this new process.

3.0 Hearing/Discussion

- 3.1 Bookstore proposal – John Lorelli
John Lorelli, Director of Bookstore Services, presented his proposal for keeping down the cost of books. His idea would be to continue offering the old edition of a text for at least one semester when a new edition is introduced. This could work if faculty would agree to allow the use of both the old edition and new edition in the classroom. This would give students a longer buy back opportunity rather than demanding that they purchase the new edition and create a missed opportunity to sell their used books. Because textbooks increase at a rate of approximately 7% per year, would this proposal be something you would support?

Many faculty already support those publishers that release a new edition every 4 – 5 years rather than every other year or even more frequently. The option of continuing with an older edition would generally be dependent upon on how extensive the changes in the newer version are. The revised book order form will provide an opportunity for faculty to indicate whether they are willing to use both the old and new edition in their classroom at the same time during a semester.

3.2 Stanback-Stroud Nomination: Faculty Recognition Committee
 Laura Welby, chair of the Faculty Recognition Committee, announced that the committee has chosen Laurie Vasquez to be the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award nominee.

M/S/C Move the nomination to Action (Garey/O'Connor)

M/S/C To approve the recommendation of submitting Laurie Vasquez's name as the Stanback-Stroud Diversity nomination from Santa Barbara City College (O'Connor/Frankel) Unanimous

3.3 Sabbatical Leave Committee recommendations

A) 2006-07 Sabbatical Leave Proposals

Darin Garard, chair of the Sabbatical Leave Committee, began by reiterating what he had reported at the Senate retreat: if the rising cost of sabbatical leaves were not met by an increase in the budget, there would be some bad tidings to relate.

There were thirteen excellent sabbatical proposals submitted. The applicants and committee all worked very collegially on getting the proposals through the process. Of the ranked proposals, the committee was optimistic in believing there was sufficient funding to include Patricia Stark's request. The committee was aware that there would be a shortfall of \$1800 in the budget and from past experience a request for the additional funds would not present a problem. Unfortunately, from what has been discovered, there was only enough funding for six of the thirteen ranked proposals.

Sabbatical Leave Budget: \$138,000 (much more when you account for the \$ in banked TLUs that they are being paid with). The Sabbatical Leave Committee's budget traditionally covers replacement, salary and benefits, not the difference in the cost of banked TLUs and their actual value when used. It was assumed that banked TLU's were actually in an account somewhere and accumulating interest.

Patricia Stark's leave was not granted because of a shortfall of \$1800.00 in the current Sabbatical Leave Committee's budget. The accounting/budgetary problem came up when Jack Friedlander requested additional funds to pay for more sabbaticals. At this point, the depth of the problem was revealed.

The irony is that, if Patricia Stark was bypassed and the next two sabbatical requests were funded, there would a \$1400 surplus. This would be a bad precedent to establish because it would mean that those who require contract faculty replacements would not have the same access to sabbaticals.

Another twist – the General Fund will get \$40,000 back from the Sabbatical Leave fund if Patricia Stark's sabbatical is not approved. (Again, this would set a bad precedent).

The EVP was very supportive of the Sabbatical committee and Senate's concerns. Changing the funding mechanism in mid-stream is problematic. There are two issues: immediate and long term.

M/S/C Members of the Academic Senate direct the President of the Academic Senate to report to John Romo, and as appropriate to the BOT, the "sense" of the Academic Senate's profound dismay and displeasure over the status of funding for

Sabbatical Leaves, and urgently recommend the following: 1) That the District fund an additional \$1800 for 2006-07 Sabbaticals in order to ensure that at least the first seven leaves recommended by the Sabbatical Leave Committee are fully funded. 2) Absolute confirmation that beginning immediately, banked TLUs will be funded into a reserve for that purpose using funds that would otherwise be paid to the faculty member who is banking that load, and further, that this reserve be held in an interest bearing account, with all interest accruing to the benefit of the reserve to cover, at least in part, the increased payout of banked loads on redemption. 3) A new policy allowing unexpended sabbatical leave funds remaining at the end of any fiscal year be rolled over into a reserve for future sabbatical leave funding. 4) Engage the Academic Senate in planning for the relief of the unfunded liability resulting from prior failures to reserve funds for banked faculty loads. (Brody/Lake) 1 abstention

B) Proposed revision: Linda Benet, Spring 2005

M/S/C To move Linda Benet's revision request to Action (Brody/Frankel)

M/S/C To approve Linda Benet's revision request (Brody/Frankel)

4.0 Action (3:30-4:15)

4.1 2006-07 calendar

A decision must be made on start and end dates for the Fall 06/Spring 07 semesters. At this time the (two) summer session options do not need to be approved until Spring semester.

Concerns/Comments about the calendar:

- Sciences do not favor a 5wk/6wk summer session configuration.
- The Performing Arts were severely affected by the change from a 17.5 week semester to 16 weeks. If the Spring semester begins a week earlier, performances would need to be curtailed.
- Early Childhood Education student requirements are also affected by the earlier Spring start. Beginning on a Tuesday is a real problem for the program..
- Athletic meets are affected when Spring ends earlier. Students are still involved in competitions during finals and beyond.

Suggestions/Recommendations:

- go to a trimester
- give up spring break
- offer a 4 week intensive course
- restrict students to x number of courses depending on length of summer semester
- Spring break preference: the earlier of the two – the last week of March.
- extend Thanksgiving break

The Senate will discuss Spring Break dates, Holidays, and Summer options at the next meeting.

M/S/C That for the Spring 2007 semester there be a January 22 (Monday) start (Options 2&4 - 8/28/06 and 1/22/07). This vote is for the Fall 06 and Spring 07 semesters only (summer session dates are not part of this vote) (O'Connor/Garey) 1 abstention

4.2 Non-instructional Job Description (p 37-40)

Ms. Molloy announced that a policy recommendation for adjunct faculty and the number of required office hours should be available from Academic Policies tomorrow. Instructional adjuncts are paid a differential for student contact hours. The argument would not be applicable to non instructional faculty. Non instructional faculty are not currently paid a differential rate because their job consists essentially of office hours.

Under "Related Educational Support Responsibilities" - content in item #1) should be deleted/eliminated.

The following is the suggested/revised language from the Academic Senate for the Instructional Job Description in response to John Romo's recommended language. Upon approval, this language would also be included in the Non Instructional Job Description:

Contract Faculty Instructional Job Description

Proposed revision by John Romo - second paragraph of the instructional job description to read as follows (the 12/7/05 Senate recommendations have been included as underlines and strikeouts):

"A regular contract faculty position at Santa Barbara City College is a full-time commitment. The faculty member is expected to perform his/her responsibilities as delineated in the faculty job description and the job announcement. ~~Concern that other factors, including external involvements, may be adversely affecting fulfillment of the faculty member's responsibilities may result in administrative action. Failure of the faculty member to satisfactorily fulfill these requirements will result in administrative action"~~

With this in place, President Romo is prepared to recommend that the outside employment policy be rescinded.

Question: What "administrative action" would take place and what are the consequences? Response: It would be nice to know; however, it should not be in the job description.

Suggestion: Maybe there should be an examination of rights and responsibilities and disciplinary measures for both administration and faculty.

The Senate recommended that the proposed alternative language should be presented to John Romo for comment.

4.3 2005-08 College Plan

Objective 2. Where X should = 6% and Y should = 6% by 2008.

The 2005-2008 College Plan is a very lean and succinct plan. P & R took their task very seriously and proposed many of the language changes at CPC. The Senate recognizes them for their diligent and thoughtful work.

M/S/C To approve the 2005-2008 College Plan (Haslund/Lake) Unanimous

5.0 Reports (4:15-5:00)

5.1 Senate Task Force on Student Success

Ms. Molloy reported on the progress of the Task Force thus far. The proposals received have been organized into three categories: Institutional; Across Departments; Departmental. The Task Force has chosen a theme of "Building Community for the Student Success Initiative. The priorities for the plan:

A. Expand Gateway/CAP/EOPS models: increase the number teacher-trained instructional aides; use student mentors and peer advisors more extensively

B. Increase Student Services presence on campus: expand Orientation; provide referral services for night students and students on West Campus

C. Increase academic and language skills: encourage language confidence and build competence in second-language learners: emphasize reading and writing across the curriculum; develop shared expectations of student behavior and academic standards; create professional development opportunities for all faculty for this purpose

D. Implement SLOs: establish a plan for implementing SLOs throughout the campus

Once the Task Force has drafted a recommended plan and presented it to the Academic Senate, senators will then have an opportunity to share and review the plan with their Divisions.

5.2 Liaison Reports

5.3 Status Report: Grievance Policy

5.4 Parking Committee

5.5 President's Report

5.6 EVP Report

6.0 Adjourn