

Academic Senate
MINUTES
March 26, 2008
3:00 - 5:00 p.m. BC214

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcón (Chair), Armando Arias, Susan Broderick, Cathie Carroll, Tom Fitzgerald, Tom Garey, David Gilbert, Kelly Lake, Ray Launier, Linda Lowell, Kathy Molloy, Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, Elida Moreno, Mimi Muraoka, Dean Nevins, Kathy O'Connor, Jan Schultz, Marilyn Spaventa (for EVP), Dan Wrentmore, Ana Maria Ygualt, Oscar Zavala

Members Excused: Jack Friedlander

Guest(s): Rhys Alvarado (The Channels), Erika Endrijonas, Tina Kistler, Diane Rodriguez-Kiino, Leif Skogberg, Laurie Vasquez, Sue Willner

1.0 Call to Order

- 1.1 Approval of agenda – approved as amended
- 1.2 Approval of minutes 3-19-08 – deferred to next meeting

2.0 Information

2.1 Presidential Search Update.

Mr. Alarcón announced that the site visits to the finalists' current places of employment are almost complete. The visit team consisted of Mr. Desmond O'Neill, Ms. Liz Auchincloss, and Mr. Ignacio Alarcón. The Board of Trustees has scheduled a closed session before the regular March 27 meeting, to begin at 2:30 p.m. Liz Auchincloss and Ignacio Alarcón have been invited to deliver reports on their site visits to Umpqua Community College (Roseburg, Oregon), Saddleback College (Mission Viejo, California), and Santa Barbara City College.

2.2 Other

A) Kathy Molloy announced representatives from the Hewlett Foundation would be visiting SBCC after spring break to conduct interviews with the leadership group for the Partnership for Student Success. The PSS is being considered for the Foundation's "Recognition of Promise" award, which is given to colleges that have evidence of success in improving basic skills competencies. SBCC is one of five schools that have been pre-screened as eligible to receive this award.

B) Ignacio Alarcón announced that Dean Marilyn Spaventa would be sitting in for EVP Jack Friedlander.

C) Tom Garey announced the delay, for one semester, of the Drama/Music project. This is due to complications of the approval of the temporary buildings that had been planned for the area under the bridge, with additional costs. Mr. Garey stated that Drama/Music would remain in their present buildings through Fall 2008. The plan, at the moment, is to use the existing Purchasing/Receiving temporary buildings and install the remaining temporary buildings on the West Campus, in the turnaround. These new temporary buildings on the West Campus are not supposed to remain in

place for more than seven years. The delay would impact the SOMA, Humanities, and Administration Building projects.

3.0 Hearing/Discussion / revised

3.1 American Colleges and Universities Presidents Climate Commitment

Leif Skogberg, Coordinator for the Center for Sustainability, reported on the American Colleges and Universities Presidents Climate Commitment. This is a document that over five hundred presidents/chancellors have already signed agreeing that global climate change is a critical issue and agreeing to take a leadership role by developing a comprehensive plan of action to achieve climate neutrality within their campus community as soon as possible. President John Romo asked the Center for Sustainability to study the feasibility of the Presidents Climate Commitment. An ad hoc study group was formed, and they are now presenting their findings through the consultative process, before making a recommendation and presenting it to the Executive Committee and the Board of Trustees for approval. President Romo has indicated his willingness to sign the document before his retirement.

There were several questions regarding the budgetary implications to the college. Mr. Skogberg responded that a proposed budget is being developed and will be available soon. He reiterated that it is believed colleges and universities "...will stabilize and reduce their long-term energy costs...attract new sources of funding..." such as grants, government rebates, establish energy efficiency partnerships with large banks across the nation.

Marilynn Spaventa noted that cost may not be a consideration in the decision to sign the commitment, since many state requirements/rules that would align the college with the commitment's objectives are becoming mandatory.

Tom Garey noted that the college has already made a commitment to adopt LEEDS standards in the construction of the SOMA building and to produce energy from renewable sources.

Ray Launier indicated that climate neutrality may not be a sufficiently ambitious goal. Leif Skogberg and others mentioned that it is ambitious enough, given the status of these efforts.

Kim Monda noted the Senate would need to address how to achieve the action set forth in item c. iii., as it addresses curriculum/program considerations.

3.2 HIT/CIM request

Erika Endrijonas announced the late retirement of Kathy Peterson, chair of HIT/CIM, and requested approval of the Senate for a full-time tenure faculty position replacing Ms. Peterson, rather than a temporary contract. She acknowledged that this is a very late request, one of several that have not been in compliance with the Senate and college's timeline.

Dr. Endrijonas was asked about the status of the new HIT/CIM full time position that was granted by Senate in the fall, and how it relates to the present request. Dr.

Endrijonas responded that the new position was for a full time person to direct the CIM program. The national organization has new requirements for the program and such a coordinator needs to be certified CTR by 2010 with an AA degree. The applicants in the pool for that position did not have CTR certification.

There were two concerns expressed: (1) these special requests are becoming commonplace; (2) it is the end of March 2008 and the search for a full-time CIM faculty is to be reopened, due to the lack of qualified applicants; starting a search for a permanent tenure track faculty member seems rushed, without much hope for a good outcome in such a short time.

It was mentioned that the policy in place allows for the hiring of a full-time employee on a temporary contract to replace the retirement. Why isn't this sufficient given the current circumstances?

It was recommended that HIT/CIM department reallocates the full-time position that it was awarded, and that it has not been able to staff. The department can exchange the current job description for the one corresponding to the position that just became vacated. This would be the full-time tenure track position that the department obtained in the Fall 2007. A full-time employee on a temporary contract may staff the CIM position. Dr. Endrijonas and Sue Willner stated that they were not aware that this could be done, and they said that they considered this to be a satisfactory solution.

M/S/C To move the recommended exchange of job description and job search focus to action (Zavala/Broderick) 1 abstention

M/S/C To approve the recommendation to exchange the tenure track position within the HIT/CIM department to be officially focused on the HIT program, rather CIM, for the 2008-2009 academic year and to fill the other position in the CIM program with a temporary contract. (Molloy/Lake) 1 abstention

3.3 Committee for Online Instruction: Online Class Size Policy Proposal.

Ms. Kistler, COI chair, reported that, in 2006, the Academic Senate/Instructors' Association requested that COI discuss the loads and compensation of online faculty. The reason for this request was that the district had requested that this be a negotiated item. A Distance Education Plan based on the College Plan was first put together. After looking at existing regulations (Title 5, Board Policy), contracts (I.A.), and existing compensation and workloads delivered in traditional face-to-face format, the recommendations for the class size policy proposal was created.

COI Recommendations:

- Online faculty should not be granted independently negotiated compensation.
- If there are 20 students above the baseline at first census, a new class section is automatically opened, subject to the overall maximum student and instructor TLU limits.
- Class size limits, as determined by CAC, shall continue to serve as the baseline for online classes.

- Online faculty shall not exceed the total student maximum (375) or 21 maximum TLUs.

Jan Schultz applauded the stated goal to have consistency between face-to-face and online. However, the COI proposal fails to meet this objective in important ways. If a face-to-face instructor has 35 students as the baseline for a course, and 20 students are added, he/she would get 3.5 TLUs. In the exact same online class scenario, he/she would get 6 TLUs. Why not continue to use what is established now for large classes, treating everyone the same? This would achieve the goal of consistency between different delivery modalities.

Dan Wrentmore commented on the high attrition rates in online offerings, rates not seen in the face-to-face sections. We could potentially have situations in which an instructor is effectively teaching a small number of students, for a large portion of the semester, only because at census time the enrollment was high. Every course is different. This could be an interesting task: to assess which courses have high online attrition rates and which have high successful completion rates.

Tom Garey said that some core problems have been illuminated. Equity is difficult to achieve in a heterogeneous environment like City College. The fourth bullet under “This is a problem because of the following:” is actually contradictory: the greater reward for an online instructor would arise from opening a new section and the overcrowded section becomes the under-compensated one. Under the “Assumptions” fourth bullet, Tom Garey suggested that this will need the Instructors’ Association’s feedback.

Kathy O’Connor said that the COI proposal had been drawn over a long period of time, with input from numerous online faculty. Some of the suggestions to COI about this issue were very extreme. This proposal is the best effort of the committee to address loads and compensation for online faculty. We need to think about class size based only on pedagogical considerations, and not like we do in a face-to-face situation, where the size of a classroom has been a consideration in many cases.

Kim Monda pointed out that the COI proposal would favor an increase in unplanned online sections. We would not want to see this as an automatic mechanism to open more and more online sections. Such an automatic mechanism would take away from departments making their own decisions as to which classes to offer and how many online sections to offer.

Dan Wrentmore stated that the first recommendation of the proposal ought to read: “Online faculty will not be granted independently negotiated compensation,” instead of “Online faculty should not be granted independently negotiated compensation.”

David Gilbert would like the new section rules and TLUs allocation to be the same for all class offerings of the college.

Tom Garey indicated that we may already have enough data to determine what the optimal class size for an online class is and that this can be used to determine the baseline.

Kathy Molloy reminded the Senate that COI has worked on this for a long time. (She was Senate President when the discussions started.) She acknowledged this effort by the committee and said that it could be a start for a broader discussion of this problem.

Marcy Moore asked what the consequences would be for having the compensation be the same for online and face-to-face, particularly in the case of adjunct faculty TLU limitations. The TLU allocation for online or face-to-face offerings needs to follow the same regulations and limits.

Ray Launier said that two controversial issues often come up: the workload for online and face-to-face classes and the effectiveness of online teaching compared with face-to-face. Some perceive that online students do not get the same educational experience as face-to-face students. Another perception is that, once the preparation for the online course has been completed, it becomes a “coast ride.” These are perceptions that are often heard. This shows the need for a much closer determination on the actual workload and effectiveness of online education, instead of solely determining compensation by numbers of students.

Dean Spaventa pointed out that the administration has not pushed for larger online classes although some faculty believe this to be the case. Frequently, instructors made the determination on their own to accommodate more students. In many of these cases, an arrangement has been made, not for more compensation, but for more online aide help. Some areas work well when you have the right motivated students and other areas don't work so well. Dean Spaventa agreed that the task of examining all this is an important one.

Ignacio Alarcón mentioned that the next step will be to submit the COI proposal to the Instructors' Association, requesting their feedback.

3.4 Mission Statement

Kim Monda used the yellow handout copy and explained each of the decisions/reasons for the recommendations and changes to the Mission Statement. The statement underwent continued language suggestions/recommendations from senators, and a consensus was reached on the final version. A discussion about having the core principles be part of the Mission Statement followed, and there was a recommendation to remove them from the main statement and to have them listed separately. The rationale for this recommendation is that the core principles are a vehicle to achieve the mission. Mission statements are usually much shorter.

M/S/C To recommend removal of Core Principles section from the Mission Statement and to list them separately (Nevins/Zavala) 10 aye; 8 nay

M/S/C To move to action the revised Mission Statement (Molloy/O'Connor) 1 abstention

M/S/C To approve the recommendation of the revised Mission Statement with the appended core values pending final ratification at the April 16 Senate meeting (Molloy/Garey) 1 abstention

3.5 College Plan 2008 – 2011.

Kim Monda handed out a strikeout copy and explained the changes and recommendations that have been suggested by the Executive Committee, by the Planning and Resources Committee, by the Instructional Technology Committee and by the Educational Support Division. The Senate did a final run through of the copy line by line. The final recommendations are to be forwarded to CPC.

M/S/C To move to action the revised College Plan (Moore/Zavala) 1 abstention

M/S/C To approve the College Plan as revised pending final ratification at the April 16 Senate meeting (O'Connor/Molloy) 1 abstention

4.0 Action

4.1 Instructors' Association - Academic Senate Liaison Agreement. No action was taken.

5.0 Reports

5.1 President's Report

5.2 Liaison Reports

5.3 EVP Report

6.0 Adjourn