

Academic Senate**MINUTES****July 16, 2008****3:00 - 5:00 p.m. BC214**

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcón (Chair), Armando Arias, Curtis Bieber, Stephanie Durfor, Esther Frankel, Jack Friedlander, Tom Garey, Kathy Molloy, Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, Kathy O'Connor, Jan Schultz, Oscar Zavala

Members Excused: Susan Broderick, Cathie Carroll, David Gilbert, David Morris, Mimi Muraoka, Dean Nevins, Ana María Ygualt

Guest(s): Alice Scharper, Andreea Serban, Marilyn Spaventa

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Approval of agenda

1.2 Approval of minutes 5-14-08

M/S/C To approve the 5-14-08 Academic Senate meeting minutes
(O'Connor/Garey)

2.0 Information

2.1 Measure V approved by voters. Next steps are the formation of the Citizen Oversight Committee, and the identification of underwriter(s).

Measure V has passed by over 70%; the Citizen Oversight Committee to include at least 7 members by recommendation of Superintendent/President Serban with Board approval and the selection of an underwriter are the next steps that SBCC would need to take to satisfy Measure V requirements.

2.2 Gov. Schwarzenegger has signed AB 591 into law on July 10.

AB 591 will allow part-time community college faculty to now teach up to 67 percent of a full-time load in a single district.

There is good news for adjunct faculty with the approval of AB 591. Effective Spring 2009, this would allow adjunct faculty to teach up to 10 TLUs per semester. Adjunct faculty can now teach 67% of the contract load per semester.

2.3 July 29 Presidential Inauguration. Student Services Plaza (4:00–5:00 pm).
Reception at 5:00 pm.

Invitations have been sent out for Superintendent/President Andreea Serban's Inauguration ceremony. Expected to attend are Systems Office Chancellor, Diane Woodruff, and Community College League of California President, Scott Lay.

The event begins at 4 p.m., with a reception to follow.

2.4 Committee Reports for 2007-2008 are available in shared folder (pg. 8-24)

The Senate year end report and all Academic Senate committee final year end reports shall be available at the retreat before they are presented to the BOT.

2.5 Jan Anderson is not eligible for the Meardy Award, as she will be already retired during 2008-2009. The Faculty Recognition Committee has recommended Karolyn Hanna to the Board of Trustees as the SBCC nominee for this award.

A complication has occurred with the Faculty Recognition Committee's ACCT nomination of Jan Anderson and her retirement effective as of May 25. The deadline to submit the nomination was July 11, 2008. One of the requirements of the ACCT award is that the faculty member "must be employed when nomination

is submitted”, which would have made Jan Anderson’s nomination ineligible. The FRC has recommended and submitted Karolyn Hanna for the Award. The Board has accepted the FRC recommendation.

2.6 Budget Development Principle #13 (pg. 25-26)

The new/revised Principle 13 states, when new funds are available reinstatements shall be given highest priority and first consideration prior to any new allocations.

2.7 ECOC 1-2, ESL will be relocated to new temporary buildings to appear by Humanities Building (near sculpture)

No official action has been taken. Before this goes to the Board a feasibility study would need to be prepared to determine if the space available is adequate. Ms. Serban reported this item will be discussed at the next CPC meeting.

2.8 FRC/Security to be moved (locations are being scouted for)

The need for relocation of the FRC/Security is still being considered.

2.9 *Rumors* – SBCC Theatre Group

Tom Garey announced the SBCC Theatre Group production “Rumors” had opened and tickets are selling fast. Judy Garey, Senator Garey’s spouse, is the director.

2.10 The new senators Stephanie Durfor and Curtis Bieber were introduced.

3.0 Hearing/Discussion

3.1 President Andreea Serban attends.

The new Superintendent/President Andreea Serban appreciated having been invited to this meeting as well as to the Senate retreat in August. She thanked everyone and let them know how excited she is to be back at the college in her new job. President Serban expressed that, for her, direct interaction is of the utmost importance, not only to establish a good dialogue and get to know everyone personally, but to discuss in a direct way the needs that arise here. Dr. Serban acknowledged how senators and all faculty are “in the trenches”, laying the groundwork for student learning, and uniquely positioned to detect trends and innovative strategies.

This is a very special year that will require a concerted effort from all of us. With the passing of Measure V the legal requirements are very complex and we are facing many major decisions. One of the main tasks to complete is the selection of underwriter(s).

We also have a major decision to make of whether to hire an overall construction management/project management company. We already have a practice in place to hire a construction manager when a project cost is over \$30,000. With the bond measure there are accountability requirements that are much more intense than we now have in place for our regular construction. The hiring of a construction management/project management company the money would come from the money we get from the bond measure. There are advantages and disadvantages. This needs to be decided fairly quickly and it is a very important decision. In an ideal universe it would have been good to not have the two most complex and expensive projects, SOMA building and Drama/Music renovation, come first. The

RFP for underwriters has been out now, and the Board's Fiscal Committee will be selecting those to be interviewed in order to make a final decision.

This year, as we have been hearing, we face a very difficult budget year. There are still additional cuts in the budget and overall the money available won't be as good as in years back. Dr. Serban's intention is to engage with CPC and with the Senate to discuss budget and its consequences. We will not just use CPC because there is so much on the agenda. At the beginning of the fall, Dr. Serban will bring up budget discussions to CPC. In Dr. Serban's mind, there is a distressing fact in our budget, the dwindling of the college's reserves. The only reserves we now have is the 5% required contingency and some end of year balance. Other than that the only reserve is the Workers' Compensation, which requires a balance that permits it to be self-sustaining.

At the end of 2001-2002 the cumulative college reserves were \$34m. Now, between the 5% contingency and the anticipated ending balance we have about \$7M. Thus is a significant decline in the fiscal health of the institution.

The college has grown by 2.1%, but we have mostly grown in non California residents. For the most recent apportionment report, we borrowed 192 FTES from summer 08 to meet cap. This has been an ongoing measure for the last three years. Besides the fact that our financial reserves are significantly down, we are beginning 08-09 with a deficit in the California resident FTES. In order to achieve our allowed 2.03% growth rate for 08-09, we have to make up the 192 for Summer 08 and on top of that reach the 2.03%. Dr. Serban expressed how aware she is of the dedicated hard work of Jack Friedlander and the deans in enrollment management. This needs to be a major focus for everyone and we have to recognize that it is increasingly challenging. High School enrollment is going to go down dramatically after this year. Our influx of new High School graduates will be reduced. We will need to become even more creative. There are areas which we have not traditionally served. As an example, some schools have focused on serving veterans from Iraq. We will need to put our heads together collectively to see how we can maintain our viability and continue to be innovative while dealing with a difficult budget situation. Innovation has always been important to us and we will need to continue.

This is also the year of our self study for the affirmation of accreditation. It is a great opportunity to critically look at ourselves as an institution. We have some weaknesses up front that we have to acknowledge. Linking planning to budgeting has been fairly weak. We do a lot of work here but we do not always document it in the way that accreditation standards require. We need to develop the discipline of documenting and we will even need to go back and document some things that have already happened.

Another important thing that accreditation requires, that we are very weak on, is having our Board Policies updated and posted.

The Accreditation Standards also require regular evaluation of our government and organization structures. Dr. Serban will chair the Accreditation Steering Committee, and also co-chair Standard IV (Leadership and Government) committee with Ignacio. We need to document our current government structure and then have a critical analysis. What is working well?, what is not working? how can we make it better?

Another important item, is the fact that with the implementation of Banner some areas other areas have suffered. For example, the solid reporting structure that we had achieved, for which the college got a commendation in 2002 visit, is now absent. for how good a reporting structure we had in place we almost have zero now. We need to work extra hard and fast to restore some of the reporting structures that are so necessary.

We pride ourselves of being an innovative institution, but we need to recognize that in some areas we are frankly behind. We were one of the last California community colleges to have online registration. We are also one of the last to have a curriculum management system, which we don't yet have. We will reallocate some money to purchase Curricunet. Dr. Serban expressed how she thinks that Kathy O'Connor, as a long-time specialist in this area, needs to be intimately involved with this project. This system will allow us to correct and avoid inconsistencies in our curriculum. Ignacio suggested also that the CAC chair needs to be involved in this process.

Dr. Serban mentioned that she will go back to the practice of holding annual division meetings. She referred how she felt that when she used to attend the annual division meetings as a citizen of the college, she actually learned things that would not be learned otherwise because you are not a part of the division. These meetings are also a good opportunity for dialogue about what certain things are important that need to be paid attention to.

Dr. Serban also said that she will be directly involved in the hiring of new faculty.

Dr. Serban will put energy in ensuring that anybody who wants, has an opportunity to talk to administration. On a trial basis, beginning early in the fall semester, she will hold "president's chats", modeled after a good working model at Saddleback College. Every month, an open forum for just conversation is held. Also, Dr. Serban will aim at starting to have more efficient college wide communication, preferable with some video streaming about current happenings.

The Centennial celebration will be happening in 09-10. This is a major opportunity for the college. There will be a core working group and then we will reach out to many people for ideas. Fund raising practice is a major priority. It is a way to showcase specific college-related items. By that time, some of the Measure V projects will be under way.

Dr. Serban expressed how she feels that although she knows a lot about the college from her time here between 1999 and 2006, she has much to learn. It is really important to have an open dialogue, even if we may not always agree. Dr. Serban said she truly appreciated the work of teachers, as she herself was a teacher in the past. Our students ought to be our focus, with their ever changing needs. Dr. Serban referred how she recently took part in a Chicano studies class, "The Chicana & Other Latina Women", by invitation of Magdalena Torres. I was a case study, as the first woman president of SBCC. This was a very large class of 50 people of various ethnicity, gender and ages. This was a good example of the multiple challenges our students face. Most of these students also work, some have children, and they all struggle to attend their classes here. The reality of our students is a difficult one. For some of them we are the last hope. This is a powerful statement, which is both inspiring and reminds us of how great a responsibility we have. We have many challenges and we have the capacity to make things work.

A question regarding Dr. Serban's statement about our reserves was asked. Namely, that she doesn't count the \$6M in Workers' Compensation fund as part of the \$7M reserves. Dr. Serban said how this would add up to about \$14M in reserves, but that the problem remains that this includes the 5% contingency plus the Workers' Compensation, and that the level of reserves is dangerously low.

Dr. Serban was asked to elaborate on the documentation that is needed. She said that we need to show what our planning process is and documentation explaining how it is carried out. For example: a lot of effort goes into enrollment management but we don't have a description on our process and how we tackle that. Another example: we don't have documentation on how the SLO process has evolved. There is some information on it but we have to go back and explicitly mention how and when we started.

Dr. Serban mentioned one more item that will require a larger conversation. There are some measurements where we don't seem to be doing very well. For example, our number of degrees has declined. There are certain studies from the System Office that look at the expected transfer rate vs actual transfer rate. Our actual transfer rate has been lower than our expected transfer rate.

The accountability reporting for California Community Colleges show that in our peer groups we are about the average in all seven measures but we are not the top performing on any of those measures. We need to engage in a conversation to understand what is. Whether there are good reasons or not we need to understand it and we need to engage in the conversation. We do great things in certain areas., but we need to look at those where our performance has declined.

For example, the most recent annual issue of the Community College Newsweek that shows performance in associate degrees both generally speaking and also for

particular degrees. We used to be in the top 20 or 50 for some of them ; we are not even in the top 100 anymore. We need to understand why this is the case. We have to aim at improving what we do, especially knowing that in the past we used to perform at a higher level.

Kim Monda asked if Dr. Serban thought that the Senate committees could have that kind of conversation or if she saw a different structure for those conversations. Dr. Serban said that she thought the whole senate ought to be engaged, but some particular areas could warrant some more focused groups to drill into the data and details.

Oscar Zavala mentioned how this is also a very good time to consider again the loss of the liberal studies major and the potential new degrees linked to transfer that could replace that. Oscar said he is concerned that there isn't any movement towards that kind of discussion. Kathy O'Connor said that while she agreed, we also need to see that the task is not easy. At the state level we actually had to define what these new degrees could be in different areas of emphasis. We're right now at the time when we should be doing this for catalog year 09. All the other changes that are trickling down from Title 5 changes we need to be on target. There are policies that need to be re written; new degrees that we can do; new certificate designs that we can make.

3.2 Accreditation Committees Membership

Correction/note: Tom Garey is listed as a committee member and should be listed only as a resource.

M/S/C To move the Accreditation Committee Membership recommendations to Action (O'Connor/Garey)

M/S/C To approve the recommended Accreditation Committee membership (Garey/O'Connor)

3.3 Addition of faculty involvement in SLO development, assessment and use in improvement to Faculty Responsibilities Checklist that is part of the Faculty Evaluation (pg. 32)

Ignacio informed that we had an accreditation workshop with Steve Maradian, Vice President of Policy and Research of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) at the end of May. One of the items discussed was that faculty evaluation has to explicitly address SLOs. This doesn't mean SLO performance but how faculty are involved with the SLO process. A couple of suggested items can be added to the Faculty Responsibilities checklist. Esther Frankel asked if something similar is being suggested for adjuncts.

Jan Schultz said that this was redone by AP over a year ago: the checklist, the job description, and the performance evaluation documents. It is important to have complete tandem between job description, job responsibilities, evaluation

procedures and checklists. They actually have to be cross checked so that they are consistent.

Part of the problem with the old checklists is that some items were wanted by some and the checklists kept getting requests added to it. Some items were eliminated from the checklists because they were not in the job description and seemed almost trivial as far as the faculty evaluation goes. We're back on the same path if we do this. It's not in the job description. It is now out of tandem where we have the evaluation drifting off from the job description where there is nothing in the job description that requires this.

Jack Friedlander mentioned how he emphasized at the time that SLOs ought to be specified in the faculty job description. At that point, there was a feeling that what we had in place met the required responsibilities per the job description, and that SLOs could be a responsibility that could "disappear". We discussed this when we looked at the faculty job description. At that point I said we really need to specify SLOs. The feeling at that time was that what we have meets the required responsibilities. The majority vote was based on the perception that this was a responsibility that could go someday. The way things have evolved since that discussion warrants the discussion of specifying SLOs in the job description. When you look at the list of schools on warning/probation and what a big deal it is now it behooves us to do this and to go back to the job description.

Kathy Molloy said that the reason why we didn't include SLOs back then was that we thought it was too limiting. There are a lot of responsibilities that are not spelled out on the job description. We wanted it to be broad enough to include SLOs as well as other responsibilities and that it would also evolve over time as we had more things that came to us in terms of responsibility. Ms. Molloy said that she would have been one of the first persons to object doing this if she hadn't been at the accreditation workshop led by Steve Maradian, where we were told in no uncertain terms that SLOs need to be part of the faculty evaluation policy. Several of us, participating in the workshop, concluded independently that the most natural place for the inclusion of SLOs in the evaluation policy is at the level of the faculty responsibilities checklist.

Tom Garey added that when we had the discussion two years ago a major concern was that this could infringe/impose itself in the area of academic freedom. This was a general fear early on in the whole SLO process. Tom said how he didn't see a challenge to academic freedom in the two newly proposed items on the checklist.

Jan Schultz said that she thought the items were well placed in the faculty responsibilities checklist. She said she wasn't sure there needed to be two separate items. The two items could be combined to be covered in one. Jan said that the job description and the evaluation policy ought to be looked at simultaneously, to

avoid problems later on, with people not accepting these since they are not part of the job description.

Kathy O'Connor said that she thought this looked like the safest and cleanest place to stick it without having to go back to specify academic responsibilities in the job description.

Marcy Moore said that it may be a good idea to look at the job description and then make an assessment to see if it should be changed to explicitly mention SLOs.

Kim Monda expressed how passing this as a motion is very urgent, since evaluations will be starting right away in the fall. She said she was not sure about combining them because the process is separate and we're new to it. It also involves an assessment part in the first step and we are not even focusing on it in this discussion. She said that it is worth it at this stage to separate them.

Tom Garey said that the discussion around the job description doesn't need to be all encompassing. We have a general policy and if it is part of our job it is part of our job. We're not opening up the whole job description. We are simply finding the right wording to put in the existing job description so that there is parallel between the documents.

Kathy O'Connor said that she would not agree on approving this immediately, since this was the first time we've seen this. People don't like summer surprises. We have time to do it right and still use it in the fall. We can ask the Academic Policies Committee to consider it early in the fall so we can use it immediately.

Tom Garey suggested to have the proposed form with the two items be used, with the added statement "pending senate approval"

Esther Frankel said she would feel uncomfortable giving this to her division especially the second piece for adjuncts. How are the adjuncts involved in this process?

Jack Friedlander said that we have made a concerted effort to engage as many adjuncts through training and department discussions. We've reached out as much as we can to subsidize and encourage training.

Kathy Molloy said that there is a separate checklist for adjunct faculty and we're not talking about putting new language in that one. She said that we could clarify with the accreditation commission personnel if adjuncts' evaluations need to be part of the policy. The level might be a little bit different than the amount of work we expect from contract faculty in terms of taking responsibility for developing a class, someone who comes in and teaches a night class once a semester. We can't hold them responsible for the development and assessment. It needs to be tweaked

and would be a good talk for the retreat. The checklist that is before us is more urgent in terms of getting it approved we need to have something for the fall.

Marcy Moore asked where she could obtain a copy of the Adjunct Faculty responsibilities checklist. She was told how this is part of the standard evaluation packet that goes to chairs every term. Marcy asked if we are definitely going to include something in the checklist for adjunct about SLOs or are we going to discuss/debate it? What about those situations where there is minimum involvement?

Jack Friedlander said that he agreed with the consensus that it is not reasonable to say that adjuncts have to be involved in evaluating and developing SLOs for a course. However, we do want adjuncts to report on their SLO data. The reporting will include a field where faculty can comment on what they have learned from their assessment of SLOs, and to have that information in case they can't be available for the face to face discussion or email. This is a responsibility that we can expect of adjuncts.

Tom Garey said that there has to be some latitude. In some cases, an adjunct instructor comes in and teaches a business law class once every two years, or a director comes in and directs a play occasionally.

Kathy O'Connor said that adjuncts do have responsibilities expected of them. As an example, Physical Education has 39 adjuncts that take responsibility to develop the SLOs for the courses they are teaching, and they also have to be a part of the data analysis, assessment and the evaluation piece.

Tom Garey said that we may need to draw a distinction between the ongoing long term adjunct and the guest adjunct. We have adjuncts that are very much involved in this process and want to be.

Ignacio, in closing, said that he will bring discussion about job description back to the senate retreat, and for action early in the fall semester.

3.4 Suggested changes to Program Review Policy, so tie to planning/ budget allocation is incorporated. (pg. 33)

Riverside Community College's model for linking planning and budgeting is one of the few colleges that has earned commendations from accreditation visits.

Please review the handout of the draft template for program review before our retreat.

Kim Monda asked what happened to the new form that the Senate worked on last semester, to be included in program reviews and then sent to P&R.

Jack Friedlander said how we are looking at a model that we need to change for our college-wide budgeting and planning processes. This is the Riverside model. One of the major areas where schools are facing difficulties with accreditation is their lack of connection between the program review and the college budgeting planning process. We are weak in this area with our current scheme. The Riverside model seems to be a good way to go for our own program review. It is a better, more efficient way of summarizing the outcome of the program review. It will allow integration with getting your requests to CPC and the overall budgeting and planning process. This way, units work once and people are informed in a concise manner of what the goals, objectives and outcomes are from the program review. These documents would be posted electronically. This is a good way of sharing outcomes of program reviews, with easy access to the goals, objectives and outcomes of a program and the program review.

This is also a way to link it to what Andreea is taking to CPC as a change in our budgeting and planning process as related to the administrative program review. The retreat in August is a good time to look at these forms, which are easy to fill out and roll over, and replace some of the text and still be compliant with the rubric that we will be held accountable for, for the program review.

Kim Monda said that she needed to understand if what came out of P&R with a new form and process is no longer to be used. Is the two-page template no longer what we are to work on, or the form that we proposed?

Kathy O'Connor said that this was mixing two different things. One is the summary that P&R would be looking at the abbreviated version of program review, and another is the actual program review document.

Jack Friedlander said that what we recently discussed was thought of as being a way of summarizing the narrative for the resource requests, not on a regular basis, over and above the narrative that we do every two years. If you had no major resource request most people don't fill it out. Those objectives you do once and each year they are updated. In reference to the narrative - the accreditation association developed rubrics with the expectations that we will be accountable for. For the next self study we are expected to be at proficiency level. We should back and see what we could do to these proposed forms to meet that rubric and add what's missing and go back to the narrative and can we streamline the text base we're asking people to fill out year to year.

Esther Frankel expressed her concern about the link to the mission and the college plan. The college plan is a broad, forward looking strategic planning document that doesn't always apply to every department.

Jack Friedlander said how we don't want a forced connection; the goal statements in the college plan are generic enough that you can add a statement. What is more important is the objective and what you are trying to do as a department.

Jack Friedlander, on his part, insisted that we need to focus on correcting our perceived weakness. We don't have a close link between program review and our college plan/mission and their budgeting and planning processes for the institution. This includes resource requests and how your goals and program objective tie into the overall institutional effort. This is a way to try to keep consistency among everyone. Jack Friedlander said that we can bring back the document we discussed earlier, and discuss it as a whole with the new proposed forms, to see if we want to still consider it, modify it, or not consider it at all.

Something else that we are missing and that we are required to have is an educational master plan. We need to build that master plan. We have never had a master plan.

Kathy O'Connor said that that the communication strand that we started last year can help document this. The whole idea was to take our program review, summarize it and send it to Planning and Resources so they could begin to integrate it to the plan for resources. We can go back and document with minutes from that discussion and what we actually do this year, showing our efforts. Kathy O'Connor asked if the forms could be a summary of the narratives we are currently supposed to write.

Jack Friedlander said that this may be the case, depending on what is done at the retreat and early in the fall.

Tom Garey said that the breakdown has occurred after all these narratives/reports are created. No one reads them. This is a detail we need to work out to have this all have a positive affect.

3.5 College plan numerical targets need to be completed early in the fall semester. Possible senate subgroup to elaborate tentative recommendations?

To be discussed at the senate retreat. We need numerical targets. For WASC we need to identify where/how the numbers were derived.

3.6 SBCC Copyright Policy (pg. 34-40)

To be given to ITC and AP for discussion and review and report back to the senate.

4.0 Reports

4.1 President's Report (none)

4.2 Liaison Reports (none)

4.3 EVP Report (none)

5.0 Adjourn