

**Academic Senate  
MINUTES  
September 10, 2008  
3:00 - 5:00 p.m. BC214**

**1.0 Call to Order**

1.1 Approval of Agenda

So approved, with added item 2.8.

1.2 Approval of Minutes 7-16-08

M/S/C To approve the 7/16/08 meeting minutes with corrections (Garey/O'Connor)  
(One abstention, due to absence from meeting.)

**2.0 Information**

2.1 Senate Meetings Calendar for Fall 2008 – Spring 2009

Some calendar dates were inaccurate and have been corrected and will be posted on the Senate webpage. Karolyn Hanna's Faculty Lecture's date and location have not been determined as of now, but it is anticipated to occur late in the spring semester.

2.2 Karolyn Hanna is the Pacific Region awardee of the ACCT (Association of Community College Trustees). She is now one of the finalists for the ACCT Meardy Award, to be announced at the end of October in New York City.

2.3 New Programs and Program Modifications needing System Office approval. The anticipated period of time needed for the System Office to respond is around 60 days. **New programs, or Program modifications, may not be included in catalog without CAC approval and System Office approval.** It is recommended that departments submit New Programs and Program Modifications that need System Office approval so that they can receive CAC approval no later than the end of January. Late submissions risk not being included in the printed college catalog.

2.4 First draft of Accreditation Self-Study is complete. Second draft is due October 6, and the next Accreditation Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for October 17. Accreditation Self-Study forums are scheduled for the morning of November 5 and the afternoon of November 6.

2.5 Don Barthelme cannot chair Planning and Resources Committee this year. Kim Monda will chair the committee beginning Spring 2009. For Fall 2008, chair duties of P&R will be split among Geoff Thielst and other members of the committee. In the Spring, Kim Monda will chair P&R. Judy Meyer will be faculty representative at CPC this year.

2.6 Laura Welby will chair Faculty Recognition Committee one more semester, hoping to groom someone to take over in the Spring 2009. The committee needs more members (and a chair for the spring.) This committee meets on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Fridays of the month.

2.7 Colleges are instructed to follow legal opinion of Ralph Black's from December, 2007. An instructor may not assign an F in the course to a student because of an act of cheating. We'll have to change Academic Honesty policy (SBCC Catalog 2007-2008, page 47).

There was much discussion on this subject. The statewide Academic Senate recommends that colleges adhere to this legal opinion. A resolution from the spring plenary calls for a workgroup that can develop a strategy about this. In the meantime, our policies should reflect this change. Kathy O'Connor expressed how we ought to take this as a recommendation that would avoid that instructors and colleges get in trouble for a policy against which there is a legal opinion that has been made public to us. Kathy Molloy reminded the senate that the current policy posted on the website and the college catalog has not gone through Academic Senate approval. She said that the posted policy is actually better than the last academic honesty policy approved by the senate. It was recommended that the Academic Policies committee takes up this policy, and that they revise it and bring it up for senate approval.

2.8 Added agenda item: Tanja Khosrawipour has contacted Andreea Serban to inform her that she will not be returning to SBCC. The Student Senate will be electing a new president on Friday, September 12. It is expected that Camila Avendaño, the ASB Vice President, will be elected president. Student trustee Sean Knotts will be the student representative on the Measure V Oversight Committee.

### **3.0 Discussion Items**

3.1 College Plan 2008-2011. (We need to act on this no later than September 24). Kim Monda noted that Goal #3 has been revised and is missing from the attached document. Jack Friedlander explained how the figures in the objectives of the College Plan were determined. He explained that they were derived from baseline data from the Institutional Effectiveness Report and existing trends. The target numbers that have been proposed are now going through the consultative process. A concern was expressed by some senators that some of the target figures seemed to be a real stretch. What would happen if we do not achieve the targets? Jack Friedlander responded that each year these figures would be a reference. These figures can be used by the institution as part of its improvement plans. Another concern expressed was the expectation from the accreditation process regarding the College Plan. Jack Friedlander said that accreditation would be looking for quantifiable measurable targets in the College Plan and how they are linked to our planning processes. Accreditation will look at how department program reviews, administrative program reviews, I.T. plans, and budgeting/resource allocations are connected.

A system of collecting needed and important data was discussed. How do we document Skills Competency Awards even though they are not reported to the state?

The Senate might want to come up with a stronger objective about the shared governance process. It was suggested to change the order of objectives 5 and 6 to reflect the order in which they are presented in the main statement.

An important question is how we evaluate shared governance. The specific strategies are left out of the College Plan. There should be some reference to the role of Classified Staff to reflect how the college addressed the recommendations from the last accreditation visit. We need to develop/identify criteria for how to evaluate success for each constituency.

Kathy Molloy reminded the senate on how the goal has actually improved from the original version that we faced. The original objective statement had words such as “cumbersome” and “time-consuming” referring to our shared governance.

Have each constituency define how their role/relationship is in shared governance. The objective should not be about defining criteria, but allow for each constituency to define its role and elaborate criteria to develop their own evaluation process. An important objective should be about integrating conclusions of the different constituencies, and develop a plan that addresses deficiencies.

The numbering of the objectives should be changed, to follow the order in the main statement of this portion of the College Plan (GOVERNANCE, DECISION SUPPORT, AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT). Tentatively, the following is suggested:

**Goal 5. Ensure that each constituency group has a role in the consultative process.**

Objective 5.1 Define roles of each constituency group in the shared governance process and establish criteria to evaluate their roles.

Objective 5.2 Develop and implement a plan to evaluate each constituency group's effectiveness in the shared governance process.

Objective 5.3 Develop and implement a college-wide plan to examine and respond to the conclusions of the evaluation of each constituency group's effectiveness in the shared governance process.

**Goal 6. Establish college-wide accountability systems that are based on quantitative and qualitative data and linked to planning and budgeting.**

Objective 6.1 Complete the implementation of Banner and associated third party software applications.

Objective 6.2 Develop and implement a technology-based decision support system to provide easy and prompt access to data, to recover the decision support capabilities that the college had achieved before the Banner implementation.

Objective 6.3 Complete the program review process for each administrative unit and each instructional program of the college.

Objective 6.4 Integrate administrative unit reviews and instructional program reviews into college planning processes, linking the program reviews findings to college-wide planning and resource allocation.

Objective 6.5 Complete assessment of alternative resource allocation models that effectively address existing and emerging staffing and infrastructure needs used in other colleges in the state, examine possibilities of implementation at SBCC, and determine if such an implementation will be undertaken.

Objective 6.6 Complete the software conversion in the non-credit division.

On September 24, the Senate will look at a more complete document that will have gone through more consultation at several instances.

3.2 Curriculum Advisory Committee requests to add a Continuing Education representative as a non-voting member.

Recent changes in Title 5 require a more stringent curriculum process at the Continuing Education division, that is tied to the credit curriculum process. Jack Bailey will be sitting on CAC as a non-voting member. The process up to now had been very informal. Title 5 now states that Continuing Education must go through the college's curriculum committee. Continuing Education courses, especially those with enhanced funding, will need to go through CAC and Board approval. The Senate had no objection to the request of adding a Continuing Education representative as a non-voting member.

3.3 Senate request to the Instructors' Association. Consider negotiating 2 extra-TLUs that would allow all senate committee chairs (except CAC) and the faculty CPC representative's compensation increases from 0.75 TLUs per semester, to 1 TLU per semester. Tom Garey indicated that the request for a 2 TLU increase has already been placed on the I.A. list of negotiable items as of Friday, September 5.

3.4 Academic Senate Report to the Board of Trustees.

Some changes to the list of Other Senate Action items were recommended, in particular the Academic Honesty policy and the Salary Class Transfer policy. It gives the impression that the Senate actually heard and acted on these items. Ignacio said he would remove them from the report.

#### **4.0 Action Items**

4.1 Program Review

(a) Program Review Policy

(b) Program Review Templates

Esther Frankel expressed that she thought that it is a mistake to include a specific set of templates in the policy. It's a good idea to have something generic. If we change the templates we have to change the policy and then we'll need to go through that whole thing again. We don't need to specify the templates in the policy. The templates are part of a procedure, and not the policy.

Kathy Molloy suggested to remove the portion of the policy that starts on 4174, and consider it a procedure.

4173 C was discussed. The recommended language is to add "and updates" after templates and end the sentence after 'when needed'.

M/S/C To approve the revisions of the Program Review Policy 4170 through 4173 with a change in 4173 item C language to read "Program Review (report and) updates to be considered in the college's planning processes will be completed annually." (Molloy/Garey)

In item B we also need to replace "provisions of section 4174.3" with "Program Review procedures." The templates will be considered part of the procedures.

M/S/C To recommend approval and adapt, at our next meeting, the 4174 Program Review procedures (Garey/Molloy)  
(Attachement to these minutes: copy of approved Program Policy.)

#### 4.2 Faculty Job Description and Faculty Evaluation Checklists

Ignacio referred a request from the Academic Policies Committee to have this go back to them for review/recommendation. There are other issues other than language continuity. Tom Garey indicated that the proposed modifications to the Faculty Job Description and Faculty Responsibilities Checklists were discussed by the Instructors' Association board, and that no objection was expressed.

#### 4.3 Textbook and Course Materials Adoption Guidelines

No action taken – deferred item to next meeting.

### **5.0 Reports**

#### 5.1 President's Report

A) IT has informed the college that they cannot complete the SLO reporting systems that we need in a timely fashion. The SLO workgroup and IT personnel have been in a demonstration of eLumen, a system that would allow us to produce these reports. eLumen will take our existing data bases and use them, so we would not have to repeat work that we have already done. There is funding for this, from lottery revenues that can be applied to educational items, and hence not making use of resources from the general fund. The cost is \$40,000 as an initial fee, plus \$12,000 as a yearly fee. eLumen has been used by a good number of Banner schools.

eLumen demonstration workshops will be held September 26.

B) Memo soliciting requests for new faculty will be sent out soon. The Full Time Faculty Obligation is not known due to the unknown state budget. The letter will request that a proposal is also submitted for replacement positions. Replacement positions may need to be ranked. The Senate will discuss the procedure for replacement faculty at the next meeting.

#### 5.2 Liaisons' Reports

#### 5.3 EVP Report

### **6.0 Adjourn**