

**Academic Senate
MINUTES
September 24, 2008
3:00 - 5:00 p.m. BC214**

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcón (Chair), Armando Arias, Barbara Bell, Curtis Bieber, Susan Broderick, Cathie Carroll, Stephanie Durfor, Esther Frankel, Jack Friedlander, Tom Garey, David Gilbert, Kathy Molloy, Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, David Morris, Mimi Muraoka, Dean Nevins, Kathy O'Connor, Jan Schultz, Ana María Ygualt, Oscar Zavala

Members Absent: Camila Avendaño

Guests: Kenny Lindberg (*The Channels*), Kenley Neufeld, Andreea Serban, Laurie Vasquez

3:00 pm 1.0 Call to Order

- 1.1 Approval of Agenda
 - 1.2 Approval of Minutes 9-10-08
- M/S/C To approve the meeting Minutes of 9-10-08 with corrections (Carroll/Zavala)

3:05 pm 2.0 Information Items

- 2.1 Camila Avendaño is the new ASB president.
- 2.2 Marcy Moore has been reelected as Adjunct Faculty representative to the Academic Senate for the term 2008-2010 (through Spring 2010).
- 2.3 eLumen workshops scheduled for Friday, September 26, 10–11:30 am. It was announced that eLumen will hold a morning session for Instructional Programs, from 10:00 to 11:30 am, in the BC forum. They will also hold an afternoon session for Student Services programs in A160 from 1-3 p.m.
- 2.4 Call for Hayward Award nominations has been sent by Faculty Recognition Committee chair Laura Welby.
- 2.5 The underwriters for the bond have been selected: 75% RBC (Royal Bank of Canada), and 25% Estrada/Hinojosa. Next step is to secure bond ratings, with anticipated issue of the first \$44M in December.
- 2.6 Academic Policies Committee has been asked to discuss guidelines regarding period of time that faculty can be expected to hold on to completed final exams after a class offering has ended.

3:15 pm 3.0 Action Items

- 3.1 College Plan 2008-2011.
It was asked how figures were determined in several of the objectives. Jack Friedlander explained how the figures have been determined taking into account baseline data and trends. The departments directly concerned with some of the objectives that include specific figures have been consulted.

There was discussion and some suggested additions and modifications. From the Transfer Center, a suggestion to be more specific in how we count Transfer Students was made, by splitting Objective 1.7 in two. There were also suggestions to expand Goal 5.

The suggested modifications are:

Objective 1.7 The number of students that transfer from the college to UC or CSU will increase by a minimum of 5% from 1,024 in 2006-07 to 1,075 in 2010-2011. The number of students that transfer to other four-year colleges or universities will increase by a minimum of 5% from 435 in 2005-06 to 457 in 2010-2011.

Objective 1.8 From 2008 to 2011 the number of students who declare an educational goal of transfer and/or declare a transfer plan to a four-year university will demonstrate a 5% increase in each of the following categories of Transfer Directed, Model Transfer Ready, and Total Transfer Prepared:

Total Transfer Directed: Students who enrolled in and earned a grade of “A”, “B”, “C” or “P” in a transferable Mathematics course **and** a UC transferable English course:

2008-09: Some time between Summer term 2003 & Spring term 2009

2009-10: Some time between Summer term 2004 & Spring term 2010

2010-11: Some time between Summer term 2005 & Spring term 2011

Model Transfer Ready: Students who were Transfer Directed **and** had earned 60 CSU or UC transferable units with a minimum G.P.A. of 2.40 as of:

2008-09: Spring term 2009

2009-10: Spring term 2010

2010-11: Spring term 2011

Total Transfer Prepared is defined as the net number of students who earned, within a six-year period, 60 UC or CSU transferable units with a minimum GPA of 2.40 and who enrolled in and earned a grade of “A”, “B”, “C” or “P” in a transferable Mathematics course **and** 2 UC transferable English composition courses as of:

2008-09: Spring term 2009

2009-10: Spring term 2010

2010-11: Spring term 2011

Goal 5. Ensure that the college has effective shared governance and decision-making structures and processes.

Objective 5.1 In 2008-09, develop a framework for regular evaluation and improvement of institutional shared governance and decision-making structures and processes and conduct the evaluation.

Objective 5.2 In 2009-10, develop and implement a plan that responds to the evaluation of each constituency group's effectiveness in the shared governance process.

Objective 5.3 By Spring 2010, develop the college's Master Education Plan and start its implementation.

3.2 Program Review Procedure (p. 7-16)

Programs in the Educational Support Division have been directed to use an Administrative Program Review format that is different from the current procedure, without going through the review or approval of the Academic Senate. This needs to be discussed.

- 3.3 Faculty Job Description and Faculty Responsibilities Checklists.
(Not acted on.)
- 3.4 Textbook and Course Materials Adoption Guidelines (p. 17)
(Not acted on.)

3:50 pm 4.0 Discussion Items

- 4.1 Process for replacement positions.
(Postponed)

- 4.2 Dr. Andreea Serban attends (4:00 pm)
President Serban discussed several items with the Senate. She provided four handouts: (1) Community College League of California's Budget Update #18 (September 23, 2008), (2) ACCJC/WASC Accreditation Notes: "What Accreditors Expect from College Program Review (April 2003), (3) ACCJC Requirements for Evidence in the Self-Study (August 2008), and (4) Revised School of Media Arts Estimate (September 2008).

(a) State budget concerns. Spending in the college.

The state budget is now signed. There are some cash flow problems. For the next three months, due to delayed payments, the college will need to continue to rely on our reserves. The COLA does not apply to categorical programs. Ms. Serban has requested that the college remains very conservative in our spending.

(b) Faculty-led/staffed Educational Support Program Reviews.

Dr. Serban expressed that providing ESD programs with an Administrative Program Review without previous consultation was not appropriate, and that discussion with the senate is needed.

The Accreditation requirements for Program Reviews are more stringent than anticipated. We will be required to be at the Sustainable Level in the rubric from ACCJC. Program Reviews will need to link to the mission, core functions and the college's budgeting process. This implies that we need to do more than just completing the templates for planning. The templates are useful and will be part of the Program Review, but we can think of them as being "the second half" of the Program Review. The templates for planning are still necessary to be included in college's planning and budgeting. There was a concern that a December 1st deadline for the comprehensive program review seem unachievable. Dr. Serban said that the December 1, deadline refers to the "operational units", because those administrative have not completed a program review in recent times. For other programs, the deadline for a complete program review can be the end of the academic year. Dr. Serban referred to the narrative discussed in the *Accreditation Notes* from 2003. This is not new, and the college hasn't addressed this properly. We cannot risk that our accreditation visit finds us lacking in this area.

(c) Revised estimate of SoMA building.

The new estimate is over 4 million dollars more. The reasons for the added cost are several. There have been some modifications to the original design, because some necessary items had not been included. The cost of landscaping had not been included either. Finally, there was a decision made to have the SoMA building be LEED certified, which in itself added about 1M to the cost estimate of the building. The Foundation is working extremely hard to raise more than 5M for the SoMA building. At this point, the Foundation has raised close to 2M.

(d) Effect on bond projects.

The source for the unanticipated extra cost of the SoMA building may have to be funds from Measure V.

(e) State matching funds status.

The state matching funds for SBCC's Measure V projects are not automatic. There are two conditions to be met. The state has to promote and obtain construction bonds from the state voters, and the projects of the college have to be ranked highly enough. For 2008, the state has not submitted construction bonds to the consideration of the voters. The next anticipated state construction bond will occur in 2010. Unfortunately, SBCC projects have not made the priority list for 2010. There are many considerations that go into the ranking of projects, such as age of the building and campus space utilization rates. In order for SBCC projects to be ranked high, we will need to address what is under our control.

(f) Other.

Dr. Serban was asked about her position regarding positions replacement. At this point, the Full Time Faculty Obligation is not known. As long as the college can pay for them there is no interest in diminishing the number of full-time faculty. It is to be noted that replacement positions within departments are not a guaranteed and that they are subject to review.

At 5:00 pm, a motion was made to hold an extraordinary Senate meeting on October 1, in lieu of the Steering Committee meeting, to address the Program Review Procedures and other items in our agenda.

M/S/C (Molloy/Garey) (One opposed).

- Attachments:** (1) Community College League of California's Budget Update #18 (September 23, 2008)
(2) ACCJC/WASC Accreditation Notes: "What Accreditors Expect from College Program Review (April 2003)
(3) ACCJC Requirements for Evidence in the Self-Study (August 2008)
(4) Revised School of Media Arts Estimate (September 2008).