Members Present: Ignacio Alarcón (Chair), Jessica Aparicio, Armando Arias, Barbara Bell, 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, Ana María Ygualt, Oscar Zavala

Members Excused: Jan Schultz

Guests: Mark Ferrer, Kelly Lake, Kenley Neufeld, Laurie Vasquez

1.0 Call to Order
   1.1 Approval of Agenda
   1.2 Approval of Minutes, March 25, 2009
   M/S/C To approve the Academic Senate meeting minutes for 3-25-2009 (Frankel/Monda)
   1 abstention

2.0 Information
   2.1 Partnership for Student Success Workshop, April 24. More than 120 attendees have indicated they will attend (Kathy Molloy)
   Our past President, Kathy Molloy will be hosting the very popular PSS Workshop, April 24.
   Ms. Molloy announced that over 140 people are expected to attend.

   2.2 Letter of Recognition from Mayor Marty Blum to David Starkey as Santa Barbara City’s 3rd Poet Laureate
   Attached is a copy of the letter from the City of Santa Barbara to David Starkey bestowing upon David Starkey the honor of serving as the City’s Poet Laureate for the next two years.

   2.3 Senate’s Fund 41 resolution has been presented to Andreea Serban on March 27, and to CPC on April 7
   Senate President Alarcón, presented the Resolution to Superintendent/President Serban on Friday last and mentioned the passage of the Senate Resolution in his report at the Board of Trustees meeting.

   2.4 Accreditation Forum: Friday, April 17 from 9:00 AM - 11:00 AM in EBS 309
   The second part of the Accreditation Forums on the remaining Standards will be held this Friday.

   2.5 Instructors’ Association Spring Party Saturday May 16, 4:00 – 8:00 pm
   The date was changed because of a scheduling conflict with the SBCC Red and White banquet.

   2.6 Division Representatives to Senate Elections
   There yellow handout indicates the election schedule for Senators. Divison results thus far: the Sciences Division has elected Gary Carroll to replace outgoing Senator Jan Schultz; Health and Human Services has elected Cindy Bower to replace soon to be retired faculty member,
Senator Mimi Muraoka; and Kenley Neufeld from Educational Support will be serving out Susan Broderick’s last year of her term as Senator. The remaining Divisions to hold elections are: Business, English, Mathematics, Social Sciences. Please note at the last Senate meeting, May 13, we will also need to confirm our representatives serving on CPC.

3.0 Action
3.1 Excess Student Load Policy
Oscar Zavala explained the policy and why he endorses Debbie Mackie’s proposed “common sense” changes. A student would need to come to counseling because the policy states: if they have a 3.0 gpa and want to take over 18 units they need a counselor’s approval. The counseling department feels this is a clerical task: get a signature and be automatically approved if you have a 3.0 gpa.

Examples of some of the many of the reasons why a student would need to come in for such an approval are: an Earth Science field trip during spring break; a vocational/technical program; a student admitted to a four-year University may need additional units; a student adding a short or late start class or for a “to be arranged” PE, ECE, ADC, or COMP class.

The counseling department would continue to do what they have done in the past with those students having a lower than 3.0 gpa that want to take more than 18 units. The summer policy remains in place with only the change in the maximum of units from 8 to 9 units.

Tom Garey wanted to know why the use of recommendation vs approval?
Kathy O’Connor: use authorization and reminded everyone this is not really a policy it’s a procedure.
M/S/C To approve the Course Load Limitations request with the amendment to change “permission” to “ability” and “recommendation” to “authorization” (O’Connor/Nevins) Unanimous

4.0 Hearing/Discussion
4.1 Comparison of Process for Allocation of Equipment Funds
(Academic Senate and Administration Proposals)
Ignacio reported that he and the EVP met with Andreea to discuss the content of the two sided pink handout, CPC 4-14-09 “Process for allocation of funds for routine, non-routine and new equipment” and “Sources of Funding for Program Review Resource Requests” in response to the Senate Resolution.

Tom Garey commented that it was a very reasonable compromise on what the Senate resolved and speaks to the core of the Resolution and what Dr. Serban had proposed in terms of ranking procedures. Discussion still needed on the evaluation to take place in Spring 2010 and 2011, and the criteria to be used.

EVP: believed this was an excellent approach to working with Divisions/departments. and the definition for non-routine replacement needs.
Inventory: count items over $5,000.
Tom: Many departments are inventory rich – many items under $5,000. That inventory is the basis for allocations.
EVP – that won’t be the basis for allocation.
Kim: clarification on “non routine equip replacement needs” second bullet: that is done at the college level and not at the department level and by whom?
EVP: Correct and done by CPC recommendation.
Esther: who determined the $5,000?
EVP: this is a state definition.

Kathy O’Connor requested that the EVP provide some instructions and guidelines before the end of the year/ semester/before Fall 09, October deadline for resource requests.

4.2 Self Study for Accreditation – Draft 5 (Kelly Lake attends)
Dr. Kelly Lake reported on Draft 5 of the Accreditation Self Study; the almost final stage of the process. Dr. Lake began by recommending that everyone be as objective as possible when they read the study. The Accreditation team will not know our policies, procedures and culture the way we do. Kelly had some reading suggestions/recommendations for everyone:
1) read the document objectively from outside of your purview on campus; ask yourself does it make sense
2) have we really explained what we do and how we do it in a way that someone who has not a clue, gets it
3) make sure it comes from the voice of the institution and not from the department, not from the committee

Our institution has a credit and continuing education program. We need to remember we have continuing education; you will read information applying to both.

The focus for (Draft 5) is you are reading for content. That what we say is exactly what we do. Kelly also showed the Senate some examples of what to look for, to give everyone an idea of what might be okay and what could be done better. Whatever we are saying in the document that we are referring to over and over; we need to make sure that we are stating it in the same way to be very consistent about what we are saying and what we are doing.

If there are questions, how do we determine which is the correct information? Make notes and report all findings anomalies/inconsistencies to Diane Rodriguez-Kiino and Andreea Serban.

Volunteered to review assigned areas and important to review content across the Standards:
SLOs: Jack Friedlander/Mark Ferrer
Program Review/Planning & Resources: Esther Frankel, Kim Monda
Student Services: Susan Broderick, Cathie Carrol
Faculty Evaluation/Hiring: Oscar Zavala, Mimi Muraoka, Marcy Moore
Technology: Dean Nevins, Esther Frankel
Shared Governance: Dean Nevins, Senator that are chairs
Curriculum: Kathy O’Connor, Laura Castro
Committees: Senate committee chairs to review
The Senate wanted to also congratulate Dr. Kelly Lake, on his dedication, leadership and service to the college on behalf of all faculty during the process of and completion of the Accreditation Self Study Report.

4.3 Program Review Resource Requests from Instructional Programs and Faculty-Led Student Services Programs 2009-2010 (Kim Monda representing P&R)

Report from P&R (orchid handout) Kim Monda reported P&R had received the “Resource Requests for Faculty-Led Educational Programs” document, a compilation with four categories Faculty/Staff; Equipment; Other; and Facilities for items that had been requested through the Program Review process.

The document has not been seen by the Senate. P&R was given the charge of determining whether the items in the document ranked by departments and deans were indeed a number 1.

P&R’s recommendation: P&R agrees with the ranking of all items as a “1” in the resource request document.

What P&R learned through the process: The information received was incomplete and too extensive with not enough time to participate in a meaningful way.

Some recommendations for the next program review/request cycle:
Establish a small faculty work-group to continue to develop the process
Allow for more time to review requests and for faculty consultation
Establish clear categories
Include ITC in the timeline

This was the first opportunity to link the Resource and Planning Process to the Program Review and resource requests and more work on defining and refining the process is needed.

Some Senators expressed concern because their requests were not on the list.

EVP: Was gratified and appreciates the level of engagement and care to the process. We learn by doing. In the fall (when money is available) routine requests will be up to the departments in their ongoing budgets. You also won’t be seeing the non-routine items. The only thing on board for the next ranking would be what could wait a year before replacing if the non routine items cost more than what was available. The only things you would see are new resource requests; items where there is no carry over funds or capacity to pay for them.

Identify potential sources of funding. We need to establish some sort of dollar amount / proportion associated with growth. We are all competing for very scarce funding resources. The EVP also explained how he represents Educational Programs in the resource request process at CPC.

Many requests were maintenance or deferred maintenance requests e.g. painting walls, repairing leaky roofs and should not have been part of this particular request process.
4.4 Fall Inservice Agenda Recommendation from FPDC (Armando Arias)
Armando Arias, liaison to the FPD committee, reported the committee had not come to a conclusion on the Inservice Agenda and are meeting again tomorrow to finalize. A draft of the tentative schedule was read:

**THURSDAY**
- 8:15a Refreshments
- 9:00a General meeting
- 10:30a Break
- 10:45a Accreditation
- 12:00p Lunch
- 1:15p Division meetings
- 2:45p Department meetings

**FRIDAY**
- 9:00a Accreditation
- 10:15a Break
- 10:30a Workshops
- 11:45a Lunch
- 1:30-4p Department workshops

Recommendation: Have both Thursday and Friday designated department meetings/activities in lieu of workshops. Departments have a lot to do and plan without competing with the workshops.

Why two separate accreditation sessions? The accreditation sessions were requested by the Superintendent/President.

Armando reported he has presented all of the Senate’s suggestions to the FPD committee.

4.5 Faculty Recognition Committee Recommendations for FEA (Faculty Excellence Awards) 2009-2010 (Armando Arias)
Senator Arias announced the Faculty Excellence Award nominees:
- Tom Garey
- Oscar Zavala
- Bronwen Moore
- Gail Reynolds
- Rob Dependahl
- Nick Arnold
- Sally Saenger (Continuing Education)

Because of a tie, the committee is also recommending the approval of all seven nominees.

M/S/C To move the Faculty Excellence Award nominations to action (Dean/Monda) 1 abstention
M/S/C To approve the nominees for the Faculty Excellence Award (Molloy/Nevins) 2 abstentions

4.6 Board Policy 4170 (Program Review Policy) (pg. 12)
To recommend the additional language about BP 2510 to the policy and to add BP 2510 to the reference section at the beginning of the document.

4.7 Board Policy 2410 (Policy and Administrative Procedure) (pg. 13)
To recommend the additional language about BP 2510 and to add BP 2510 to the reference section at the beginning of the document.
4.8 Board Policies 2100 (Faculty Evaluation Policy) (pg. 21-48) and 1500 (Duties of Faculty) (pg. 49-56) This has been sent to AP for review.

4.8.1 Expectation by ACCJC/WASC that a syllabus containing the SLOs for the course be distributed in all classes (pg. 14-18)

Several communications have been attached to the agenda from various sources on SLOs. And verification that they must be added to your course syllabus and course outline of record.

4.8.2 Proposal for Student Evaluation of Instructor Survey to verify this WASC requirement has been met (pg. 19)

Students won’t remember that you gave them the information. Recommendation: Put this on the checklist not the evaluation. What if a course is not yet in the SLO cycle?

4.8.3 Process for Reviewing and Approving Course SLOs (Mark Ferrer attends)

Mark Ferrer (with flow chart handout) explained and reported on the SLO approval process identified in the flowchart and how eLumen should help with the automation of the data entry/collection/mapping process.

Members of the SLO review group: EVP, Ignacio, Ben Partee, Claudia Johnson, Mark Ferrer, Mohammad elSoussi and Jack Bailey.

4.9 Senate Bylaws Revision Subgroup

Review at Senate next time.

4.10 Parking Problems (especially during the first three weeks of semester) (Marcy Moore) (pg. 20)

At CPC we were told that the problem will be worse, and we will be losing parking spaces because of the new Coastal Commission requirement that 25% of our parking be carpool parking.

5.0 Reports

5.1 President’s Report
5.2 CPC Liaison Report
5.3 Senate Committee Liaison Reports
5.4 EVP Report

6.0 Adjourn