Academic Senate
MINUTES
April 29, 2009
3:00 - 5:00 p.m. BC214

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcón (Chair), Jessica Aparicio, Armando Arias, Barbara Bell, Susan Broderick, Stephanie Durfor, Esther Frankel, Jack Friedlander, Tom Garey, David Gilbert, Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, David Morris, Mimi Muraoka, Dean Nevins, Jan Schultz, Ana María Ygualt, Oscar Zavala

Members Excused: Cathie Carroll, Kathy Molloy, Kathy O’Connor

Guests: Kelly Lake, Kenley Neufeld, Ben Partee, Laurie Vasquez

1.0 Call to Order
1.1 Approval of Agenda – so approved
1.2 Approval of Minutes, April 15, 2009
M/S/C To approve the Academic Senate April 15, 2009 meeting minutes
(Frankel/Zavala) 1 abstention

2.0 Information
2.1 Congratulations to the Partnership for Student Success Workshop, April 24.
A job very well done!
Kelly Lake reported that the Partnership for Student Success’s event was great, extremely well organized with more than 120 attendees from all over the state. Everyone had a great time getting information about the writing lab, math lab, Academic Achievement Zone, and the Gateway Center, and had an opportunity to tour the featured program sites identified in the Partnership for Student Success. Ignacio reported that several of the attendants remarked that the perceived strength of this program arises from the fact that faculty are so heavily involved in this.

2.2 Drama/Music Renovation Status (Bids in and Contract Award)
Tom Garey reported that contracts have been awarded. The initial bids came in about $3 million under budget. Work to proceed orders should begin in a few weeks after the state has given its final approval with construction scheduled to begin in May and should be completed in approximately 13 months.
- The "Core and Shell" bid and the "Theatre Systems" bids were won by Diani Building Corporation (Santa Maria).
  Core and Shell = $ 10,874,000; Theatre Systems = $ 3,279,000
- The "AV" bid was won by Frank Schipper Construction (Santa Barbara)
  AV = $ 477,770

2.3 SoMA Building Status (Approval for Submittal of Preliminary Plans to Public Works Board Meeting in May)
Once approved then the working drawings are next. SoMA seems to be on track and construction should begin sometime between July and December 2010.

2.4 Kelly Lake has been elected president of the California Association for the Education of Young Children (CAEYC)
Dr. Lake will begin serving as President-Elect 2009-2011; President 2011-2013 and Immediate Past President 2013-2014. Congratulations Kelly!

2.5 Statewide Academic Senate Spring Plenary Resolutions
Ignacio Alarcón reported that if he were to summarize the tone for all three days of the Spring Plenary, it would be anger at the Accreditation Commission. The feeling is that ACCJC/WASC, who is demanding transparency, has no transparency. See items listed under 2.0 Accreditation. There are reports of glaring irregularities in terms of how teams are formed; in some cases the teams have had no faculty; and some team members have been given waivers to have their time with the accreditation visit shortened.

Plenary Resolutions of note: 9.02 Validation of prerequisites – revision of Title 5: To replace the statistical validation, a very onerous process, by using content review instead. The complete and Final Resolution document can be found at: http://www.asccc.org/Events/sessions/spring2009/S09_Final_Resolutions.doc

2.6 Proposition 1A, 1B Impact on SBCC’s Budget (if they don’t pass, $4.4m hit)
If the Propositions do not pass, as most polls currently indicate, the effect on SBCC’s budget will be additional shortfall of $4.4 million dollars. The state budget would also be at square one again. Marcy Moore asked if our college will receive any federal stimulus funds. Jack Friedlander explained how California Community Colleges will not receive any stimulus funds. The rationale is that, unlike the CSUs and UCs, CCC have not increased tuition, which is the main target of any federal stimulus funds.

2.7 Budget Assumptions 2009-2010
Ignacio provided a handout (attached) containing information for the tentative budget that has to be completed before the end of June, including general information and risk factors, assumptions on revenue, expenses, transfers and fund balance. There will be an open budget forum on Thursday, April 30 from 10:00 - 11:30 a.m. in ECC 30 on East Campus. Joe Sullivan, Vice President, Business Services and Andreea Serban will provide an update on the fiscal status of the college.

M/S/C To move the Budget Assumptions Information item to Hearing/Discussion (Garey/Frankel)

2.8 Summer Meeting Academic Senate to be held on July 15, 3:00 – 5:00 pm

2.9 Last Senate Meeting, May 13
This meeting cannot be at Jack and Marci Friedlander’s house due to road closures because of construction projects. The proposed locations: Endless Summer Café or Gourmet Dining room. Members of the Senate thanked Jack and Marci for being willing to host this last meeting of the Senate.

2.10 Instructors’ Association Spring Party Saturday May 16, 4:00 – 8:00 pm
This is a change in the originally announced date.

2.11 ITC ranking/report (handout)
Ms. Vasquez reported ITC’s ranking process was modeled after the “Wopat method”, the same method used by the Senate to rank new faculty requests.
As the issue of printers was discussed, Tom Garey suggested that there ought to be a way around the coding technology and allow the satellite copy machines to have their printer capabilities functional. David Gilbert mentioned that in the Math Department, this has been explored some time ago by some of our new faculty, and they were only given the response that this capability would not be functional due to the technology used for entering codes. Jack Friedlander offered to talk about this with Joe Sullivan.

Esther Frankel wanted clarification/update on replacement cycle. The Accreditation Self Study identifies three different cycles, and neither one is what we actually do now.

Jack Friedlander said that the intent is to have all computer requests placed in the replacement/refresh cycle. We need an accurate list before this can be done.

Esther Frankel said that in the past there have been errors on that list. There may not be enough time to make corrections. We have computers that were supposed to be replaced last summer.

Tom Garey reminded everyone that there was a time when a new computer requested by a department would need to have twice the cost of the computer “in the books,” for eventual replacement. Jack said that the College has stopped that practice.

Oscar Zavala asked if the number of computers requested affected the ranking? In other words, would the request be ranked higher if fewer computers were requested? Laurie said that this was not necessarily the case. Laurie was also asked if the College has the personnel to service all the possible requests. ITC is mindful of IT workload and service needs Ms. Vasquez explained a detail in the ITC process: All division representatives go back to their areas, talk with deans, departments, chairs, and faculty to determine how the requests in their division should be ranked.

Jan Schultz questioned the new requests and ranking process given the fact that previous requests elsewhere have gone unfilled. Jan said that it would be very upsetting if we started funding new initiatives when other basic needs have not been met.

Jack Friedlander said that CPC will be considering all requests. Those that are most urgent will rise to the top if a department cannot function.

Armando Arias said that in his division alone there are two departments that will not be able to continue operating this fall if their computers are not replaced. These two departments are not on the ITC list. Armando said that in order for us to be able to continue this fall we need to start the replacement process within a week. Jack Friedlander said that there was money in the budget for the replacement cycle, but that he understood how the Technologies division would feel much better seeing the requests explicitly on the list.
Esther Frankel said that all of this confirms Jan’s misgivings about doing new things when there are all these replacement needs that should be done. What are the criteria that ITC has used for ranking these? The top two items were prior requests.

Laurie Vasquez said that this is a new process for us and we are well aware that there are inconsistencies with previous requests.

Kim Monda asked about new technology received and if it automatically becomes part of the replacement cycle. Esther Frankel said that if done right, this is the way it should happen, budgeting depreciation expenses. There should be replacement funds that have been set aside. The problem has been when units have bought things in other ways, such as one time only funds from grants.

Kim Monda said that there are years when we don’t have any money to fund new items. There are years when we don’t have enough money to fund all the needs that departments have. If P&R and ITC only look at new things where is the place for faculty to contribute to how we do spend the money we don’t have enough of?

Jack Friedlander said that, as an example, if next year we identify $4 million worth of needed items and the College can only come up with some of that? The process now is to go back to departments and ask what can they hold off on and what they can’t. We make our determinations from there. It’s a fair question to ask who ranks the needs from there. He offered to bring this up to the Executive Committee.

Tom Garey asked if it wouldn’t be advisable to have in the templates a coding to identify what a department can’t function without?

Jack Friedlander said that with our new process, by October the equipment items that are routine will go into your budget and not in your spreadsheets. What is non routine will also be taken out of the spreadsheet and into a master inventory.

Ana María Ygualt asked if in the present situation the money is sufficient to acquire all the requests? Jack Friedlander said that we still need to determine one time vs ongoing funds available.

Esther Frankel asked about the plan for rolling our smart classrooms on campus. Why are there smart classrooms on the ITC list? Jack said that there may be redundant requests listed and that we need to check what phase the requests belong to.

Tom Garey wanted to reiterate the importance of one of the points made earlier by Esther Frankel: to budget $200 every year for every $1,000 spent on equipment/computers.
3.0 Action
3.1 Self Study for Accreditation – Draft 5 (Kelly Lake attends)
Ignacio Alarcón reported on his last meeting with Andreea Serban. Andreea wanted to convey her appreciation for the volume of feedback that the Senate has submitted. The Self Study has consistently gotten better, and will be a better document because of the work of so many. Ignacio mentioned several people who had submitted suggestions for corrections and modifications, among others Oscar, Kim, Esther Frankel (nine pages from her alone!), Mimi and Stephanie.

Tom Garey made the recommendation to add to the Self-Study under 1206.3 last paragraph on procedures: “The Academic Senate retains the right to meet with or appear before the Board of Trustees to present its views, recommendations or proposals.” This would close the circle on shared government.

Esther Frankel asked Kelly Lake what he expected the Senate to do in the way of an endorsement if this is still an incomplete document undergoing additional edits.

Tom Garey said that the Senate would be endorsing the work of numerous colleagues of ours who have been involved in this for more than a year. Kelly added that the Academic Senate would be endorsing a work in progress, and the process to get it done.

M/S/C To endorse the Self Study for Accreditation draft (Garey/Nevins)

3.2 Academic Integrity Policy
Jessica Aparicio reported on some of the Student Senate recommendations. Under Definitions 5 and 6: Change “Allowing” to “Permitting.” Under Plagerism: it is the student’s responsibility to cite all sources (replace “know and use standard referencing forms” and use “cite all sources”). Citing sources correctly is part of the student’s education, so incorrect use of a format is not really dishonesty. The point is that the student should cite his/her sources.

Jessica said that the Student Senate was also concerned about a timeline to notify a student about an incident of lack of integrity. Several said that this was intrinsically difficult, since we couldn’t say that the clock starts ticking at the time of the incident, but rather at the time of the discovery of the incident, and this moment was difficult to monitor. The only thing that we could realistically do, is to set some kind of timeline based on the first reporting of the incident.

For next meeting Jessica, Ben and Ignacio will work on the recommended changes, and incorporate all of the feedback from the Senate, Ben Partee’s office, and the Student Senate. Tom Garey requested that the Senate is presented with a clean copy of the policy that we will be acting on. This is, after all, the most important document for future reference. Ignacio offered to provide the Senate with all three items: the first proposal of the Academic Policies Committee, the strike-through document that Ben produced by inserting this
proposal in the old 1995 Academic Honesty policy including all the changes suggested and agreed on by Senate and Student Senate, plus a clean final copy of the policy to be acted on.

3.3 Board Policy 4170 (Program Review Policy)
Tom Garey remarked that in both policies 4170 and 2410, it was important to note how it is made explicit that consultation with the appropriate shared governance groups is expected.
M/S/C To approve BP 4170 (Nevins/Schultz)

3.4 Board Policy 2410 Policy and Administrative Procedure
M/S/C To approve BP 2410 (Nevins/Frankel)

4.0 Hearing/Discussion
4.1 Planning and Resources Committee Recommendation to Form a Subgroup to Examine Process for Ranking New Instructional and Faculty-Led Student Services Programs Requests
Kim Monda reported that P&R would like to have the Senate endorse the idea of a smaller workgroup to work on and be clear about the process by which information will be given to P&R; what would the committee be getting from departments to determine what needs to go where (ITC or P&R) and what the timeline would be. One meeting at the end of the semester and one at the beginning of the semester should be all that is required. Proposed participants in this subgroup would be the P&R chair, and some current department chairs. Suggestions: Geoff Thielst or Don Barthelmess, Esther Frankel, Jason Miner, Judy Meyer, Dean Nevins, someone from Educational Support.

Jack Friedlander noted that a lot of the problems we faced this time around won’t happen again once the new proposed process works the way it was designed. Routine items would become part of the budget, non-routine items would be scheduled for funding.

Esther Frankel and Tom Garey said that the proposal from P&R is a very good one. Everyone seemed in agreement.

4.2 Academic Senate Bylaws Revision Subgroup. This was not addressed.

4.3 Fall Inservice Agenda Recommendation from FPDC
M/S/C Move Inservice Agenda to action (Garey/Frankel)
Armando Arias presented the Fall Inservice Agenda recommendation from the Faculty Professional Development Committee. Ignacio Alarcón mentioned that FPDC had been very receptive to the general feeling of the faculty, that only the morning of Thursday at Inservice should be structured, and that both Thursday afternoon and all of Friday should be left up to the discretion of the departments, just as we did the last Inservice. Marcy Moore asked what if a department wanted to make use of the scheduled workshops. Ignacio said that this would be fine. The point is for departments to have the flexibility of use of this time for the many tasks that they need to complete every beginning of a semester,
but if they felt that a workshop was of value to them, they could choose to do this as well.
Ignacio asked Armando to thank Dixie Budke and FPDC for all their work on this.
M/S/C To approve the Fall 2009 Inservice Agenda (Nevins/Garey)

4.4 Academic Senate Officers 2009-2010 (Vice President, CPC Representatives, BPAP Representatives, Committee on Non-Teaching Compensation, Senate/IA Liaison)
This was not addressed, to be done at the last meeting of the Senate.

4.5 Budget Assumptions (see agenda item 2.7 above)
Oscar Zavala asked about revenue assumption #3, the allowable growth of 0.7%. Is that where we are now? Jack Friedlander explained that the allowable growth is only based on resident students, not nonresidents. With an allowable growth of 0.7%, we will actually expect the minimum guarantee of 1% or about 200 FTES for SBCC.

Oscar Zavala said that the expense assumption #7, workers comp and the corresponding one on the spreadsheet are different. Jack Friedlander said that the 24% increase is an assumption that comes from the Insurance Commissioner’s request, but that the Governor has asked that this is not actually implemented, given the state’s budget problems.

Esther Frankel asked about expense assumption #1. Does this mean they will continue in the tentative budget?

Jack Friedlander said that this is what the tentative budget will reflect as of now, that the reductions are not restored.

Esther Frankel asked about the Professional Development contract. Jack said that we realize the revenue but had not identified the expense.

David Morris said that initially we were warned for the semester about severe cuts to Gateway, and readers and so on, then we were told money was found to maintain those. What are we looking at for next year?

Jack Friedlander said that the tentative budget doesn’t commit to the backfill right now. Many of the reductions are not sustainable. This is what risk # 6 addresses.

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

6.0 Adjourn
(Attachments: Budget Assumptions for Tentative Budget 2009-2010)
SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
09/10 BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS
(Tentative Budget)

GENERAL
1. These are the assumptions used to develop the tentative budget to be taken to the Board for approval in June 2009.
2. The assumptions listed below do not reflect the results of the May 19, 2009 election which may result in a reduction of $4.4 million dollars to the General Fund Allocation from the state if Proposition 1A fails.
3. Ending balances will be reduced by over $6 million due to the deferred payments that are in place. This is not reflected in the ending balances due to the accrual method of accounting; but are shown for illustration purposes.
4. CPC will receive and discuss the estimated tentative budget at the May 5, 2009 meeting.

REVENUE
1. COLA - COLA for State Apportionment is estimated at 0.0%.
2. Deficit factor – The 2008-09 deficit factor of 1.3% is assumed to reoccur in fiscal year 2009-10 as property tax shortfall and state structural deficit continue.
3. FTES – Growth is not budgeted in the tentative budget. Growth revenue will be added as FTES growth materializes and is funded in 2009-10. THE PRELIMINARY ALLOWABLE GROWTH FOR SBCC FOR 2009/10 IS ONLY 0.7%.
4. Enrollment fees – No enrollment fee rate increase is anticipated for 2009-10.
5. Nonresident student fees from international and out-of-state students will increase by $539,100 and $161,600 respectively due to increases in per unit rates. The number of international and out-of-state students is expected to remain at the 2008-09 levels.
6. Interest revenue is conservatively estimated based on declining interest rates and earning cash balances.
7. Lottery revenue is assumed to decline by 5%.

EXPENSE
1. Expenditure reductions of $4.2 million put into effect in 2008-09 will be maintained in the tentative budget.
2. Salaries and wages are budgeted for the year at pay rates that were effective 1-1-08.
3. The budget for salaries and wages are based on expected spending patterns.
4. FULL-TIME FACULTY OBLIGATION – The Fall 2009 full-time tenure-track faculty requirement of 6 additional faculty for Fall 2009 has been waived and deferred to Fall 2010. In addition, there are 3 positions that will need to be added as a result of an error made by the Chancellor’s office in calculating the FTFO for Fall 2008. Also 4 to 5 new faculty positions will need to be added as a result of the 2.24% growth in 2008-09. The 3 faculty combined with Fall 2009 and Fall 2010 obligation will result in 13 or 14 new full time faculty to be hired to start in Fall 2010.
5. The increase for fixed and mandated expenses is based on actual or trends. Fixed and mandated expenses consist of $XXX,XXX in increases in maintenance agreements, utilities, postage, rent etc.
6. Other areas of concern which may result in increases are: School of Culinary Arts, Adult Education classified hourly, Cosmetology, Professional Development contracts, Citizenship Center, GED and adult high school.

7. Workers comp is projected to increase 24%.

TRANSFERS
These are the transfer of funds from the General Fund Ending Balances.

1. Transfer to the Children’s Center Fund is estimated to be $240,000.
2. Transfer to the Construction Fund is estimated to be $640,000 plus the amount of anticipated loan payments to the California Energy Commission for the photovoltaic system loan.
3. Transfer to the Equipment Fund is estimated to be $100,000 to purchase furniture and equipment for the new faculty.

FUND BALANCE

1. Board Operating Contingency = 5%.
2. Other Post Retirement Benefits – The District will be paying for early retiree medical insurance on a pay-as-you-go basis. The cost of medical insurance allowances for early retirees will be budgeted as an operating expense.
3. The liability for banked TLU’s is estimated and reserved for approximately $1 million.
4. Ending balances will be reduced over $6 million due to the deferred state payments that are in place. This is not reflected in the ending balances due to the accrual method of accounting: but are shown for illustration purposes.

RISKS

1. The State will not reach a budget by June 30. A delay in state funding beyond the end of August 2009 may create additional cash flow problems and lost interest income.
2. The property tax shortfall is continuing to grow at a statewide level.
3. Uncertainty at the state level imperils our assumption that the property tax shortfall will be backfilled.
4. There is 0% COLA eliminating any flexibility in meeting our obligations.
5. Rising costs will increase the cost of goods and services.
6. The budget reductions of 2008-09 may not be continued in 2009-10.
7. The Tentative budget does not reflect the results of the May 19 election which may result in a reduction of $4.4 million dollars to the General Fund Allocation from the state.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>2006/07 ACTUAL</th>
<th>2007/08 ACTUAL</th>
<th>2008/09 ASSUMPTION</th>
<th>2009/10 ASSUMPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated Mid-Year Increase-Sch 10</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated Mid-Year Increase-Adjunct</td>
<td>12.14%</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated Mid-Year Increase-Overload</td>
<td>12.14%</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated Mid-Year Increase-Sch 20,29 (CSEA)</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated Mid-Year Increase-Sch 28,30 (MSC)</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRS</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERS</td>
<td>9.124%</td>
<td>9.306%</td>
<td>9.428%</td>
<td>9.428%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Max</td>
<td>$94,200</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Comp Insurance</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Degree</td>
<td>$2,299</td>
<td>$2,522</td>
<td>$2,683</td>
<td>$2,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA - Health &amp; Welfare – Single</td>
<td>$6,054</td>
<td>$6,424</td>
<td>$6,424</td>
<td>$6,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA - Health &amp; Welfare – Family</td>
<td>$15,248</td>
<td>$16,146</td>
<td>$16,146</td>
<td>$16,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA – Health &amp; Welfare - Retiree</td>
<td>$5200</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEA &amp; MSC - Health &amp; Welfare – Single</td>
<td>$5,694</td>
<td>$6,042</td>
<td>$6,042</td>
<td>$6,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEA &amp; MSC- Health &amp; Welfare – 2-Party</td>
<td>$10,042</td>
<td>$10,706</td>
<td>$10,706</td>
<td>$10,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEA &amp; MSC- Health &amp; Welfare – Family</td>
<td>$14,382</td>
<td>$15,229</td>
<td>$15,229</td>
<td>$15,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct TLU ave. rate</td>
<td>$1,238</td>
<td>$1,457</td>
<td>$1,498</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overload TLU ave. rate</td>
<td>$1,416</td>
<td>$1,639</td>
<td>$1,708</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer TLU ave. rate</td>
<td>$1,311</td>
<td>$1,493</td>
<td>$1,636</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>