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, Kathy O’Connor, Jan Schultz, Ana María Ygualt, Oscar Zavala
Members Excused: Mimi Muraoka, Dean Nevins
Guests: Priscilla Butler, Kenley Neufeld, Ben Partee, Alice Scharper, Hanna Scott (the Channels), Laurie Vasquez

1.0 Call to Order
1.1 Approval of Agenda – so approved
1.2 Approval of Minutes 2-25-2009
   M/S/C To approve the meeting Minutes of February 25, 2009 (Monda/Frankel) 1 abstention
1.3 Approval of Minutes 3-11-2009
   M/S/C To approve the meeting Minutes of March 11, 2009 (Garey/Frankel) Unanimous

2.0 Information
2.1 Joint Meeting CPC/Senate/Classified Consultation Group/Management/
    Instructors’ Association Notes
2.2 Remainder of Spring Semester Meetings
   April 15: Instructional Programs and Faculty-Led Educational Support
   Programs Requests 2009-2010
   Draft V also needs to be discussed
   April 29: Accreditation Self-Study
   Hopefully endorse the Self-Study
   May 13: Final Meeting Spring Semester
   The meeting will be held at Jack and Marci Friedlander’s
    (May 15 End of Year Faculty Party @ Kathy O’Connor’s)
   July 15: Summer Meeting (3:00 – 5:00 pm)
2.3 Reminder: April 30 is the date of Karolyn Hanna’s Faculty Lecture
    The title: Legacy of Our Past and Challenges of the Future: Nursing Education in Santa Barbara.
2.4 Faculty Lecturer 2009-2010 Selection Process
    Don Barthelmess has sent out the nomination forms; the deadline for nominations, April 24.
2.5 LAO Report on $8 B additional shortfall for state. This would represent about
    $1.2 M less for SBCC (1.47% of System’s anticipated $80 M reduction)
    The Legislative Analysts Office reported this information.
2.6 Funding for Resource Requests Available for 2009-2010 Block Grants:
   (a) ~ $168 K Facilities
   (b) ~ $168 K Equipment
   (c) ~ $129 K PG&E Lawsuit Settlement
    These are one time only funds.
2.7 Academic Senate Vice President 2009-2010. Call for nominations.
    Susan Broderick’s term as Senator ends at end of spring. Senate will need to elect
    Vice President, and approve appointment of two CPC representatives for 2009-2010
    Kenley Neufeld will be replacing Susan on the Senate and he has expressed interest in serving
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as Vice president. The appointed CPC representatives would also need to be approved.
Questions: Is this a call for nominations? Yes. What are some of the duties of the VP? The VP
is a Senate and Steering member; voting member at CPC; and would preside over Senate
meetings if/when the President cannot; and other duties as assigned. This information can be
found in the Senate Constitution and Bylaws.
2.8 Update on CAC Chair Search
Randy Bublitz, the finalist, will be officially endorsed sometime during and before the end of
the Spring 2009 semester.
2.9 'Moonchildren' Playing through March 26 in the Interim Theatre
Ms. Broderick reported the play was a lot of fun!
2.10 City of Santa Barbara’s 3rd Poet Laureate is SBCC Professor David Starkey. David will
be Poet Laureate for the next two years and the official induction ceremony, in coordination with
“Poetry Month” will be held April 7.
2.11 Systems Office/Chancellor’s office name change
Again, the name is being changed for the State office; it to be called the Chancellor’s office.
2.12 Facilities Committee meeting
The information is that SoMA may be delayed and the project may not be starting construction
January 2010 as planned. The state construction bond priorities are levees and road work.
2.13 Timeline for feedback of the Self Study Draft 4 and 5
Draft 4 is available and Diane Rodriguez-Kino would like feedback as soon as possible. Draft 5
will be available April 13 in time for some discussion at the April 15 Senate. Between April15-27
there will some editing with track-changes and then brought to the Senate April 29.
Request: Invite Kelly Lake to the April 29 meeting.
Suggestion: Have chairs from each standard submit a summary of highlights for the proposed plans.
2.14 All faculty, full and part time, at SBCC have approved a contract membership with the Faculty
Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC).

3.0 Hearing/Discussion
3.1 Academic Senate Committees Bylaws (Subgroup to Review and Propose Updates)
3.2 Proposal for Revision of Student Unit Load Limitations

4.0 Action
4.1 Process for Analyzing and Ranking Resource Requests Identified in Program
Reviews in Instructional Programs and Faculty-led Educational Support Programs.
Motion Regarding Fund 41
TG: The “Resolution” is not a huge change from President Serban’s proposal, except department’s
would retain the block granting rollover capacity for equipment funding. It provides for and
recommends that the equipment funding be put in the Program Review for anticipated needs and the
actual application of the block grant funding; that the Senate along with the EVP work out the
process for determining the size of the block grants to each dean’s area and then within there to the
Divisions/departments; and that a certain amount be reserved for discretionary use by the EVP and
deans so there is emergency money available. That there still be institutional ranking, as Dr. Serban
proposes, for large ticket items outside the scope of what the block grants would cover.

For routine needs this would allow departments, in conjunction with their dean, to have some
discretion to plan and to anticipate planning down the road that seems to have worked successfully
for many years.
I.A. When you say “block grants” you’re not referring to State block grants.

TG: Institutional block grants and how it’s distributed within Educational Programs. We’re not telling anyone else how to distribute their funds.

EVP: Funds allocated for non-technology equipment and it comes from all different sources. We call it equipment replacement dollars (non-technology).

Replace: block grant with non-technology equipment funding allocation process

EVP: For clarification – after discussion with Andreea Serban here is what we’re proposing: In fall 2009 each department will identify what they need (we are calling routine). Every year we estimate that we have these expenses to take care of our equipment needs. Then in October of that year here is what’s non-routine, meaning it’s a major item that you don’t need to expense every year. That we pick up the sum total of all routine requests, so CPC would know as a college the needs in Educational Programs, and other areas would be doing the same. Example: Educational Programs needs $2m per year for routine. We look at how much money is available from the various funding sources: state block grants, year end balances, wherever the funds are coming from to pay for these. The intent is to put that into the departments as much as we can in their budgets so you wouldn’t have to go through this process. This would be the money you have to take care of your routine items. For non routine items you would know that for 2013-14 institutional wide; we need to identify what money is available to pay for the large ticket items for that year. We need to take that into account. So, how much gets into department budgets depending on how much money we have in the budgets to fund for routine. The change – what is being proposed – the new way of handling equipment funds funding through program review is that in your routine allocation if you don’t spend it all at the end of the year you have the capacity to carry that money over because you can’t predict with any kind of preciseness from one ear to the next. Some years you might need less, or you might know next year you’ll need more for non routine. That allows you to put over the carry over fund into your routine and some flexibility in your planning.

What I’ll be doing in my role is, I’ve always held back money, and I’ll continue to do that, for contingencies because some years the emergencies are greater than others. I talked to Andreea this morning and it meets half way what everybody is asking for. It also allows us to do the planning and it’s in your budget so you don’t have to go through this process of having to ‘make a case’ for some non routine items.

TG: Most of what Jack said is pretty consistent with our recommendations in the proposal.

EVP: Based on the outcome of this discussion, what I propose with my working with Andreea, we would come back to modify our existing processes that we’ve done to reflect the carry over capability and that would come back to the Senate. What we would/would not be endorsing is the process for how those funds are allocated including the carryover, as opposed to having a separate Resolution.

TG: The Resolution is the recommendation to do that. This is the way we do business.

Jan: Jack, what you’re saying somewhat addresses it. Routine has been defined as things that are replaced on a yearly basis. One thing I still think is not being addressed and what I was hoping the Resolution would address is the sort of non routine; that sort of sounds like a bigger version of supplies. Extraordinary things that could not possibly be done with regular or Fund 41 would go
through ranking. My concern is there is this middle category of instructional equipment that is not
going to be replaced on a yearly basis but has been successfully taken care of by Fund 41 planning at
the department level for a long time and can be accounted for and tracked and linked through
program review so the transparency is there, that fund those dollars, and I specifically asked Andreea
about this. Saying, if you have telescopes that are going to be replaced on a regular basis for
instructional needs every ten years, in the past because it was based on inventory, we set aside that
money. I asked if that money was going to be set aside and she said it will be ranked and then it will

What we would like is to have some control over these kinds of expenditures. I consider them
extremely routine to me. They are not extraordinary things where I would say this is way beyond our
regular Fund 41 things. For a lot of the sciences 90% of what we are talking about is not going to be
stuff replaced on a yearly basis.

EVP: I can address that and here is my understanding and I verified it with Andreea today. Here is
the process: by knowing what is non routine we have all the money that is available to us in getting
your equipment. If say these items, microscopes, in 2014-15 we know you have to have them so
when we look at our overall money that’s available that comes off the top. They can get ranked,
these are the items that need to be taken care of in 2014-15, so we budget for it in our planning and
budgeting for that. You are not out begging CPC for it.

Now here’s a situation that could happen, let’s say computer technology. This is a horrible budget
year for whatever reason, and I wish I were giving a hypothetical. What we did is: which of these
items could we possibly delay for a year knowing we will pay for them next year. That would be the
discussion at CPC with the department, not whether you should have them or not. Whenever we
don’t have enough money to fund these things, and if we now know we have to come up with 14 or
15 microscopes if we can’t pay for them all, which ones could possibly wait? You won’t have to go
through having to go to CPC and make a case for your items. This is why we are trying to establish
an inventory where we know that every year we have to replace high ticket items. And that comes
off the top of the budget in terms of the allocations. We know that you can’t function without
microscopes. We’ll know in advance. The difference now is department’s won’t have to squirrel
away that money.

Jan: The same type of flexibility happens at the Division level all the time. Someone has something
coming up and something lasts longer and another has a desperation and Marilyn works it out at the
Division level and makes the necessary adjustments.

EVP: One more time: also in talking with Andrea, about this brand new process and I personally
think it makes sense to me, but that’s fine. In Sprng 2012, which gives us a year and a half, we do an
evaluation: is it working or not and what are the problems. It’s a new process and with every
process, you learn as you doing. It should work as well as it does now and if it’s not there will be an
opportunity to do an assessment.

Kim: I wanted to share a little of what P&R discussed on this and a couple of comments of what I
wanted to say about this having watched the process for a long time. P&R had a larger discussion
about the larger context of this Resolution and concern that there is a bit of a communication
problem with our President in terms of faculty having a sense of what they think might work;
Andreea having a vision based on her expertise with accreditation; and her very sincere effort to
make sure our process is as good as possible; and as a new President asking us: try this with me for a year or two and then we can reassess.

There is a little bit of a trend that people are noticing that well, our new President isn’t responsive enough and shared governance isn’t getting enough attention, etc, etc, and this is a larger part of that larger locking of the horns, and there has even been talk amongst some that if it doesn’t work out I’ll bring this up at accreditation; which is crazy because this is about helping our institution’s health and we need to bring these problems up now, as we are now. P&R decided as a committee that Fund 41, we don’t know but we wanted to get on the table because we were concerned about this other locking of horns becoming a problem with accreditation. That’s something I hope we can figure out what to do with at some point.

As a person that doesn’t have these funds I’m still trying to understand the process. The crux of the matter just happened with Jan and Jack about the issue of replacement items that go one over time. It might be more logical to a lot of departments to get a little piece of that money each year that they’ve squirreled away rather than having to deal with it at the CPC level. That’s a legitimate philosophical question. For someone who has read a little of the Standards I think it’s debatable and would be glad to talk to Andreea about whether her system addresses accreditation better than this one does. What I’m hoping and what my vision is our planning has already been meeting the Standards we just haven’t had it sunshined enough. It’s a debatable budget issue. One thing that attracts me about trying to continue this idea of allowing the more long term replacement items to be budgeted yearly and carried over, by keeping that at a local level is I believe it is still coordinated in Institutional Planning and the Institution knows about those expenses and when they are coming and it allows a lot more efficiency and a lot more autonomy on the department level. I like that idea because many faculty like it, those faculty who work with Fund 41 like that method. I also like it because Planning and Research just tried to look at this 28 page document of different requests and it was impossible.

EVP: The items P&R was looking at are new funds. Not routine and being requested for next year. Items paid for by carryover funds or lottery were not in that document.

Kim: That document included some replacement requests.

KO: It did if they didn’t have Fund 41 money to pay for it. It was a combination document. It’s more complicated this year because it is a mesh of new and replacement.

Jan: We were told to put everything we needed because the process wasn’t quite clear. If we wanted Fund 41 money it better be in there.

EVP: We extracted carryover funds and lottery. What was different this year we received no augmentation.

Kathy O: I’m glad Kim got the elephant on the table. It’s time we have a deeper conversation. I don’t think this Resolution was with good intent and concern but it actually makes it more complicated than it used to be. I think because the Resolution includes all equipment money, I don’t think that’s fair to the other groups on campus.
Handout – some of this relates to a bigger discussion. It is an excerpt from the faculty role in planning and budgeting approved by the state Academic Senate; which actually is the model that Andreea has used in trying to bring a change to how budget and planning is done on this campus. It is an excellent document. I’ve brought it to the Senate before and to P&R but at the time we weren’t trying to revamp how we do business. It would be valuable for P&R to read. There is a solution to P&Rs dilemma and that solution was created at ITC over ten years ago. ITC has had a very collegial and shared governance budget and planning process that has never created a problem at the Senate. It’s been done by faculty, approved by CPC and when there was money things were funded.

I’m talking about what P&R has to deal with is new stuff. In the budget process that’s been recommended and with Jack’s clarification’s and conversations with Andreea which I think we really need to appreciate this ability for Jack and Andreea to work these things out, I think with that clarification P&R really only has to deal with new stuff and I think this routine needs a larger eye, my department has had to hoard money to buy things. Personally I don’t like that. I’ve used it and used it effectively but looking at the statewide recommendations of how planning and budgeting should be done in an optimum way from the bottom up. The new process is close with a few tweeks that we’re talking about today; some carryovers and contingencies that Jack will have.

I don’t want to be saving pennies.

Kim: Even if there has been a budget cut and no money?

KO: If there’s no money there’s not going to be any money anyway.

Kim: Not if they’ve been on the old process and saving for years.

KO: If they’ve been saving for years they should have $#@^$## bought it by now! We need to try to trust how we’re going to work this out. You are not going to be without your necessary equipment. Even in tough budget times we’re going to have a chance.

TG: “We need to find the model that works for SBCC; again nobody tells us how to do stuff. It’s about what works here.” a quote from Andreea two weeks ago.

ITC works for big new stuff – I think for individual item computers it doesn’t work at all. Most departments that have individual computer needs can’t take the time to go through ITC. Timeliness becomes part of the issue. What the current process has allowed us is flexibility. What is being proposed is to put the money in a process that involves the Academic Senate (the proposal does not dictate the process), it should include some principles, it should include grants to departments, to deans and VP and transparency and included in the program reviews so all department’s can see what it is. It provides for exactly what Andreea has proposed; departments can request allocations of money either on an ongoing routine basis or for one time items. The departments that don’t get it now can apply for it. The money that department’s carryover is a reserve. It shows up in the equipment fund balances, it’s just rolled over. It becomes part of the percentage reserves at the end of the year, and during our last budget crisis, equipment monies were taken back to be used to balance out the budget and later restored. The process has worked and is not a great deviation of what’s being proposed. Our business is based on enrollment; it varies from year to year and departments need immediate flexibility.

AA: The Technology Division thanks the Senate for discussing this issue.
The general consensus from the Senate: Central Planning is not the answer; a little local control is a good thing.

David: I think understood the difference between the Resolution and the system that Andreea presented to us when we were last together. I’m not sure I understand the difference between the Resolution and revised system that Jack and Andreea have put together. I would either like to hear perspectives if there is differing perspectives on how those differ, or someone else, who can say, okay new revised system coming from the President, Resolution system as proposed with the document in front of us.

Kim: The difference seems to be the routine replacements needed every few years and how departments can, under the current system, save for these items by carrying over a small percentage of their budget, to save for these routine items over a number of years rather than going through the CPC request and ranking procedure.

Jack and Ignacio plan to work on bringing a clear comparison of the differences in the proposals/methods to the next meeting.

M/S/C To approve the Resolution Fund 41 (Garey/Bell) 11 yea; 1 opposed; 3 abstentions

4.2 Academic Integrity Policy proposal from Academic Policies Committee
Ben Partee wanted to thank AP for the outstanding work they did.
Dean Partee explained: What you have here (the agenda attachment) is, AP extracted the attachment from the college catalog not from the actual Board approved Academic Honesty Policy. My office embedded what AP recommended into the actual policy (the handout). The recommendation being proposed brings the Student Standards of Conduct into the conversation because I believe some of the changes already exist here.

Esther Frankel: What you are saying is we have an overlap.

Kathy Molloy: There have been no official Senate or Board approvals to the Academic Honesty Policy since 1995. Revisions have been done. Some of the changes made have been for the better; they just haven’t gone through the proper consultation and approval processes.

Ben Partee: This is really timely with some of the other Ed Policies changes that have occurred. What I would like to do is work with Kathy Molloy and get the right version. Take the current policy and put the AP recommendations into the 1995 version of the policy and bring it back to the Senate along with the Student Standards of Conduct.

Recommendations:
- The ‘Fraud’ part should be removed from Section I and the following (17, 18, 19, 20) and line 31. This is addressed in Section J of the Student Standards of Conduct.
- Have Student Senate review.
- Once completed work with Student Senate and the Channels and faculty on how to get the information out.
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