Academic Senate
MINUTES
February 11, 2009
3:00 - 5:00 p.m. BC214

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, Jan Schultz, Ana María Ygualt, Oscar Zavala
Members Excused:
Guests: Rhys Alvaredo and Hanna Scott (Channels), David Mathers-Winn, Kenley Neufeld, Renee Robinson, Laurie Vasquez

1.0 Call to Order
1.1 Approval of Agenda – so approved
1.2 Approval of Minutes, Dec. 3, 2008 (pg. 2-8)
1.3 Approval of Minutes, January 28, 2009 (pg. 9-11)
M/S/C To approve the Academic Senate meeting Minutes of 12-3-08 and 1-28-09 with minor corrections (Garey/Nevins)

2.0 Information
2.1 Rhys Alvarado is Editor in Chief for The Channels, Spring 2009. Rhys Alvarado the new editor-in-chief at the Channels was introduced. Rhys wanted everyone to know the Channels reporters have been working hard to make sure every story receives coverage and reminded everyone to check out the Channels online. They are making sure the online product is up to date. Rhys would like you to please contact him at channels@sbcc.edu if you have a story of interest, or if you have any comments or suggestions you would like to make.
2.2 Board Policies and Procedures Committee faculty representatives: Susan Broderick, Karolyn Hanna, Ignacio Alarcón will be serving on the college-wide Board Policies and Procedures committee with chair, Dr. Sue Ehrlich.
2.3 Lou Spaventa will step down from chairing Curriculum Advisory Committee at end of spring semester. Search for CAC Chair for 2009-2012 is under way.
2.4 Disciplines List Revisions
Please forward any comments for or against any of the proposals in time for the spring Plenary Session in April, where they will be voted on. Of note for SBCC would be the Political Science, Biotechnology, Humanities, Mathematics, Statistics Instructional Design/Technology. The proposals are for changes for new disciplines or changes in the minimum qualifications.
2.5 Partnership for Student Success Dissemination Plan (Hewlett Award)
Kathy Molloy announced that a half day ‘building student success’ themed conference would be held at SBCC April 24, 2009. Darla Cooper to be the guest speaker. A flyer will be emailed with the details. There have already been a number of responses.
Ms. Molloy also wanted to let everyone know about the math department’s commendable response to the budget cuts that have been made. Several of the full time faculty are spending their office hours in the lab to make up for the student tutors who cannot be there and to keep from cutting the lab hours too much. The department has also completed all the directed learning activities for the courses through Math 100.

2.6 Other - Curtis Bieber will no longer be the fine arts second senator division rep., he had a scheduling conflict.

3.0 Hearing/Discussion
3.1 Discussion of Resource Requests process to start at CPC on February 17. Role of Planning and Resources Committee.
The handout reflects recommendations received from P&R and Andreea. The chair reported that in order for the timeline to work P&R would have to schedule a meeting immediately after the break. The guidelines will go to CPC for review Feb. 17. The senate proceeded to review the timeline.

Esther Frankel: Suggested departments/chairs should be asked to submit a prioritized list.

Comment: The Senate is being involved too early in the process.\nJan Schulz: Suggested equipment repair should be a separate account. How can you prioritize a repair?

EVP: This is the first time that we are doing this and the hope is that over time we may see that. What we are asking for this time is to identify it as routine and essential. Instructional block grants are received and before distribution to the deans I keep a certain percentage for myself for emergencies in an account that can be used over and above supply money. Money that departments don’t have; deans also have money for emergencies. For sunshine, the first time around it has to get ranked and prioritized.

Kathy O’Connor: When we do our ranking, as a division we’ve always done our own ranking. Should we separate out new versus replacement or should we mesh them together?

EVP: Good question. I think right now you’re meshing.

Marcy: Where do computer replacement in priority classrooms fall?

EVP: If it is part of the college’s inventory refreshment it would happen on schedule without request. If a computer was bought with grant or fund 41 money you would put that on a prioritized list.
Tom Garey: It sounds like we are being asked to rejustify what has been our equipment allowance up to this point. With the money that is available we have been allowed so much equipment money, into an established budget, based upon our inventory.

What is the criteria on which we justify the realowance?

EVP: What isn’t clear is our process for setting aside big ticket items; three years, five years; six years. We’re being asked to make decisions in a very short time.

Esther Frankel: How do we communicate to CPC the justification for reprioritizing those funds?

Kim: P&R doesn’t think it would useful to look at requests for such things as 5 new helmets for Marine Tech for n$. We want to make sure that these kinds of requests that we would know nothing about isn’t something that we would have to look at.

EVP: It still needs to be prioritized. I can’t take these things off the list.
Kim: I know we’re in this process of trying to make sure that our planning fits in with budgeting and that’s why we’re trying to figure out how to redesign this process. I think we have been doing a really good job with the program review and decide how to spend money. We just didn’t have it on these fancy templates. You were doing it. You were figuring out what you needed.

Kathy O: When accreditation comes we need to connect the dots. It’s worked for some and not for others. The planning piece can be put into place later. For now this will help accreditation see a collegial process.

Kim: How many years are you planning for? One year or more, how many?

EVP: I don’t have that answer.

Jan: These things should not go outside the department. The departments have the expertise. Not someone outside the department. I understand the need for documentation.

Oscar: With all these requests coming in and with the computer replacements lagging in certain areas, how do you realign that? How can a department make it transparent that those needs are now and not matched by this other source? I’d like to give feedback on the division vs dean ranking. Some divisions have multiple deans.

EVP: We need feedback today on what stays and what doesn’t. This goes out next week.
Tom Garey: We have a system that works!

Esther: We’re trying to replace a bottom up process with a top down system. I don’t think departments go around spending money just to spend money. I think we have a process in place that works I just think it’s not as transparent or documented for accreditation as it needs to be. If there is a way to continue to do what we’re doing and add the level of transparency that was missing, which the resource request forms are now doing, I suggest we continue doing our bottom up planning and budgeting.

Kathy O: Why can’t we split the process? Split the replacements that have already been submitted. What would that dollar amount be? Is it something reasonable that every year you put in your replacement requests and justifications and you have a specified amount of money and if you come up short then that becomes the job of maybe the Senate, P&R, or the deans to decide who can be moved or cycled to the next year.

Replacement items are what we need for ongoing purposes. Separate them and the new requests go through a ranking process.

Tom: why can’t we take the existing program review and make a part of it a reevaluation and a defense of the analysis of your annual equipment allocation? What you’ve done with it, and why it’s where it is and what works, it it’s enough or too much. So you document what you’ve done for the past five years.

Esther: That does link the budget to the planning process and that is what we have to do. It is in the resource requests that we have a connection with planning and budgeting. Planning and budgeting has nothing to do with ranking.

Kim: Would accreditation be happy to see this new system we’ve never used or would they be happier to see how our old way fits with the new way, with transparency?

Tom: If we didn’t have a rollover budget over the last few years our department would have been in a real jam. I have been telling music and theatre for the last four years that we need to conserve equipment money. We have had huge expenditures moving into the temporary facilities and the money would not have been there during this financial situation. We planned for this project.

Dean: Why can’t we use the current process with the revision?

D. Morris: Where did this model come from?

Everyone: Riverside!
EVP: Accreditation has no desire to tell us how to do our process.

Kim: Our working together is also what accreditation wants.

Kenley: What concerns me is fund 41, will it be there?

K. Molloy: Recommended that everyone go to CPC. Those of us that are there try to articulate the issues on your behalf.

EVP: The synopsis that Ignacio and I developed is as an internal process.

3.2 CAC recommends addition of a Continuing Education voting representative. CAC liaison Kathy O’Connor reported the recommendation was approved by the senate last fall to have a Continuing Education non-voting administrator serve on the Curriculum Advisory Committee. All resource members/administrators serve in a non-voting capacity on Senate committees.

Continuing Education preferred to have a faculty member serve on CAC and requested that the Continuing Education division representative also be a voting representative. The Curriculum Advisory Committee voted unanimously to approve the request based on the fact this would be a faculty position.

Ms. O’Connor added that Continuing Education would be part of the curricUNET workflow process and have a representative on the curricUNET steering committee.

Question: Wouldn’t an approval also require a change in the Bylaws?
Yes, the Bylaws would need to be updated.

3.3 Faculty Responsibilities Checklists (Educational Support Adjunct Faculty and Instructional Adjunct Faculty)
The Educational Programs Faculty Responsibilities Checklist (adjunct faculty) states the adjunct faculty to attend department meetings. This is not a required “Responsibilities to Department”
M/S/C To move to Action (Zavala/Muraoka) 1 opposed
M/S/C To remove from the Faculty Responsibilities Checklist (adjunct faculty) under 2.0 Responsibilities to Department section “b. Attends department meetings” (Garey/Zavala)

3.4 Full Time Faculty Obligation proposal
We were not granted a waiver for the full-time faculty obligation mistake the state Chancellor’s Office has made. According to the “Full Time Faculty Positions Not Counted in the FTFO Faculty Obligation” list there are 15.3 positions that could be used to count toward meeting the FTFO obligation. The proposed resolution would be to count two faculty from Cosmetology (Sherry Fair Paz; Deborah Dohy) and three from DSPS (Gerry Lewin; Steve Conti; Henry Reed) toward the
Fall 2008 FTFO calculation mistake. This would fulfill the requirement and maintain the college’s fiscal viability such that we would not need to hire five additional new full time faculty positions.

Another related item: There is a resignation in the PE Department (Jennifer Siegel) effective the end of the Spring 2009 semester. That would be a sixth full time faculty that we would be obligated to hire. PE does not want to fill that position. The proposal to fulfill the Full Time Faculty Obligation would be to count the Health Service position (Susan Broderick). This would solve the problem for one year while maintaining the college’s fiscal viability and fulfilling our FTFO obligation.

The remainder of the proposal is to count cosmetology going forward and in years that we have growth for two or more positions we phase in one of those four extra from DSPS and Health Services. We would get at least one growth position apart from the positions that are being phased in. For example just for next year our count would be the six new positions that were initially waived, plus the two from cosmetology and three more from the five that would have been obligated without any growth.

M/S/C To move the FTFO proposal to Action (O’Connor/Molloy) 1 abstention
M/S/C To adopt the proposal (Garey/Bell) 1 abstention 2 opposed

3.5 Online Student Survey alternative for faculty evaluations.
Kenley has volunteered to find/research for an online alternative.
There was concern that ESL and English Skills students would not be as adept and that both options should be used.

There was concern about the response rate.

EVP reported that we were not ready for Spring and would be going forward using a survey money type program beginning Fall 2009. He asked for volunteers from across disciplines to volunteer.

4.0 Action
4.1 Servicemembers Opportunity College Proposal (pg. 27-29)
M/S/C to approve the Service Members Opportunity College Proposal (O’Connor/Schultz)

5.0 Reports
5.1 President’s Report
5.2 Liaison Reports
5.3 EVP Report

6.0 Adjourn