1.0 Call to Order
1.1 Approval of Agenda – so approved
1.2 Approval of Minutes, June 15, 2009, with addendum
M/S/C To approve the meeting minutes of June 15, 2009 (Carroll/Nevins) 3 abstentions

2.0 Information
2.1 Forms in Evaluation Packets (approved June 15, 2009)
The attached forms are the updated forms from recommendations made at the last senate meeting and
are effective in the fall semester cycle for evaluations.

2.2 Senate Retreat Wednesday August 19, 8:30 am – 3:00 pm
Ignacio reminded everyone about the Senate retreat that will be held at St. Mary’s Retreat Center on the
Wednesday before Inservice.

2.3 Rubric for Faculty Evaluation (School of Modern Languages)
Ana María Ygualt reported that the School of Modern Languages would be evaluating all teaching
faculty in their Division every semester. Attached to the agenda is the rubric they will be using for their
full and part time faculty evaluations. The attached rubric identifies the criterion and the three levels to
be identified by a minus, check, plus; this would save writing time and reduce omissions.

Kathy O’Connor asked if the School of Modern Languages had taken this to the Academic Policies
committee. If your faculty did not like this evaluation cycle/process that the SOML proposes, they
would have just cause to propose following the college policy instead. Kathy added that having the
required full-time faculty be part of the evaluation committees, with the outside faculty requirement, the
observations plus the meetings before and after observations will mean a lot of work.

It was explained that the policy establishes that departments can tailor the evaluations to their own
needs. Any evaluation procedures will need to include the information that is found on the approved
faculty responsibilities checklists.

Ana Maria said that in reading the policy, the School of Modern Languages is considering the described
procedure as the college minimum and using the provision that each department may increase their
requirements, including creating a tool for their evaluations. The formal faculty evaluation will take
place as the policy requires. These would be more informal evaluations to allow important feedback to
be given primarily to newer faculty.
Marilynn Spaventa expressed that in her discussion with the department when developing this, she understood that the intention would be to give more consistent and more complete feedback particularly with new faculty. The proposed rubric is much more specific to their discipline than the general college evaluation form.

Oscar Zavala asked what other departments have developed. It should somehow be acknowledged if they have additional requirements and maybe other departments could benefit from their work. Ignacio said that, to his knowledge, the School of Modern Languages was the first department to do this.

Jack Friedlander said that he thought that the matrix should be a real timesaver and assure that essential points are considered, avoiding what happens now, that evaluators do individual narratives of their observations. This would be a standard way of collecting information, that assures that the observer addresses the major aspects that the department considers important to evaluate.

It was recommended that the School of Modern Languages shares this with the Academic Policies Committee, so the committee is aware of what they will be doing, and possibly share with other departments which could be interested in a similar procedure.

2.4 Partnership for Student Success Status
Kathy Molloy reported the Partnership is in a different place now than they were since the last report. Everything is still up in the air on what the funding cuts will be. The latest information from the Chancellor’s Office is that there may be a 13% cut; better than the 30-60% previously reported. A letter will be going out this week to faculty of Gateway classes, to find out their most basic needs and describing next steps.

Jack Friedlander said that he thought it would be advisable to wait to send this later until we know what the budget is. We will need find out what money is available for support from the general fund and from the Foundation to support Gateway tutors, depending on discussions with Dr. Serban.

Alice Scharper said that the letter is much more general and does not mention any specific dollar amount. It is an informational letter stating that cuts are coming and would they consider x, y, z and be in communication with us.

2.5 Academic Senate Bylaws Revision Status
Ignacio reported that he and Kathy Molly and Kenley Neufeld have been working on some revisions/additions to the SBCC Academic Senate Bylaws. A summary will be prepared and the strikeout version in electronic format will be made available for everyone to review before it is brought back to the Senate for review.

3.0 Action
3.1 Board Policy BP 4560 (Faculty Professional Development) and Administrative Procedures AP 4560 (pg. 21–22)
As with other policies, the goal is to separate the Faculty Professional Development Policy from the Procedures. This has been reviewed and approved by the Faculty Professional Development committee.
It was recommended to add “professional development” before “scheduled activities”.
Gary Carroll mentioned that the word “sanctioned” is not the best here, and asked about changing “must” language to “shall” on agenda page 23.

Jack Friedlander said that the policy needs to follow the Ed Code requiring the college to have 175 days of scheduled instruction. Inservice days, like flex hours, are the allowed substitute of a certain amount of days of instruction by some special development for instructors. We do not have the authority to reduce the number of scheduled instruction days because we would not be fulfilling our requirement and we would be in violation and our funding would be cut. We used to not count Inservice days. They were over and above our required number of instruction days or “contract days”. That has changed.

Oscar Zavala asked if there is any flexibility for the Counseling department?

Jack Friedlander said that this was a good point. For Counseling, the Inservice days are some of their busiest times. The Educational Support faculty do have a different set of expectations. It might be a good time to reflect that in the Professional Development Policy and procedures.

It was suggested that the word “mandatory” is changed to “scheduled” (special language would need to be written for this change). It was recommended to talk to Keith McLellan or Dixie Budke to reword/add language for the Educational Support faculty and their flex days obligation.

M/S/C To approve with the policy as amended (Molloy/Carroll)

4.0 Hearing/Discussion

4.1 Adjunct Faculty Reappointment Procedure and Amendment (pg. 23–26)
Lynne Stark reported that the Instructors’ Association has worked with department chairs and the Executive Vice President to update the reassignment policy. Please read pages 24 and 25 of the agenda and pass it on to your department chairs.

Lynne said that there are no major changes in the rehire policy itself. What I’d like you to take away from this meeting is the amendment that appears on the final page of your agenda attachment. When we compiled this reassignment policy we looked at state wide policies and tried to come up with an entry level policy that was fair but it was targeted towards normal times and a normal budget. We find ourselves in this situation that developed very rapidly and one for which the current rehire policy doesn’t really provide fair guidelines. What we did is to recommend departments how to handle a year such as this budget year with the proposed cuts. Currently there is an approximately 5% reduction in course offerings being considered. This will possibly be 200 sections. These reductions are not going to be even across campus. Certain basic skills classes will be preserved and core classes for the majors. The end result is that we may end up with certain departments with a very large number of sections being cut. We wanted to encourage departments to consider saving preserving/saving the jobs of their senior adjuncts. What the amendment does is a modified approach. The rehire policy itself gives seniority for the assignment of any section to most senior adjuncts. What we have said here addresses the event, as could well happen this year, that there are departments where the number of sections to be cut exceeds the number of non senior adjuncts you have. An adjunct doesn’t achieve seniority until they have been through three years/six semesters of evaluation. These will be the adjuncts most at risk - those adjuncts still at the probationary phase of 1, 2 and 3 years. Some departments may have a number of sections to
be cut that exceeds the number of adjuncts without any seniority. You could follow strictly the policy we have and give your most senior adjuncts a full load and work your way down. This could mean that an adjunct who has been here 15 years could get a full load and another adjunct who has been here 12 years could get nothing. We wanted to encourage departments to “spread the pain.” The recommendation is that if the number of classes have to cut after they have laid off non senior adjuncts, then begin extra cuts with the least senior adjunct taking one class away, and proceed up until the most senior adjunct. That would be from the least senior to the most senior removing one class at a time hoping that a load for everyone can be preserved. If this still does not fulfill the required cuts, come back to the least senior to continue removing classes one at a time. There are probably very few departments where this will be this critical, but, we’re recommending that you try and preserve jobs even if it means spreading the load around among your senior adjuncts.

Esther Frankel asked if this overrides a departmental policy on adjunct rehires. Lynne said that this is a recommendation. Many departments do not have reappointment procedures. Most procedures follow the approach of our default policy. This year we are trying to create a little more flexibility.

Esther said that she had two observations on this, coming from a department that does not hire “freeway flyers.” She said that this recommendation seems to be based on the freeway flyer model. Two things are left out: 1) Schedule ability issue; I might offer another section to a senior faculty member and that person may not be able to teach at that time or that day. 2) Subject matter is a critical issue; we don’t have a lot of sections and in some cases we have had adjuncts come back, saying I’m more senior teaching this subject matter that this other person who has more seniority.

Lynne responded that every department is different and that is exactly why we chose to make it a recommendation. We wanted to convey the fact that we are encouraging you to take approaches within your various departments that take into account the concept of preserving jobs as well as strict seniority and whatever your written policy is as well as your individual department requirements.

Marcy Moore said that in order for adjuncts to qualify for health insurance a certain load needs to be maintained. One fewer class per semester would jeopardize my ability to qualify for health insurance.

Kim Monda said that we need to be aware that we cannot make a generic process that is totally fair. For the purpose of this discussion, someone might want to change it because of health insurance; then that would change it. If you teach a full load for adjunct, which is 10 TLUs and you loose all your classes; which would be better; to have one class or unemployment?

Gary Carroll said that it may happen that a person can decline the offer of only one class.

Jack Friedlander said that his plan for the fall is to work with the chairs to identify low enrolled courses and cancel them sooner than later to give students a chance to find something else. We need classroom space because we are adding sections of impacted courses in basic skills and core courses in majors. We will develop a contingency list of classes that we could cut if in fact the state budget calls for, in their language, “reducing our workload.” We won’t know until we see it. Jack said that by next week he would be making a plan with Andreea keep our costs down. What is assured is the priority courses that the Senate reviewed a while back: basic skills courses, and core offerings for majors.
4.2 Sabbatical Leave Committee 2009-2010 Status
The situation: Sabbatical leaves have been suspended. Should the Sabbatical Leave committee also be temporarily suspended? Darin Garard reported there are still Sabbatical Reports to evaluate, one in the fall and six in the spring. The question before the Senate is how should the committee proceed? Tom Garey suggested that the committee could explore and develop self-funded sabbaticals. Some schools allow faculty to take authorized leaves funded out of banked TLUs. It would allow the continuation of the Sabbatical Leave program and reduce the banked TLU liability that hangs on the tail end of the budget. Lou Spaventa suggested that the committee could research schools across the country to see what other community college practices are. Dean Nevins mentioned that another possibility to be explored by the committee is the funding of sabbaticals through grants. The Sabbatical Leave Committee’s charge for the fall semester shall be to explore options/alternatives to funding sabbaticals and write a recommendation.

4.3 Budget 2009 – 2010
4.3.1 Criteria for Cutting Sections under likely Workload Reduction (at least 4%)
4.3.2 Possible Actions by Faculty
(a) Larger Class Size
(b) Supplement Tutorial Labs
(c) Other
Ignacio reported that he and Jack Friedlander reviewed the Fall 2008 class enrollment for possible savings of sections offered. They looked at the maximum enrollment cap for courses and how many seats were taken at census, many classes that were full at the start of the semester actually lost enrollment by the time the census data was taken. They looked at the possibility of raising the enrollment limit by three students per section. The research concentrated on multiple offerings of sections, for example all degree applicable 100 courses. The increased enrollment cap would be implemented in the absence of waiting lists, and would really help in our situation, not only to save money, but to give access to students. Increasing class size is an instructor’s decision. How this would actually work best was discussed: 1) Handing out authorization codes 2) Contact Scheduling Office and increase your class size accordingly.

Jack Friedlander said that any ideas for what we can do that would save money so we do not have to fully decimate the infrastructure to students and the college would be helpful. We do not know what the future holds with the possibility of additional cuts from the state. The increased enrollment fee and how it is going to be implemented was discussed. Jack reported that the procedure used the last time this occurred worked very well. Students enrolled in the fall would not be able to enroll in Spring classes if they did not pay what they owed. Transcripts would not be sent out until money owed was paid.

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

6.0 Adjourn