1.0 Call to Order
   1.1 Approval of Minutes
      A) April 20, 2005 (pgs 2-3)
      B) April 13, 2005 (pgs 4-7)
   1.2 Approval of Agenda

2.0 Hearing/Discussion
   2.1 Student Success Initiative – Kathy Molloy
   2.2 Faculty Job Description (pgs 8-10)
   2.3 CPP – review of our earlier work, 4-20-05
   2.4 Bond Measure Proposal – status

3.0 Action
   3.1 ITC Recommendation: to support DTC workgroup recommendation on
      Technology Replacement (pgs 11-12)

4.0 Reports
   4.1 President’s Report
      A) Grievance Policy Status
      B) Recommendation on Student Sustainability Project
   4.2 EVP Report
   4.3 Committee Liaison Report
      A) Parking subcommittee – Tom Mahoney

5.0 Adjourn
Call to Order
   Approval of Agenda – so approved

Hearing/Discussion
   CPP – Consultative Planning Process

   Background: The Consultative Planning Process came about as a way of reducing expenditures. During in-service every department responded and suggestions for budget cutting were incorporated into the CPP document.

   At Issue: Have our faculty colleagues had sufficient opportunity to have input and/or respond to this? The process of how to get feedback from our colleagues needs to be discussed.

   Concern: Some items in the document were the result of a brainstorming session by Executive Council and Deans where any and all suggestions were welcome and where no adequate discussion or consultation has taken place within the Division and/or departments involved.

   Suggestion: Label the report as a “Brainstorming Session” and/or identify the source of the suggestions/recommendations.

   Recommendation: Promote creative department discussions on how to generate income.

   Senators reviewed/discussed and commented on all items sequentially.

   A compilation of the comments/concerns/recommendations and directives shall be distributed before the next meeting.

   Bond Measure Proposal
      not discussed

   Faculty Job Description
      not discussed
Institutional Effectiveness Annual Report 2003-2004
The report was distributed to Senators and should be placed on a subsequent agenda for further discussion. The origin of the statistics contained in the report and how they were derived was of concern.

Email -
An email was received and read from the Academic Senate President of Pasadena. Kathryn Dabelow states, “without following shared governance procedures, our administration recently imposed a blocking of Internet sites dealing with what administration deemed inappropriate materials. Faculty members were told that many colleges were instituting such blockages although no evidence can be found. If your college administration has suggested or implemented such blockage please contact me with the particulars. The blockage is an actual blockage of Internet sites and not a spam filter/blockage for email. After the local Senate opposed the blockage as a violation of academic freedom the compromise now allows a blockage to be overridden for an hour at a time. Then a warning screen follows with not only a link to the college’s “privacy policy, security and personal use of electronic resources” it also indicates “site usage is monitored.”

Action – an Urgent and Unprecedented request
Art Albanese retirement
His retirement announcement was not made in time to be included in the replacement phase of faculty replacements.

The dean, EVP and department chair agree that the pool of candidates is excellent and therefore are requesting an unprecedented exception from the Academic Senate process for the current cycle to allow for the additional hiring from the current pool. There would be savings in time and money by not initiating the entire search process again.
Rationale: This is a position replacement – there are no changes planned within the department and all applicants apply from the same job description.

M/S/C To suspend the rules and move the one-time hiring relief request to action (O’Connor/Chesher)

M/S/C To approve as a one-time only arrangement the request to hire an additional English instructor out of the existing pool. (O’Connor/Moreno)

Adjourn
Members Present: Blake Barron, Barbara Bell, Susan Broderick, Jim Chesher, Esther Frankel, Jack Friedlander, Tom Garey, Peter Haslund (Chair), Mary Lawson, Tom Mahoney, Petra Malinova, Kathy Molloy, Marcy Moore, Elida Moreno, Kathy O’Connor, Peter Rojas, Sheri Shields
Members Absent: Kim Monda, Jan Schultz, Laura Welby
Guests: Charles Grogg, Jenny King-The Channels, John Romo, Art Olguin, Leif Skogberg, Laurie Vasquez

Call to Order
Approval of Minutes – March 23, 2005
M/S/C To approve the Minutes of the Academic Senate, 3-23-05 (Garey/Chesher)

Approval of Agenda – so approved

Information
Proposed Bond Measure – John Romo
This is a follow up from the last Senate meeting where President Romo announced the possibility of going forward with a Bond campaign. He reiterated that the Executive Council and College Planning Council have started brainstorming about what might be considered. The broad categories/areas under consideration are:

East Campus
- SOMA – everything related to the School of Media Arts
- SCAHM (School of Culinary Arts and Hotel Management) – possible expansion once Journalism vacates to SOMA bldg.
- International Education Center – creating a Global Studies center
- La Playa Stadium
  - Press box
  - Stadium improvements
    - Pershing Park baseball facility
    - Humanities Building
    - Physical Science Building
- West Campus expansion and upgrading
  - Classrooms, LRC/Library
  - Drama/Music infrastructure and improvements
  - Garvin Theatre infrastructure
- Wake and Schott Center – replacement/renovation of substandard facilities
- Kinko’s Learning Center
- Equipment – substantial consideration should be give to this area
- Student Success Program

The next step: At a special study session on 5/21 the BOT will determine if the Bond measure is something they would want to consider. The decision will depend partly on the extent to which faculty, staff, and administration are supportive of such a measure.
A quick survey will be conducted. The results will be presented to the BOT at the 5/21/05 session where the question of another bond initiative will be settled.

President Romo requested the Senate to set aside some time on the agenda for a focus group discussion about the proposed bond initiative. The results of the discussion will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the special 5/21/05 study session.

Announcement: Kim Monda, English department senator, has given birth to her son Leo.

Kathy Molloy and Kathy O’Connor attended the State Academic Senate Spring Plenary Session, held April 7 through April 9, in San Francisco. The resolution requiring college level English composition and intermediate algebra as the math minimum for an Associate Degree carried. For the resolution to go into effect, a Title V language change would be required by the state legislature. A written report on the Spring Plenary Session will be available for the next meeting.

President Haslund announced that he presided over the annual meeting of The Western Collegiate Model United Nations in Oxnard last week, April 6 through April 10 and that the Santa Barbara City College team had, for the first time, won the first place Distinguished Delegation Award.

The EVP reported that all faculty positions have been filled, with the exception of one, and that the successful applicants are all outstanding.

Tom Garey reported the play Real Women Have Curves held in the Garvin Theatre is sold out - including the added performances. There is a wait list only.

**Hearing/Discussion**

**Faculty Job Description – Charles Grogg**

AP chair Charles Grogg reported that the committee considered language in the current District Policy; “Performance Criteria for Faculty Evaluation”; and other documents and attempted to make the language and directives in all the documents as consistent as possible. The committee consulted with Sue Ehrlich, an IA attorney, and an independent attorney and learned that no legal parameters existed for creating or revising a job description. That all authority, what to include/exclude, rests with the individual districts.

COMMENT: AP should be commended on the extensive work they have done, and in particular the time and effort put in by Elizabeth Hodes and Art Olguin.

Hearing/Discussion: to be continued.

CPP Process: How do we assure that faculty input can be received and taken into account?

Suggestion:
Post the chart on the Senate website minus the far right column.
Use the Bulletin Board for discussion/comments.
Give to dept. chairs for discussion at their meeting on 4/15
Division Senators – contact their colleagues
Send copy to Senators via email
Post information in Adjunct Newsletter
Plenary Session Issue?
Invite those with questions/suggestions to the next Senate meeting

Proposed timeline per John Romo: Before semester end, to get a clear sense of those items that could be underway immediately and items that would require further study and begin that process.

ITC Recommendation on Technology Renewal
The handout is a reaction to and addressed concerns about the recommendation/development to eliminate the replacement/renewal budget.

ITC voted to accept the DTC workgroup recommendation. The ITC is requesting that the Academic Senate endorse the DTC workgroup recommendations and the extension of the replacement cycle for fiscal year 2005/2006.

Action
AAUP Statement: Jim Chesher
M/S/C To append the AAUP statement of philosophy to the Academic Freedom Policy #2520 (Chesher/Garey)

The intent is not for the AAUP statement of philosophy to become policy.

Faculty Lecturer subcommittee: Request for Rule change re: committee membership and Faculty Lecturer subcommittee Guidelines
M/S/D To adopt and approve the FL subcommittee recommendation (Garey/Barron) Unanimous
M/S/C To make a friendly amendment to retain the non-voting Senate Liaison on the FL subcommittee (Molloy/O’Connor) 10 aye 3 nay

Resolution on Sustainability Proposal: Request for support from student coalition (previous agenda)

M/S/C To commend the students on the “Sustainability” project and the work they are doing and the goals they have set for the college. While the Academic Senate cannot adopt this as a body the Academic Senate would like to offer their services on a consultation basis on how these types of proposals are moved within the institution (Garey/Barron)

Academic Senate does not feel competent to move outright support because of the fiscal limitations within the proposal. The Steering committee however, would be quite pleased to meet with the Student Sustainability Coalition and strategize on how to move this item forward.

Leif Skogberg, recently honored in Sacramento, commented that it was on the advice of President Romo that the Coalition obtain the support of the Academic Senate before proceeding to the Board of Trustees with the model sustainability project proposal.

M/S/C To extend the Academic Senate meeting (O’Connor/Lawson)
Reports

President’s Report
Chancellor’s Office Survey re: 75/25 Rule and Senate President’s response

An updated version of the survey was distributed. For clarification: The Academic Senate President responded to question 8 only in the survey.

EVP Report
Growth figures for next year from the Chancellor’s office are much less than 3%. The goals may still be met through creative Student Success efforts. The EVP strongly recommended that faculty be engaged in the conversation and what process should be in place for that dialog to begin.

The 6-wk Winter Intersession. A lot of creative thinking and a number of good alternatives have emerged. Conversation/dialog needs to be sustained and alternatives should be brought forth.

Committee Liaison Report
P&R: Recommendation re: 6-week Winter Intersession
P&R has recommended to not endorse the proposal to add a winter intersession, but instead to explore other options to enhance enrollment.

The dialog has been healthy and has resulted in a number of alternatives that might be explored.

Faculty Working group on Student Success – Kathy Molloy (pgs 21-27)
The committee has made great stride and crafted alternative strategies for student success. The committee’s efforts are to be commended.

Sabbatical Leave Committee Proposal – on BOT agenda for approval

Adjourn
CONTRACT INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY JOB DESCRIPTION

POSITION SUMMARY:
The primary duties of instructional faculty members of SBCC are those related to curriculum and teaching. The teaching assignment for a full-time faculty instructor is thirty Teacher Load Units per year, divided between lecture and laboratory classes, as determined by the department. In addition, class preparation time, college service, department meetings and office hours are included in the faculty member’s responsibilities. Faculty members work with their peers to develop departmental and college-wide policies and make themselves available to advise students in academic and professional matters.

(NOTE: Specifics of the Job Description below may vary according to terms of the current Instructor’s Association Negotiated Contract and the specific job description, under which the faculty member was hired)

The instructional staff of SBCC is divided into departments and divisions. Each faculty member is supervised by his/her department chairperson and may be responsible for the supervision of departmental aides. The Dean of Educational Programs for a division is the administrative supervisor. Faculty member are expected to conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics and to conform to standards of conduct as stated in federal and state law and Board policy.

[For purposes of clarification in the AP Committee discussion, items are cross-referenced to other existing policies/procedures whenever they seemed equivalent or substantially the same in spirit. These references are in square brackets after an item and there references are abbreviated as follows:
FRC = Faculty Responsibilities Check List (Contract Faculty) contained in Board Policy Appendix E, Evaluation Procedure; adopted 9/24/1998
IR = the draft Contract Instructional Faculty Job Description written by the Senate Ad Hoc committee in Summer 2004 and distributed to AP Committee in the Fall.
BP = Santa Barbara Community College Board Of Trustees Policy; downloaded from the college’s Policy web-site
DC = District Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, Board Policy Appendix E; downloaded from the college’s Policy web-site]

INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES:
1) Demonstrate expertise and competence in academic discipline and/or area of assignment. [DC–1.1,2,3; DC–2.5]

2) At the beginning of each semester, prepare and distribute current course syllabi to the students in each class taught. Such syllabi shall be consistent with the CAC-approved course of study outline and should include, as applicable, an outline of course objectives and requirements (exams, assignments, written work, field trips, etc.), grading policy, course content, student learning outcomes, and any specific rules or expectations of the instructor [DC- 2.1]

3) Present course content according to a planned schedule and consistent with CAC-approved course outline. [DC–2.1]

4) Begin and end scheduled classes on time. [FRC -1a]
5) Instruct and/or supervise students during all class times
   [BP Faculty/ Ed Admin 2010 Absences]

6) If ill, unavoidably detained, or engaged in approved professional, departmental, or college business
   of a priority nature, make reasonable efforts to ensure continuity of course coverage by arranging for a
   qualified substitute or by other means.
   [FRC – 3a, DC– 4.9 and BP Faculty/ Ed Admin 2000, 2010, General Policies]

7) Encourage student effort to master course content, participate and ask questions.
   [DC– 2.4,6,7,8]

8) Establish and consistently enforce appropriate classroom rules and procedures.
   [DC– 2.8]

9) Administer exams or other assessment tools consistent with course objectives.
   [DC– 2.2]

10) Administer final exams according to the published schedule.
    [FRC – 1c]

11) Return graded materials, with appropriate feedback, in a timely manner.
    [not now in DC –adding to DC-2 ?]

12) Maintain accurate records of students’ grades.
    [not now in DC –adding to DC-2 ?]

13) Maintain currency and depth of knowledge in discipline by participating in professional
    organizations, conferences, workshops, reading professional journals and engaging in informal
    discussions with colleagues.
    [DC– 1.3]

14) Show respect for diverse student opinions and needs of individual students
    [DC– 2.7]

RELATED INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES:
1) Maintain regular office hours in accordance with Board Policy 1650B and inform students of those hours
   [FRC– 1b; DC–3.1; BP Faculty/Ed Admin 1650B Faculty Work Week]

2) Refer students to appropriate College resources for information, counseling, or other educational
   support as necessary.

3) Submit records of grades, student attendance, textbook orders and other required reports to
   designated campus officials in a timely manner.
   [FRC–2c, 3g,3g; DC– 4.1 and 4. 9]

4) Select textbooks and other course materials consistent with the CAC-approved Course of Study
   Outline, and as appropriate, in consultation with the instructor’s department, program, or disciplinary
   colleagues, for each of the classes taught, and regularly update such materials.
   [BP Faculty/Ed Admin 2520, Freedom of Expression; adopted 12/11/03]

5) Participate in the evaluation of existing departmental courses and the development of new
   departmental offerings.
   [FRC– 2a; DC–5.4]
OTHER PROFESSIONAL/ACADEMIC RESPONSIBILITIES:
1) Be available, if given reasonable notice, for departmental, division, committee meetings and other professional tasks during normal working hours Monday through Friday on all contract days and hours, as stated in the annual faculty contract except during assigned class times, office hours, and when performing other official duties. [DC–3.2; BP Faculty/Ed Admin 1600 on Faculty Work Week]

2) Attend department and division meetings except during assigned class times, office hours, and when performing other official duties. [FRC–2b,3b]

3) Attend Commencement and scheduled college-wide mandatory flex activities. [FRC–3c; DC–4.8]

4) Participate in required college service, departmental/divisional program reviews and college planning activities, including periodic accreditation. [DC–4.5; BP BP Faculty/Ed Admin 1520 on college service]

5) Report illness/absences as outlined in Board procedure. [FRC–1b; DC–3.1; BP Facult/Ed Admin Absences 2010]

6) Participate in evaluation of college personnel, including self in accordance with Board policy. [FRC–3e; BP BP Faculty /Ed Admin 2100 and Appendix E, Evaluation]

7) Engage in professional development activities on an on-going basis and seek ways to improve teaching effectiveness. [DC–5.1]

8) Make a good faith effort to conform to college policies applicable to job assignment and professional activities. [DC–4.6; FRC–3d]

9) Report to Dean and Department Chair outside activities, which might conflict with contractual duties of SBCC employment, as to the extent required by Government Code and District policies, and BP 2525 Faculty /Ed Admin, Incompatible Activities.] [DC–4.9; BP Faculty /Ed Admin 2450,Outside Employment]

M/S/C on 3/10/05 To make the 14-item section “Instructional Responsibilities as amended a part of the final committee draft.

M/S/C on 3/17/05 To make the 5-item section “Related Instructional Responsibilities” as amended a part of the final committee draft.

M/S/C on 3/24/05 To make the 9-item section “Related Instructional Responsibilities” as amended a part of the final committee draft.
**Recommendation of Technology Replacement Workgroup**

1. Charge: Develop a comprehensive and flexible technology equipment life cycle management plan.

   Given the information presented in the ‘Background’ section of this report, the workgroup feels that item #1 in the ‘Charge to Workgroup’ section (‘Develop a comprehensive and flexible technology equipment life cycle management plan.’) has been satisfied and no further work is required. (Please see documents: TCO & Life Cycle Mgmt Evaluation.doc; TCO Yrs 4,5,6.pdf; Desktop PC Life.pdf; Life Cycle Management.pdf)

2. Charge: Develop a recommended level of annual funding for new technology initiatives and a process for review and approval.

   In that requests for new technology initiatives have come to a standstill due to the budget problems and lack of funding sources, it is difficult to gauge what might be requested and in what numbers. Constant in previous years, however, has been the demand for smart classroom technology and lab additions or expansions. Common to each of these is the need for the establishment of ongoing funding sources to accommodate the eventual replacement of the added technology items. If an item has a total cost of $10,000, that same amount needs to be added to the identified replacement budget. This addition can be incremental since the equipment won’t be scheduled for replacement for four to five years, or perhaps longer, but the full amount must be added to the budget before it can be replaced in a fiscally responsible manner. In addition, line items, which are directly related to the initiative, but not considered part of the ongoing replacement budget, must be added in as either one-time funds or ongoing. Items such as electricity, HVAC, furniture, construction costs, extra cabling and network connectivity, and additional staffing must be considered. An example of this would be the addition of one smart classroom. In addition to the computer and projector, a typical installation would include an audio amp and speakers for presentations requiring sound, a combo VCR/DVD player for those types of media, and a video switchbox so that additional external inputs can be made should someone with their own laptop or other device wish to utilize the system. Electrical modifications and possibly network additions to the room must be made to accommodate the ceiling mounted projector and possibly the equipment cabinet itself. An adequate presentation station must be purchased to securely house the equipment. Keys to the system must be supplied to those wishing to use the equipment after training by staff. Ongoing maintenance of all the equipment includes any hardware repairs, software configurations and upgrades, preventative maintenance such as the cleaning of the equipment and filter in the projector and antivirus protection and upgrades to the software. Guesstimates for equipment funding for a smart classroom would be $10,000 and for a standard 36 station lab, including smart classroom technology at the instructor’s station, printing and network connectivity would be in the $75,000 range, high-end labs would be more. This does not include the furniture, electrical, cabling and other work required for the initial installation nor the staffing.
The recommended amount for annual new initiative funding is dependent upon the direction the College takes with technology as well as individual department plans. The workgroup felt it could not set a standard annual amount. 

- Is the commitment to make all classrooms smart?
- Will the College re-design its method for scheduling the existing smart classrooms?
- Will the College reduce its reliance on technology for delivering instruction?

These and other questions must be answered in order to project the funding required for new initiatives and their ongoing support and replacement needs.

Regarding the process for review and approval, the workgroup felt that the existing process of the ITC/DTC/CPC channel has served the College well and requires little or no alteration.

3. Charge: Develop a replacement plan for the 05/06 thru 07/08 fiscal years.

The recommendation from the workgroup, on this charge, is to fund full replacements with Reduced Maintenance and Other, as per the Consolidated Projections worksheet within the Technology Replacement Workgroup Submittal Excel workbook. This assumes that the $500,000 line item for Maintenance and Support will be moved into the General College Fund from the Fund 41 account. Although this estimate is slightly above the $1,200,000 allocated for replacement of computers and associated technology equipment for each of those years, it is assumed that the savings realized through economies of scale from bulk purchasing will reduce those amounts. Fund 41 carryover will produce at least $100,000 from the 04/05 budget cycle and thus will cover the 05/06 short fall. Additionally, the funding estimates for full replacement assume display replacement and we can choose to replace only the CPU if the budget requires it.