

Approved 9-14-2011

## **Meeting Minutes for Wednesday, August 31, 2011**

### **West Campus, BC 214, 3:00 – 5:00 pm**

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcón, Cornelia Alsheimer, Cindy Bower, Stan Bursten, Angel Cardenas, Gary Carroll, Gordon Coburn, Steve DaVega, Jeff Englert, Esther Frankel, David Gilbert, Debbie Mackie, Jeff Meyer, David Morris, Kenley Neufeld, Dean Nevins (President), Kathy O'Connor, Melanie Eckford-Prosser, Gail Reynolds, Sally Saenger, Marilynn Spaventa (EVP), Pat Stark, Ann Wilkinson  
Guest(s): Carmen Rivero, Jan Schultz

#### **1.0 Call to Order**

- 1.1 Public Comments – no request received
- 1.2 Approval of Agenda – so approved w/corrections
- 1.3 Approval of Minutes 08-17-11 – so approved w/revised info item 2.3

#### **2.0 Reports**

##### **2.1 President Report (Dean Nevins)**

President Nevins reported that the Reader Allocation Group has done a great job and commended Alice Scharper, Bronwen Moore, Jan Schultz, Kathy O'Connor and Phyllis Johnson. Stats from an email dean Scharper sent: The funding was the same as 2010-2011 and approximately 110 instructors requested reader hours and of those there were 19 first time requests. Total request hours available: 1,000 for full-time faculty and 500 for adjunct.

##### **2.2 Planning and Resources Liaison Report (Kenley Neufeld)**

Vice President Neufeld reported that he is also liaison to the Facilities Planning, Safety, Security and Parking committee, and the EOPS/Financial Aide committee and at this time none of the committees have met. A question arose about the committee sign-up sheet and why, based on instructions from the chair Lorenzo Zwaal, the Facilities committee was not open to enrollment. President Nevins to inquire about the 'not open to enrollment' status of the committee.

##### **2.3 Faculty Development Liaison Report (Ann Wilkinson)**

Senator Wilkinson, liaison to CTL; FPDC; FRC and Sabbatical Leave announced there was nothing to report because none of the committees had convened.

##### **2.4 CPC/Curriculum and Instruction Liaison Report (Kathy O'Connor)**

Senator O'Connor's liaison duties also include COI; International Education; and Matriculation all of which have not yet met. Senator O'Connor reported CAC has been underway reviewing and hearing all curriculum proposals. CPC met yesterday and agenda information/discussion items and topics were: 1) Discussion about the replacement for Keith McLellan will take place after the EVP of Educational Programs has had an opportunity to speak with faculty and staff in the Student Development area and after an evaluation by all deans has been completed. 2) The ongoing discussions/process for determining new districts for the purpose of electing SBCC Board of Trustees. 3) A September 23 deadline has been set by ACCJC for SBCC to respond to the July 1, 2011 Letter of Complaint they received. Dr. Friedlander has set September 13 as the deadline for individuals to respond before he begins the draft in response to allegations in the letter of complaint. 4) Update on the Superintendent/President search; the Board of Trustees are in the process of determining which consulting firm should be hired to assist in the process and hopefully be ready to advertise for the position by December. 5) Program Review templates have been modified and the changes will be to move non routine items into Program Review. All spreadsheets from equipment/facilities/staff will all be in Program Review. This year everyone starts with a blank template for resource requests; department Goals/Objectives narrative will be rolled over. A "...Budget Development..." handout provided background and data for the workload and revenue reduction the District is facing and for the discussions that need to take place for program reviews, budget development for 2012-13.

##### **2.5 IA Liaison Report (Gary Carroll)**

Senator Carroll reported the I.A. had not yet met. Negotiations have concluded and a placeholder for Article XII is there if a new agreed upon version can be established. District approval will be needed. If language cannot be agreed upon the placeholder will go into the contract. A Plenary Session to be held September 9.

## **2.6 EVP Report (Marilynn Spaventa)**

Marilynn Spaventa reported the head count for Fall 2011 is 18,115 students and up 2.37% from last fall. What some departments are doing to be more efficient, economize and get a better enrollment pattern is to drop a section if there are multiple sections with low enrollment and get those students to enroll in one of the other sections. Enrollment for out of state students is 866 and for international students it is 1,249 (up approximately 125 international students from last fall). The enrollment numbers do not include dual enrollment students. The dean's have worked with department chairs on the workload reduction and in many cases has resulted in some very creative thinking e.g. some departments are making a two year plan in terms of electives. Through counselor liaisons; department web sites; Banner coding; the next challenge being worked on: how to we let students and counselors know what that plan is. Note: Workload reduction is not one size for all departments. Departments will have to make reductions for next year as well and for some department's it will be easier than others. Some department's are thinking of reducing the number of seats available in a large lecture as a way of taking some of the reductions without reducing a section: a choose your poison approach where you are either not offering the class or offering it to fewer students. No all departments were asked to reduce equally. Ultimately it will be the department's choice for how to reduce. With the exception of 3 departments, all were asked to reduce by 3 units, 6 units or 9 units. The next time departments will have to make additional reductions on top of those that have already been made. All of the deans are working on reducing the overall 4000 and 5000 accounts. One of the immediate ways costs can be reduced is by not using the satellite duplicating machines and sending your orders directly to the duplicating department. As much planning within departments as possible is needed; everyone has to think this through together and Marilynn Spaventa reported how pleased she is the Academic Senate is working on this.

## **2.7 Academic Policies Liaison Report (Ignacio Alarcón)**

Senator Alarcón reported the Master Teacher Evaluation review and Faculty Evaluation procedure results should be available for the next Academic Senate agenda.

## **3.0 Unfinished Business - none**

There was no unfinished business to report.

## **4.0 New Business**

### **4.1 Replacement and New Faculty Ranking Process**

President Nevins posed the question: should we even ask for new faculty proposals at this time? Dr. Nevins explained, of the group that are or may be retiring – six of those positions would not be replaced. A question was asked at what point does a replacement position that is not replaced cease to become a replacement position? The administration made the decision that, after one year unless you ask for and receive special dispensation for an extra year, the position is no longer available as a replacement.

Outcome: The consensus at the table was to not ask faculty to submit proposals for new faculty at this time. Recommendation: To have AP and/or P&R review the replacement questions/issues.

### **4.2 Replacement and New Faculty Ranking Timeline**

Strike “and NEW” references to “exempted position” from proposal and some minor language modifications were recommended. Presentations from faculty for replacements will be needed.

### **4.3 Data needed for Department/Division discussions**

President Nevins wanted to know what data do Divisions need to facilitate conversation? MATH requested: Total TLU allocation data; ENGLISH requested: Data from the Friday Forum (keeping the college mission in mind would like to see the general direction of the college); demographics (online: where are the students we are serving); ESL/SoML requested: Persistence data on 60-65 students. Data on what has been cut where and rationale; HEALTH TECH/HUMAN SVCS requested: Rather than data requests there were many comments; EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT requested: The data we do not have (and being worked out) is the data needed from Assist.org. Poppy Copy data, PSS data for the last few years in particular writing center/ tutorial services success, SARS STRS BANNER data integration, having tentative future schedules for students to

Approved 9-14-2011

make decisions e.g. as the trend to offer courses every so many semesters; CONTINUING ED requested: Total FTEs generated outside of the District (VTA jail). FTEs based on subject area from 09 to present. Data on courses with high attrition rates and cost of maintaining the CE Computer In Our Future Lab and FTEs generated; FINE ARTS requested: factual current data about online courses, data on student demographics, data on overall college completion rates. Success rates/transfer rates of students who have been employed as TAs/readers/etc; TECHNOLOGIES requested: data on number of students who find jobs after taking a class; BUSINESS requested: History of TLU allocation over the several years, data on percentage of International Students over different sections, would like employment data on students who have completed degrees/certificates; SOCIAL SCIENCES requested: to have the data on cross-listed course information combined; PE/ATHLETICS requested: the “College Plan” data from the last college plan, and would like to know enrollment data on International Students per department.

Suggestion: Create a Student Survey to collect the intangible data being requested.

#### **4.4 Question list for September 2, 2011 Course Realignment Forum**

President Nevins explained the goal of the forum is to get as much information and feedback and discussion from faculty as we can. The idea is to get everyone thinking about the college as a whole. There will be other opportunities to participate in the discussion and process. The beginning discussion here will form the basics to be taken back to each of your Divisions and departments in preparation for the first forum. The forum is about the big picture TLU allocation and what do we think we want to do about that.

Suggestion: Frame the first question in more specific terms about what kind of college do we want to be, would be to have data that identifies how much emphasis the college places on remediation vs transfer vs vocational, etc. and what percentage of the college resources are dedicated to each.

What happens if none of this works; what is the appeal process? What does “works” mean? We (faculty/the Academic Senate) come up with a set of recommendations that we vote on and those are forwarded to the administration/Board. That is all we can do and by “works” that is when it works. If we cannot come to a vote then it won’t work. Our role is to recommend and advise.

#### **5.0 Adjourn**