

<b>Academic Senate SBVC</b>	AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30
---------------------------------	--------------------------

## Minutes of February 19, 2014

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>Call to Order</b>		
	<b>Approval of Minutes from February 5, 2014</b>		<b>Motion</b> by A Alsip for approval of the Minutes of February 5, 2014 <b>2nd</b> by J Hoyt <b>Voice vote - unanimous</b>
	<b>President's New BReport</b>	<p>A Au gave her report (attached) addressing the following matters:</p> <p><b>2013 Amendment to Brown Act:</b> Senate will now record individual senators' votes on all motions.</p> <p><b>ASCCC Accreditation Institute New Standards:</b> A Au, C Huston, and H Kinde attended the La Jolla meeting (2/7); new standards will be effective immediately upon approval. Public email comments are invited through 4/30 (send with subject line "Revised Standards Discussion List" to Chairperson Phil Smith, <a href="mailto:smith@arc.losrios.edu">smith@arc.losrios.edu</a>). Regarding setting standards for student achievement, areas of emphasis are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) defining student course completion rates</li> <li>2) retention rates</li> <li>3) degree completion</li> <li>4) student transfer measures</li> <li>5) certificate completion</li> </ol> <p>Trends for sanctions are discussed in the ACCJC Summer newsletter.</p> <p><b>Legislative Analyst's Office Report on 2014-2015 Budget:</b> hearings were held 2/18 in Sacramento; Senators are encouraged to read the summary at article's end.</p>	

Academic Senate SBVC		AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30	
Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>President's Report (cont)</b>	<p><b>District Resource Allocation Model Analysis Presentation:</b> the meeting was more informational than discussion. Observations from the contracted brain trust are available online. Their report is a dispassionate assessment of district strengths and weaknesses. The current 70/30 split is explored; CHC is endeavoring to reach 5K FTES for sustainability, but is not there yet. Y Lee observed that unless the model is adjusted, that goal won't be reached before 2025. C Huston said CHC might be granted experimental seed money rather than a reallocation. S Stark: a strong meeting theme was that everyone wishes for CHC to grow, but not at SBVC's expense. As a smaller college, CHC's overhead is inflated. J Smith said that demographically, they are in a low-density, high-age retirement area. Addressing inherent inefficiencies must precede growth.</p>	
	<b>New Business</b>	<p><b>March 19 Meeting:</b> Senate discussed whether or not to meet during Spring Break.</p>	<p><b>Motion</b> by C Huston to cancel the March 19, 2014 Senate meeting; <b>2<sup>nd</sup></b> by J Hoyt. <b>Voice vote – unanimous.</b></p>
	<b>Old Business</b>	<p><b>SBVC Budget Committee – Membership Composition:</b> S Stark solicited examples from other colleges; most have faculty representation between 20 – 30%. Executive Committee recommends eight members: 3 faculty (37.5% representation), 2 managers, 2 classified staff, 1 student.</p> <p><b>Program Review Committee Charge:</b> in S Lillard's absence, T Heibel proposed a language change for AP 2225: <i>Program review is conducted by authorization of the SBVC Academic Senate, and according to the guidelines contained in the SBCCD Administrative Procedures (AP 2225)</i> is to be replaced by <i>Program review is conducted by authorization of the SBVC Academic Senate.</i> J Lamore asked what guidelines would then govern Program Review; A Au responded that the "Purpose" section of the charge contains its guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Motion</b> by C Huston to accept the Executive Committee's recommendation. <b>2<sup>nd</sup></b> by R Pires. <b>Voice vote – unanimous.</b></p> <p><b>Motion</b> by A Alsip to approve the proposed language changes. <b>2<sup>nd</sup></b> by C Huston. <b>Voice vote – unanimous.</b></p>

Academic Senate  
SBVC

AD/SS 207  
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<p>Old Business (cont)</p>	<p><b>Institution Set Standards:</b> C Huston presented information on what needs to be done immediately and what are the best practices regarding data. SBVC needs to establish ISS for the areas in the ACC annual report (due March 17) dealing with student achievement data. The goal is to hold to current ACCJC-submitted data for establishing and measuring ISS. Course completion should be expressed as a percent, all other data as numbers. Three possible models for establishing a performance “floor” were presented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Average ISS averaging 5 years of data</li> <li>2) Standard Deviation: 5-year data, ISS one standard deviation below mean</li> <li>3) Lowest Year Model: lowest in last 5-year period</li> </ol> <p>C Huston presented comparative SBVC data using all three models: (1 – 65.2%, 2 – 61.78%, 3 – 61.70%). CHC and Norco use the Standard Deviation model. J Smith suggested adopting a model that is ambitious, but which doesn’t force the college to “sound the alarm” regularly. He also suggested a 7-year time frame rather than 5. Any model selected must be justified to the ACCJC. J Lamore said the recent climate has put class slots at a premium, inflating course completion numbers.</p> <p>Regarding the Accreditation Self-Study, goals will be addressed, which will be part of the accreditation study through the Strategic Plan. The research office is seeking ways to collect data on licensure rates and job placement. The Online Education Committee will propose ISS for Distance Education, preparatory to forwarding to Academic Senate.</p> <p><b>SBVC Organizational Governance Handbook:</b> many sanctioned colleges lacked a governance handbook or don’t have a spelled-out governance procedure. A Au suggests editing the CHC organizational handbook into a governance or consultation handbook. ACCJC wants to see a clear document. C Huston: such a resource can show how committees interact and demonstrate integrated planning. Sentiment was that Senate should only have to rewrite its specific sections and highlight interaction with other campus areas. College Council and President Fisher have requested the edited document. A Au is willing to be Senate’s point person pulling the project together.</p>	<p><b>Motion</b> by J Buchanan to adopt the Standard Deviation model tracking 7 years of data. <b>2<sup>nd</sup></b> by S Meyer. <b>Voice vote – unanimous.</b></p> <p><b>Motion</b> by S Meyer to move forward with Senate’s portion of a shared governance handbook. <b>2<sup>nd</sup></b> – L Hector. <b>Voice vote – unanimous.</b></p>

**Academic Senate  
SBVC**

AD/SS 207  
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>Committees</b>	<p><b>Ed Policy -</b>  <b>Student Services - no report.</b>  <b>Personnel Policy - no report.</b>  <b>Career &amp; Tech Ed - no report.</b>  <b>Financial Policy - no report.</b>  <b>Equity and Diversity - no report.</b>  <b>Legislative Policy - no report.</b>  <b>Elections - no report.</b></p> <p><b>Curriculum</b> – C Huston said that management and Student Services proposes continuing current SAO process through the Spring 2015 revision. Most areas would be doing SAOs this semester anyway; the campus is on track for accreditation. H Kinde’s department has been compiling information, with a 76% return on fall course data collection; combined with other courses, the campus will have an overall success rate exceeding 80%. Out of 1,229 sections, the college has assessed 998 of them (81%).</p> <p><b>Program Review</b> – T Heibel reported that Library’s needs assessments, while properly prepared and submitted, were not forwarded to the Committee. Program Review amended its overall report, including Library’s Classified Staff, Budget, and Equipment requests prioritized according to a Top Five-Second Five, etc. model. He expressed hope, on the committee’s behalf, that the campus’s entire Equipment list (totaling just \$583K) and Budget’s (\$575K) might be approved. He also presented Program Review’s new two-year mini-review cycle for Career Technical Education (CTE) mandated by Title V. Departments are invited to attend the small-group workshops (March 7, 28) to get help writing their Efficacy Review reports. Despite some delays, needed forms are being emailed out in the near future.</p> <p><b>Professional Development -</b></p>	
	<b>Additional Reports</b>	<p><b>College President’s Report -</b>  <b>SBCCD-CTA -</b>  <b>District Assembly -</b></p>	
	<b>Public Comments</b>		

