

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Academic Senate SBVC | AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30 |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|

Minutes of October 2, 2013

| Time | Topic | Discussion | Further Action |
|------|--|---|--|
| | Call to Order | | |
| | Approval of Minutes from September 18, 2013 | | Motion by C Parish for approval of the Minutes of September 18, 2013. 2nd by K Barnett Voice vote - unanimous |
| | President's Report | <p>J Gilbert presented information on the following items (attached):</p> <p>AB 955: debate continues on the two-tier system, still awaiting the governor's signature. An article in EdSource.org notes that four of six colleges in the pilot program support the bill, including CHC. The quotation, "We're hoping that we'll be on the cutting edge of providing new ways of access for students," is essentially attributed to both the District PR department and the Chancellor. Senators are encouraged to read the article. It was noted that in 1984 CC's had no enrollment fees; from 1985 until the present, unit fees have gone from \$5 to \$46.</p> <p>Community Colleges Offering Bachelor's Degrees: will California join more than 20 other states (including FL and MI) in offering bachelor's degrees in a limited number of technical fields? The state's CC's enroll more than 2.4 million students, 1 in 4 of all nationwide. At present the program is limited campuses and limited degrees.</p> | |

**Academic Senate
SBVC**

AD/SS 207
3:00 - 4:30

| Time | Topic | Discussion | Further Action |
|------|----------------------------|---|----------------|
| | <p>New Business</p> | <p>Substantive Change Proposal: J Jackson, faculty co-chair of the Online Program Committee administrated by Kay Weiss, addressed accreditation, noting that the college must adhere not only to the standards but to the policy of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The Substantive Change Policy directs that the commission must know of and approve major changes, e.g. offering baccalaureate degrees. Regarding distance education, if students can get a certificate with 50% online, hybrid, or distance learning, this triggers the Substantive Change rule. Two years ago, the college had 15 degrees and 21 certificates meeting the threshold; it's now up to 40 degrees and 29 certificates. Mt. Sac made application just one year ago and now must again, due to heightened online offerings. On the present track, SBVC would have to apply every couple of years. A draft has been circulated to Technology Committee, Online Program Committee, department heads, Accreditation Committee; it will come back to the Senate for approval, prior to submission to the Board, then the ACCJC for final approval next June. The goal is a clean slate when the accreditation process commences next October. Senate will consider the proposal at the next meeting with a vote in November. K Weiss noted that the committee has adopted a proactive approach; programs which get close to the threshold are included in the submission.</p> <p>EAP MOU: the existing Early Assessment Program MOU has been distributed. It was Board-approved last November. The K-16 Bridge Program was going to take the place of this MOU; now that it is gone, this MOU is the platform for an agreement that parties are very interested in implementing. G Fisher solicits feedback. S Lillard asked where the agreement originated; it came into being when Dr. Buckley was VP of Instruction. G Fisher explained that it was a goal of the K-12 system and CSUSB, partnering with Valley College, whose role is critical. "It was a collaborative conversation where both parties had an interest in moving forward with some type of agreement." Dr. Buckley had conversations with the then-chairs of Math and English, along with the Senate president, who concurred with the pilot project. Her concern was that the proposal did not go through a full collegial consultation process before Board approval. A Aguilar-Kitibutr addressed Point #5 of the SBVC Commitment and the unrealistic goal of working with students to create two-year ed plans at the outset due to a lack of knowledge about how much career exploration they've done and their limited interaction with counselors. G Fisher concurred that two-year graduation schedules are unrealistic.</p> | |

**Academic Senate
SBVC**

AD/SS 207
3:00 - 4:30

| Time | Topic | Discussion | Further Action |
|------|---------------------|--|----------------|
| | Old Business | <p>Accreditation Standard 2B/C Small Group Review: Senators took 30 minutes to edit and comment on the working documents.</p> <p>Committee Structure Review: J Gilbert queried about committee meeting times. Arts, Lectures, and Diversity has shifted to first Wednesdays at 1:00; Facilities and Safety to first Mondays from 3:00 – 4:30; Professional Development to first and third Mondays from 2:00 – 3:30. He is compiling a new list for 2014-2016. The goal is to eliminate any dramatic conflicts, e.g. College Council. He announced that the College has a new Professional Coordinator, Rania Hamdy. J Gilbert also addressed committee rules, e.g. requiring at least one faculty member per division, (Accreditation, Basic Skills). The Curriculum and Program Review guidelines both mandate exactly two faculty per division; however, larger divisions have requested three. By contrast, the AP for Program Review (17 faculty, 6 managers, 8 classified) is off track in terms of participation and does not mandate proportional representation. The Senate guidelines call for a representative per every five faculty members (or majority of). A Aguilar-Kitibutr said that Matriculation Committee would have a wider range of membership because of the Student Success Act. O McGinnis pointed out that Program Review’s makeup was historically not based on departmental size, so that smaller divisions would feel equally represented in terms of influence. K Weiss added that Program Review has not been intended as a representational model, where members advocate for their particular programs, but an objective team devoted to getting the work done. J Gilbert wishes to revise one definitive document, addressing time and membership issues, for review by the executive committee, then the full Senate.</p> <p>Also addressed: does Senate wish to recreate the Budget Committee? C Huston said their committee wanted to resolve the official charge and membership issues. Hopefully the executive committee can develop membership guidelines that Senate will approve following examination by Budget Committee. A Au added that a Sustainability Committee might be needed on campus to conform with an agreement signed by the Chancellor; something is needed locally to manage what each college can do.</p> | |

**Academic Senate
SBVC**

AD/SS 207
3:00 - 4:30

| Time | Topic | Discussion | Further Action |
|------|-------------------|---|--|
| | Committees | <p>Ed Policy - Student Services - no report. Personnel Policy - no report. Career & Tech Ed - no report. Financial Policy – S Lillard shared details (attached summary) from District Budget Committee based on notes offered by E Millican. Details were also reiterated at the Board meeting. Projected spending by SBV is \$700K less than the approved budget; CHC is \$650K over. The District has an anticipated \$1.3 million in additional revenue, although Redevelopment Agency funds are not guaranteed. There is a projected 34.7% reserve at the District level. Typical is a 20% reserve; the State suggests only 5%. District’s good-accounting-practices guideline is 15%. The Budget Committee’s charge now includes examination of the District’s resource allocation model, currently a 70/30 split between SBVC and CHC. A subset of the committee has been assigned to examine the structure. An approved one-time grant of \$300K to CHC did not materialize, but the Board was not informed. Consultants Mike Brandy and Mike Hill of College Brain Trust have been retained to 1) help streamline CHC operations, 2) review the allocation model on CHC’s behalf, 3) aid the Chancellor in overall budget objectives. The hiring has yet to receive Board approval. S Lillard expressed concern regarding why the District Budget Committee is not doing this analysis as agreed to last semester. Senators are encouraged to be aware, attend board meetings, and communicate with members. E Millican reported that at the last campus budget committee meeting, according to S Stark, the \$300K was actually given as a loose percentage, that the real figure is closer to \$500K. Based on Millican’s Internet research, the hired consultants are positive choices who have experience with community colleges.</p> <p>Equity and Diversity - no report. Legislative Policy - no report.</p> <p>Elections – C Huston reported that elections for Senate president are governed by Bylaw 201; two candidates shall be nominated by Senate, including from faculty-at-large. Floor nominations are also possible. Election is by secret ballots from faculty – those with more than half a FT contract. Floor nominations will be solicited at the next Senate meeting along with an email to the campus at large. Oct. 25: nominations close Nov. 5: finalize ballot Nov. 15: voting closes Nov. 20: ready to announce new president Dec. 15: election deadline according to bylaws Senate will narrow the ballot to two nominees on Nov. 6 if there are more names.</p> | <p>Motion by R Pires for Senate to direct its representatives on the District Budget Committee to ask that the consultants from College Brain Trust be brought in to the District Budget Committee meeting. 2nd by J Lamore. Voice vote – unanimous</p> |

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

| Time | Topic | Discussion | Further Action |
|-------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| | <p>Committees (cont)</p> <p>Additional Reports</p> | <p>Curriculum - Program Review – S Lillard distributed the calendar and new 4-Year Program Review Rotation (attached). The Needs Assessment process is underway; the next meeting is October 25 with a workshop for writers needing assistance. Cochairs are S Lillard and E Millican Reports are due Nov. 1.</p> <p>Professional Development – Rania Hamdy introduced herself as the new coordinator. Her office is in LA 204; she welcomes visitors. Updates will be coming soon.</p> <p>College President's Report – G Fisher said that there were several failed searches for a VP of Student Services. Another search is underway. A consultant was hired to examine the operations of the Foundation; does SBVC need a larger alumni component? Donna Hoffman has transferred to CHC. There is an opening for an interim director of the Foundation.</p> <p>SBCCD-CTA –S Lillard said there was a good turnout at the Oct. 2 luncheon. Negotiations are underway; volunteers are needed and an email from Ed Gomez soliciting help is coming out. Needed are two-hour blocks of offered time assisting with negotiations teams.</p> <p>District Assembly – J Gilbert reported that yesterday's meeting dealt with student success. The Mutual Respect Policy, currently in limbo, needs revision. Senate is charged with reconsidering non-credit policies. J Gilbert will go through old Senate minutes and prepare a list of pros and cons. He will research how much District support there is. CHC requested information on an audit policy (currently not permitted). Chaffee allows auditing for a refresher class; there was disagreement whether fees were more or less than standard.</p> | |
| | <p>Public Comments</p> | | |

