

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

Minutes of April 7, 2010

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
3:03	Call to Order		
	Approval of Minutes for 3/3/10		Motion for approval of the Minutes of 3/3/10 by P Buckley 2nd by J Mendoza Voice vote - Ayes unanimous
	President's Report	<p>J Stankas reported (see attachments) on Resource Allocation Plan information from as distributed from the District. J Stankas reviewed both the historical data and the data in regards to the draft '10 - '11 Budget Model. It was explained that current thinking is that the District will apportion funds to SBVC and CHC and then levy a "tax" on each site to cover District expenditures made on behalf of each campus to increase the transparency of funding process allocation. The estimate of the District's tax is 22% from each campus. J Stankas then reviewed the Budget Allocation Model's guiding principles (see attached). J Stankas also announced the webcast (April 8th) conducted by the acting Chancellor seeking comments about the Budget Model. W Chatfield enquired about the source of the "interest income" listed in the Model. D Shipp explained that the District maintains some accounts that are interest bearing accounts. J Stankas expressed some concern that the 70/30 split between CHC and SBVC of the total State funded FTES, left SBVC with less than 10,000. The difference will be offset by an increase in the part-time hourly faculty budget. The expectation is that Valley will still make the 10,000 FTES threshold. J Stankas also reported on Committee Structure moving toward Board approval.</p>	

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	New Business	<p>Plenary Session and Resolutions for Debate - J Stankas reviewed the procedures for resolution processing that will occur at the Plenary Session. J Stankas pulled some of the more notable resolutions for debate (from the Plenary packet) to comment on (see list associated with Pres Report).</p> <p>Res 2.03 and 2.04 - Comments were made about the historical events leading up to the formulation of Res 2.03 and the Where As statements appearing in the resolution. Res 2.04 was also reviewed in association with 2.03. Some debate occurred as to the signal given by the potential passage of 2.03. P Buckley indicated that the resolution seemed to be a means to put pressure on the overseers of the ACCJC. There was some further informational enquiry about the relationship between WASC and ACCJC. E Milican reminded the Senators that the ACCJC is in favor of the inclusion of SLO assessment scores as a part of faculty evaluation and this represents another reason for some strong feedback. J Stankas also noted the increasing frustration between the Statewide Academic Senate and the ACCJC. E Szumski and C Huston enquired about the sources of evidence used in the crafting of the where as statement of the resolution. A brief review of the evidence in the associated appendix was made.</p> <p>Res 7.01 and 7.03 were also reviewed.</p> <p>Res 7.02 - C Huston wanted clarification on 7.02 in terms of the campus' commitment to the CCC Access project. J Stankas reviewed the goal of CCC Access relative to offering one assessment that could be used at all CCC. The manner in which those scores are viewed at each campus will be left up to local interpretation. C Huston expressed a concern that the passage of this resolution would lead to the requirement of participation in the CCC Access project. J Stankas stated that there was no such requirement in the language of the resolution.</p> <p>Res 9.05 - There was concern expressed by C Huston and E Millcan in embedding SLOs in program review due to the potential for loss of control over the SLOs as a product of the discipline faculty. R Pires pointed out that the language of the resolution seemed vague.</p> <p>Res 8.02 - A Aguilar-Kitibutr voiced the opinion that the proposed change in the recommended ratio of counselors to</p>	<p>Motion to recommend that J Stankas vote in favor of Res 2.03 by P Buckley, 2nd by E Millican. Voice vote - Ayes unanimous</p> <p>Motion to recommend that J Stankas vote against Res 9.05 by E Millican, 2nd by C Huston. Voice vote - Ayes unanimous.</p>

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	New Business cont.	<p>Res 8.02 cont - students of (1 to 370) would be very beneficial to students. P Buckley enquired about the ratio at Valley. It was estimated to be approx 1 to 1700. J Lamore enquired about the origin of the 370 number. J Stanskas stated that this was identified as the ideal number (as cited in the details of the resolution).</p> <p>Res 10.02 - J Stanskas read the resolved statement and discussed other resolutions dealing with the same issue. D Hook provided several examples of adjunct instructor candidates who were not able to teach courses despite being pre-eminent in their field due to the lack of an Assoc degree. K Kammer provided an additional example. J Stanskas stated that this resolution doesn't affect hiring by identification of eminence. J Stanskas reviewed the historical background of this argument. P Buckley pointed out that creating a general rule for different fields of study (academic versus CTE) may produce poor outcomes in terms of hiring limitations. J Lamore highlighted that in this case it is probably wise to defer to those individuals who are expert in the CTE field and take their predictions seriously. E Nuno pointed out that the downside might be to undermine a process that would limit the effect of hiring due to personal relationship. A Moore reiterated that the goal of this hiring should be to promote the students best interest.</p> <p>Human Resource Allocation Plan - D Shipp discussed origins of this plan from a sub-committee of the Budget Allocation Committee, in response to the recommendation from the Accreditation report. He stated that the recommendation for including this plan in the accreditation report came at the behest of the former Chancellor. So the charge of the sub-committee is the development of a Human Resources Staffing Plan to assist the colleges in the staffing and prioritization of the new positions. D Shipp reiterated that function of this plan (see attached) is to help the colleges maintain staffing levels by; a) providing relevant data to support the requests, b) developing a proposed staffing processes (ie recruitment, timelines, etc.), c) maintaining diversity in the workforce, d) providing advice in the face of new programs, or due to the elimination of programs. They are aiming at finishing this plan before June 30th. After the Human Resources Staffing plan has been finalized by the sub-committee the plan will be forwarded to Academic Senate for review. R Pires enquired about starting to move ahead with the new round of hirings before this plan is finalized. D Shipp responded that there will be no hold up, relative to the</p>	<p>Motion to recommend that J Stanskas vote in favor of Res 8.02. 2nd by K Kafela. Voice vote - Ayes unanimous.</p> <p>Motion to recommend J Stanskas vote against Res 10.02 by P Buckley. 2nd by D Hook. Voice vote - Ayes in majority, one abstention.</p>

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	New Business cont.	<p>Human Resource Allocation Plan cont. - completion of this plan, in the anticipated new hires for next year. A Aguilar-Kitibutr enquired about the workings of the proposed plan relative to the Educational Master Plan and the existing collegial consultation processes (ie Program Review) operating on each campus. J Stanskas stated that the Staffing Plan will respect the local decisions with respect to hiring. He added that the Ed Master Plan is there to inform the District's Strategic Plan. This Strategic Plan takes into account the HR Staffing Plan, the Fiscal Plan, and the strategic goals of the District.</p> <p>Tools Committee - D Shipp announced that the Tools Committee will be meeting April 20 to discuss student evaluations?</p> <p>D Shipp commended the work of the Senate's equivalence committee in assisting HR in sorting through the applications and helping in the evaluation of equivalencies.</p>	
	Old Business	<p>Student Success and Access Plan - J Stanskas announced this meeting on April 28 from 2 - 3:30p in NH 308. A mention was made that this was also Humanities Day.</p> <p>Faculty and Staff Needs Assessment Ad-Hoc Committee will be meeting this coming Friday, April 9th (2p in B111) and will be sending a prioritized list to the President.</p> <p>Student Election Process - Javier ? spoke about the for the voting process on the Student Body Center Fee Election (see attachment). The process is similar to the process in performing student evaluations. P Buckley stated that this might interfere with mid-terms. There was some clarification of the process made in response to faculty questions. E Millican offered to give extra credit to his Poly Sci students to aid the process.</p> <p>Updates from Dirkson Lee and Jennifer Mendoza will be made at the next Academic Senate meeting.</p>	
4: 29	Adjournment		