

Senators present:

Nena Baldizon-Rios
Morrie Barembaum
Doug Deaver
Michael DeCarbo
Steven Deeley
Corinna Evett
Jim Isbell
Danielle Martino
Evangeline Mathews
Mary Mettler
Craig Nance
Andy Salcido

Randy Scott
Nooshan Shekarabi
Jolene Shields
Barbara Sproat
Melinda Womack

Non-Voting Members

CIC
Craig Rutan

Guest(s):

John Weispfenning

Call to Order

I Order of the Agenda

II Approval of Minutes

III Public Comments

IV ASG Report

None given

V Action

A Approval of the 2011 Midterm Accreditation report

- 1 Dean Weispfenning stated that, due to timelines and the nature of the study, the report is 90% finished; what remains is editing and finding a few items of evidence.
- 2 By Friday (September 2), 95% shall be completed.
- 3 By Friday (September 9), 99% shall be completed.
- 4 Professor DeCarbo asked that the approval be modified to read:

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the 2011 Midterm Accreditation report to the Board pending editing and evidence updates.

- a President Barembaum seconded the modification.

The modified action item is approved without dissent.

VI Discussion Items

A Budget Update - President Barembaum (Appendix 1 – 2011-12 Budget Update)

- 1 Peter Hardash has yet to post his budget update on line; but it should soon be available.
- 2 There will be a 6.21% workload reduction.
- 3 There was an increase in student fees from \$26 to \$36 this Fall and there will likely be an increase to \$46 in the Spring.
- 4 There will be approximately 600 to 700 sections cut throughout the District.
- 5 Slide 6 of the Appendix contains the following information regarding the triggers for cuts.
 - a The tentative budget was adopted in spring with the assumptions of trigger 0.
 - b The recommendation is to assume trigger 1 for the adopted budget that will be passed at

the next board meeting.

6 The Associate Dean of Athletics will not be filled, nor the Dean of OEC or SCC Plant Manager.

a SCC will be hiring an administrative secretary for MS and a Graduation Specialist.

During discussion:

Professor Nance stated: if our surplus continues to grow this year, I shall go to the board and bring this to their attention; we need to be vigilant. Why must we find the \$4,000.00 for a water fountain for the U buildings rather take it from our surplus?

Professor Evett stated that this is another place where Faculty can raise their voices when they serve on committees and can identify areas in need of funding.

Professor Evett reported that President Vazquez has asked that the departments have a discussion for what classes may be cut.

Professor Nance said that 6% was a number first bantered around for cuts but predicts it will be higher.

Professor DeCarbo reported that the Department of Communication has begun this process wherein each faculty member has identified two classes that could be cut from her/his schedule and that at their next department meeting they will look at these options and choose the ones that will hurt the students the least in regards to course offerings, schedule and those necessary for a degree.

B Faculty Hiring Process - President Barembaum

- 1 There is no expectation of hiring but we must still go through the process.
- 2 The timeline for the process will be coming soon.

C Robert's Rules/Minutes - Professor DeCarbo

C1 Operation of meetings

- 1 It is necessary for the Senate to determine how meetings should proceed:
 - a Shall the Senate go to a pro then con form? If arguments are not made against the previous speaker then the discussion is closed.
 - b Shall the Senate limit the time for discussion?
 - c Shall the Senate allow the speaker to yield the floor to the next speaker?
- 2 Regardless of what form, it is necessary that we respect that only the speaker has the floor and that it cannot taken from her/him.
- 3 Professor DeCarbo recommends that the Senate direct the President of the Senate to monitor and direct discussion; that a speaker takes the floor only if recognized by the President, and that only the President may take the floor from a speaker. Further, that the President keeps track of the order in which Senators have raised their hands so that discussion may proceed fairly.
- 4 Upon discussion, the Senate agreed with the above recommendation, stipulating that in times of need (i.e. heated discussions, time constraints, etc.) the body may move to put further restrictions on the process of discussion and debate.

C2 Minutes Professor DeCarbo asked, "How detailed should the minutes be?"

- 1 As little as possible?
 - a The advantages: easier to read, the records cannot be used by one against another, the senate should only report action taken.

- b The disadvantages: the minutes are not rich in detail, reasons for decisions may not be clear, recording of history is sparse.
- 2 As much as possible?
 - a The advantages: rich in detail, history of decisions can be easily traced, things said in public meetings are available to the public they serve.
 - b The disadvantages: time consuming to read (and create), administration can use some things said against non-tenured faculty, may be divisive.

During discussion:

Professor Martino stated that she did not see a need to see who said what.

Professor Womack said that it was not necessary for a “he said/she said” but the minutes are a historical device and that there must be enough on them so someone can track down the origins of policy and debate, as well as follow the flow of discussion.

Professor Nance argued that the minutes should be generalized so as to be more reader friendly.

Professor Sproat stated that detailed minutes were very helpful to the “newbies”.

Professor Evett said that at the Exec Board meeting it was discussed that we have a digital recording of the Business meetings, so as to ease the task on the secretary, allow the Secretary to participate and have an accurate recording of the meeting for when there may be questions as to what was said.

Professor Elschlepp cautioned that recording maybe inhibit conversation; however, if it could be guaranteed that the recordings not be made public, then it should be done.

Professor Nance agreed that recordings should only be made available to the Senate.

Professor Martino asked if we need to talk our constituents about the recordings and the minutes.

President Barembaum responded that we should talk to our constituents about the minutes, but the recording would be procedural for the Senate.

Upon much discussion, it was agreed that the Business meetings would be recorded; and upon adoption of the minutes for the meeting to which they pertained they would then be deleted.

Professor DeCarbo asked if there was any objection to recording the next meeting, there was none.

D Task Forces (communication)

1 Professor Evett asked to clarify who is serving on the Grants Informational Task Force and determined it is Professors Deeley, Sproat, Wagner, and Evett.

2 There was a Committee Governance task force that was created but seems to be disbanded; so as to create a communication flow chart for the Faculty, Professor Evett moved:

The Academic Senate create a Communication Task Force that will create a communication flow chart for the Faculty to be posted on the website by November 29.

a Professor Womack seconded the motion.

The Task Force is formed without dissent.

Professor DeCarbo will chair and staff the Task Force.

E Program Discontinuance/Reduction/Suspension/Reinstatement

1 Professor Evett moved:

The Academic Senate create a Task Force to be charged to review the Program Discontinuance policy and create policies for program reduction, suspension and/or reinstatement and to report back to the Senate by April 17, 2012

a Professor DeCarbo seconded the motion.

- 2 Professor Rutan reported that the Program Discontinuance is an Administrative Regulation and is mutual agreed upon by both Academic Senates.
- 3 Professor Rutan summarized AR6134 (Appendix 2 – Program Discontinuance)
- 4 Professor Nance questioned whether this Task Force should be formed without notifying and/or including the SAC Senate.
- 5 Professor DeCarbo asked Professor Evett whether she would accept as a friendly amendment to her motion, the following:
The Academic Senate request the Academic Senate at Santa Ana College to join in our to be created Task Force; charged to review the Program Discontinuance policy and create policies for program reduction, suspension and/or reinstatement and to report back to the Senate by April 17, 2012.
- 6 Professor Evett accepted the friendly amendment.
- 7 During discussion, many agreed that such a Task Force should be formed, but thought that procedurally, SAC should be communicated with first before the formation of the Task Force.

The Task Force is created with a vote of 12 to 5.

- a Professor Rutan agrees to serve as Chair of the Task Force.

VII Reports Discussion

A Curriculum - Professor Rutan

- 1 SCC has completed its stand alone course training as required by TITLE V.
- 2 SCC will attend that South Regional Meeting on September 23rd.

B SAC Senate Report - Professor DeCarbo

- 1 The SAC Senate has yet to meet.

C Technology – Professor Scott

- 1 TAG met twice over the summer and is working to define their duties.

D Facilities – Professor Nance

- 1 The loop road will be completed this November.
- 2 The Gym completion date is now predicted for May 2012.
- 3 The Humanities completion date is now predicted for March 2013.
- 4 The administration is deciding whether to pay to repair the MNO ceiling or go through litigation.
- 5 The Signalization for the two new entrances may happen as soon as March, but it may be a year.
- 6 Bids for the surveillance system will now be accepted by the board.
- 7 Water fountains will be installed in the Science Center.
- 8 They are working to solve the vacuum that is created in the Science Center when emergencies are triggered.
- 9 The fume hoods in the chemistry labs are insufficient to pull up carcinogens; this is being remedied.

E College Council - President Barembaum

- 1 Budget information from the council was presented.

F President's Report

- 1 Soldiers to Scholars Reception will take place September 15, 6 to 8:30
\$50.00 for a mixer at the Orange County Sheriff's Regional Training Academy
- 2 The board will be meeting at SCC on September 26th, 4:30 in SC 105

SCC Academic Senate Minutes – Approved September 20, 2011
Senate Business Meeting August 30, 2011

Professor Martino moved to adjourn
Professor Evett seconded the adjournment.
The meeting is adjourned without dissent.



**2011-2012
Budget Update**

Board of Trustees Meeting
August 22, 2011

1

1. State Budget Update
 - Latest information
2. RSCCD Proposed Adopted Budget highlights

2

**State Budget Update
What's new?**

- Chancellor's Office Budget Workshop
 - "Blue Book"
 - Details on apportionments
 - Workload measures
 - Apportionment reductions
 - Reduced funded FTES targets
 - Categorical program entitlements
 - Trigger 1 and Trigger 2 scenarios
- So far, state revenue collections are well below estimates
 - Economy sluggish
 - Bad sign for chances of collecting additional \$4 billion in revenue dependent on holding off "trigger" cuts

3

**State Budget Update
Community Colleges**

- Net \$290 million reduction in state apportionment funding
 - RSCCD - (\$7,961,366)
 - 6.21% workload (FTES) reduction (negative growth)
- Increases student fees from \$26 to \$36 per unit
- Student fee collection shortfall acknowledged to be \$25 million statewide in 2011/2012
 - Estimate additional RSCCD funding reduction of approximately \$800,000
 - Unique to each district dependent on BOG waivers
 - Will be applied as general apportionment deficit

4

State Budget Update

- Mid-year funding cut tiers or "triggers" if certain levels of additional \$4 billion in revenue doesn't materialize
 - Trigger 1 and Trigger 2
 - Automatic as of January 1, 2012
 - Based on lower assessment of DOF or LAO
- Additional apportionment cash deferrals
 - Year end state apportionment deferrals (IOU)
 - RSCCD = \$24,091,280 as of June 30, 2012
 - 30.7% of total state general apportionment

5

**State Budget Update
Mid-Year Triggers**

- **Trigger 0**
 - at least \$3 of the \$4 billion materializes: No additional funding cuts
- **Trigger 1**
 - between \$2 and \$3 billion of revenue materializes: \$30 million apportionment cut, backfilled by an increase in fees of \$10, from \$38/unit to \$46/unit (January 1, 2012)
 - RSCCD - additional \$763,070 funding cut
- **Trigger 2**
 - between \$0 and \$2 billion of new revenue materializes: Trigger 1 cut and fee increase **PLUS** a \$72 million additional apportionment cut
 - RSCCD - additional \$1,831,368 funding cut
 - **Combined = \$2,594,438 mid-year funding cut**

6

Will the Triggers be pulled?

- CCLC has advised district's to prepare for Trigger 2 mid-year funding reductions
- State Chancellor's Office is not providing any advice or direction for districts
 - Each district has unique set of circumstances
- K-12 districts are being advised to prepare for Trigger 2 reductions
 - Seven days less instructional school year
- Prudent to at least prepare for Trigger 1
 - RSCCD recommendation in Budget Assumptions

7

What is included in RSCCD Proposed Adopted Budget?

- Workload measures funding reduction
 - \$7,961,366 apportionment reduction
 - Partially offset by \$7.5 million reduction already budgeted last year
 - 6.21% reduction in funded FTES (1,893.61)
- Employee health benefit cost increases, Unemployment Insurance increases, PERS increases
 - Approximately \$2.5 million in additional ongoing costs

8

RSCCD Budget

- Therefore, additional \$3.5 million in ongoing cost reductions are necessary for Proposed Adopted Budget
 - \$2.5 million for additional new ongoing expenditures
 - \$1.0 million in anticipation of Trigger 1 mid-year reduction

9

RSCCD Budget

- Campuses/Centers and District Operations have identified the required \$3.5 million in additional reductions for the Proposed Adopted Budget
 - Santa Ana College - \$2,005,500
 - 57.30% share of combined fixed/discretionary costs
 - Santiago Canyon College - \$917,700
 - 26.22% share of combined fixed/discretionary costs
 - District Operations - \$576,800
 - 16.48% share of combined fixed/discretionary costs

10

2010-2011 Ending Fund Balance

- Approximately \$46 million as of June 30, 2011
 - June 30, 2010 - \$32 million
- Increase of approximately \$14 million
 - \$7.5 million budgeted expected mid-year reduction that didn't materialize
 - \$3.1 million - funded 2.21% growth
 - \$2.2 million - two years OEC center funding
 - Approximately \$1.2 million in cost savings primarily due to funded vacant positions
- Ending balance funds are **one time** funds
 - Proposed Adopted Budget spends down approximately \$7 million (estimate)
 - Trigger 2 implementation will spend down an additional \$1.8 million

11

Ongoing Concerns

- State and National economies not performing to state revenue expectations
- If Trigger 2 is implemented
 - An additional reduction in RSCCD state funding
 - Additional \$1.8 million mid-year reduction
 - Further encroachment on ending balance
 - Too soon to tell...
- Cash deferral concerns
 - \$24 million as of June 30, 2012
 - Additional new deferrals?
- Additional Prop 98 tinkering?

12

Proposed Adopted Budget Timeline

- Adopted Budget Assumptions recommendations
 - On tonight's docket for approval
 - Includes anticipated Trigger 1 reductions
- Proposed Adopted Budget approval
 - September 12th Board meeting
 - September 15th Adopted Budget due date

13

Program Discontinuance - AR6134

Rancho Santiago Community College District

PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE - AR6134

January 2000

The procedures are based on the guiding principles that: 1) considerations of program discontinuance are distinct from program improvement; 2) if there is mutual agreement between the affected faculty of a program and the administration, and when students will not be adversely affected, the processes of this procedure [i.e., two semesters of program review and convening of the Program Discontinuance Review Committee of (PDRC)] do not need to go into effect; 3) program discontinuance is an academic and professional matter for local academic senates, and; insofar as the procedure impacts employment, it is a matter of collective bargaining in all cases. As a result, this procedure will be kept separate from development of Department/Discipline portfolios. In addition, if this procedure needs to be invoked, or if a program is to be discontinued on the basis of mutual faculty/Administrator agreement, the bargaining unit will be notified and given the necessary time to resolve the issues of collective bargaining.

Vital academic considerations include effects on students, balancing the college curriculum, education and budget planning and issues of regional coordination for occupational programs. Qualitative as well as quantitative data need to be used as a result. Qualitative data is less statistical and more value-laden. The quality of the breadth and depth of the curriculum, and the teaching and learning process should be taken into consideration. Student satisfaction and how the program is perceived by articulating universities or employing business and industry are factors as well. Quantitative data include weak enrollment trend (e.g., lack of demand); insufficient frequency of course section offerings to assure reasonable availability for students; poor retention; poor term-to-term persistence for those in courses in the major; poor rate for student achievement of program goals; lack of demand in the workforce; or unavailability of transfer major.

1. A review process will go into effect when the department chair, in consultation with the discipline faculty, and/or the administrator working directly with the program in consultation with the faculty and the Vice President of Academic Affairs, using the factors listed above, have determined that a program is in jeopardy. Department/discipline members and the administrator working directly with the program will identify aspects, e.g., qualitative and quantitative data, which apply to the specific program and then do a preliminary analysis of items related to the mission of the college, enrollments trends, workforce-related issues, completion rates, articulation issues, course availability (both lower and upper division), and outside agency requirements. Then, formal notice, including the factors used to make the determination, will be sent to the President of the Academic Senate, the chair of the Curriculum and Instruction Council, the collective bargaining unit, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs.
2. The department/discipline will then work internally for two semesters to review program goals and attempt to ameliorate the situation. Ongoing documentation will be needed. Notice of process will again be sent to the President of the Academic Senate, the chair of the Curriculum and Instruction Council, the bargaining unit, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the President of the college.
3. After two semesters, a comparative study will be conducted on the quantitative/qualitative factors identified as pertinent to the program. If the situation persists, the area administration, in consultation with the faculty, will ask the District Curriculum and Instruction Council to convene the Program Discontinuance Review Committee to make a recommendation. This committee will hold meetings with provision for public comment, and will have a first and second reading of action items. The membership of this committee will include the District Curriculum and Instruction Council Chair or designee as ex officio member, the affected department chair(s), one faculty member, chosen by the department chair(s) from within the program or related discipline and two from outside the program, (chosen by the Curriculum and Instruction Council Chair with the approval of the Curriculum and Instruction Council), the affected Division Dean/Administrator and the Vice President(s) of Academic Affairs. If a program is unique to either SAC or SCC, the designated

committee makeup will include the department chair, faculty and administrators from the affected college.

4. If it is determined by the Program Discontinuance Review Committee that the program should be discontinued, by an absolute majority, there will also be a recommendation for a phase-out period which will vary from program to program to ensure that all students in the program have the opportunity to complete the program, and to ensure that all students in the program have the opportunity to complete the program, and to ensure that the bargaining unit may resolve contractual issues for faculty in the affected program. These recommendations will then be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval.