

Santiago Canyon College

Academic Senate

8045 E Chapman Ave
Orange, CA 92869-4512

(714) 628-4831
FAX (714) 532-2055

Minutes-Approved

Senate Business Meeting

October 2, 2012

1:30 pm-3:00 pm E-306

Present:

Senators

Breeden, Emma
Cummins, Shawn
Deaver, Doug
DeCarbo, Michael
Deeley, Steve
Evet, Corinna
Hovanitz, Eric
Martino, Danny
Matthews, Evangeline

Mettler, Mary
Nance, Craig
Salcido, Andrew
Scott, Randy
Shekarabi, Nooshan
Shields, Jolene
Sproat, Barbara
Wagner, Joyce
Womack, Melinda

Non-Voting Members

CIC: Rutan, Craig
ASG: none

Guests:

Kawa, Steve
James, Scott
Roe, Maureen

Absent:

Aguilera, Leonor Carrion, Rudy Elchlepp, Elizabeth Granitto, James Isbell, James

- I. Order of the Agenda (no changes)
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - A. The minutes of September 18, 2012 were approved (moved by Prof. Nance and seconded by Prof. Martino).
- III. Public Comments
 - A. Prof. Martino: Community Science Night will be on March 15, 2013. Volunteers are still needed. If you are interested, contact Prof. Martino.
 - B. Prof. Smith: An article in the *LA Times* differentiated between Proposition 30 and Proposition 38. We have a duty to inform people that if Prop 30 doesn't pass it will cost community colleges \$550 million over two years. At minimum, that would be a cut this spring and next year of 7.9%.
 - C. Prof. DeCarbo: ASG is organizing a faculty v. student basketball game on Nov. 8 from 5:00-7:00pm. Contact Prof. DeCarbo if you are interested.
 - D. Prof. Rutan: Dr. Brice Harris is the new California Community College Chancellor. He was the Chancellor of the Los Rios District in the Sacramento area. He is generally considered to be a good choice.
- IV. ASG Report (none)
- V. Discussion Items
 - A. Administrative Services Update (Steve Kawa)
 1. The current budget model is a hybrid of the older model and the way it is supposed to be. The revenue was adjusted by what was on budget last year to ensure that all full and part-time salaries were covered. A true model would give colleges the revenue they have earned from FTES or by being

a center. The colleges would pay back a percent to the District for services. The true model should start next year. SCC needs to be comfortable with what is paid to the District. The District will receive \$35 million overall; \$10 million in district-wide services and \$25 million for district operations. SCC will receive about \$30 million and SAC about \$70 million.

2. The Gymnasium is close to completion except for some touch-up work. There have been some incidents of people jumping into the pool and throwing rocks into the pool.
3. The Humanities Building is scheduled to be completed at the end of March. The building will be fitted with equipment and furniture, and faculty can move in at the end of spring or in summer. There has been a request to have a mock classroom and a mock office set up for faculty to look at and make choices.
4. The Loop Road project is near completion. The wood railing needs to be replaced. It should be done within two weeks.
5. The new entrances and signals should be ready in the next few weeks. A homeowners association has some issues with the signal on Santiago Canyon Road. Also, all the signals around SCC will need to be synchronized to avoid causing major backups.
6. The installation of video surveillance started yesterday. Between now and December, cable will be installed for the cameras on the exterior of buildings. In January, the company will begin boring the concrete and asphalt around the light poles to add cameras in the parking areas. That will take about 4 months of work and will eliminate some parking places.
7. The Maintenance and Operations (M & O) building will have a completed roof in about 3 weeks. Decisions need to be made on which people to move to that building. The maintenance crew and custodial staff will probably be moved. The Administrative Services clerical staff might remain in the Publications/Mailroom area to be available for backup.
8. Money for maintenance of parking lots has already been reserved from District revenue. Sometime in the next 6 months, parking lots 3, 4, 5 and part of lot 1 will be upgraded.
9. SCC needs to decide how to restack after the Humanities Building is occupied. The D-building will be the hub for the Mathematics Department. Money will have to be found to refurbish D. The portable buildings will need to be removed or be fireproofed. The 5 portable buildings near Athletics will go away when the Gymnasium is occupied, which will allow a half aisle more of parking spaces.
10. Questions from Senators:
 - a. *Where will MaSH and tutoring center go?* One thought was to move MaSH into E-203.
 - b. *What about students smoking in parking lots?* If ASG doesn't pursue a total smoking ban, the Facilities Committee would need to consider establishing smoking areas, perhaps with tables.
 - c. *Has BAPR decided to address District line item expenditures?* BAPR is to become the Fiscal Resource Committee (FRC). The District is taking a percentage this year but the budget allocation model states that from now on line items must be reviewed annually by the FRC.
 - d. *How much will the removal of the portables save?* \$15,000-20,000 on rent plus not having to pay for fire alarm system and sprinklers.

B. BSI Report (Prof. Roe)

1. The report is due to the state Chancellor's Office on October 10.
2. The report is a product of the joint effort of the SCC BSI Taskforce, the Orange County Learning Network and the State Chancellor's BSI Coordinator.
3. It was a 5- year grant but is currently in its 6th year without a foreseeable end.
4. The advance apportionment this year was \$184,758 for SCC. Some of the major expenditures categories are program/curriculum planning and development (\$110,000), advisement/counseling (\$20,000), and supplemental instruction and tutoring including continuing education (\$46,000).

5. The narrative is a response to the question: *What would we have done differently?* Some of the answers given were:
 - a. Starting projects with assessment tools already in mind.
 - b. Thinking long term with the goal of institutionalization.
 - c. Being more diligent in disseminating information.
 - d. Offering more staff development.
6. The data analysis section of the report involved tracking two cohorts of students using a tracking tool from the Chancellor's Office. The cohorts were students taking English 061 in Fall 2006 and those taking English 061 in Fall 2011. The percentage of students who successfully completed English 061 and then successfully completed English 101 the next semester was 37.2% for the earlier cohort and 47.9% for the later cohort. The disaggregate data using Hispanic students also showed improvement.
7. SCC was limited to listing three long-term goals:
 - a. Support the Writing Center with supplemental instruction and increase student success by 2%.
 - b. Support the MaSH with supplemental instruction and increase student success by 1%.
 - c. Strengthen educational pathways by having mandatory orientation during early decision, effective placement test preparation, and comprehensive Continuing Education tutoring.
8. Questions from Senators:
 - a. *You want to be more college-wide. Is that reflected in the 5 year plan?* No, because SCC was limited to listing 3 goals.
 - b. *The specific numbers for expenditures weren't listed in the report the Senators received. Is that going to come in another email?* Yes, Prof. Roe will send the updated report to Prof. Evett.
9. **The rules were suspended to allow a vote (moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Womack and passed without dissent). The motion to approve the report passed without dissent (moved by Prof. Mettler and seconded by Prof. Martino).**

C. Resolution F2012.2: Senate Support of Proposition 30 (Prof. Shekarabi)

1. Prof. Evett asked and received feedback from Michelle Pilati, the State Academic Senate president. As long as we are not spending funds to promote a position, we are within our rights to educate people.
2. Student Trustee Ahari had asked for the resolution to be approved before the October 8 Board Meeting.
3. If Proposition 30 doesn't pass, there may be a 24% reduction in our schedule. That would mean a cut of 500 classes across the District including 130-140 sections at SCC. We may be able to avoid the cut this spring by using the District's ending balance, but the cuts would still apply for next year.
4. Prof. Salcido expressed concerns about crossing a line if the Senate makes a recommendation on how people should vote instead of just addressing the pros and cons and consequences. Education Code 7054 states that no school district should use funds, services, supplies, or equipment for the purpose of urging support for any ballot measure.
5. Prof. Evett said that the call is to educate which is well within our purview. The Senate can state its support of Proposition 30.
6. Prof. Martino wanted to know whether it was appropriate to add a resolve stating clearly that the SCC Academic Senate is in support of Proposition 30. She also suggested that we attach the information Student Trustee Ahari presented last meeting as an appendix.
7. Prof. Rutan expressed concern that posting the resolution as it now stands on the Senate website would violate the Education Code.
8. Prof. Shekarabi will make revisions including attaching a pro/con statement. The revised resolution will be brought forward at the next meeting.
9. The majority of the Senators expressed general support, but the resolution still needs to be reworded.

D. Distance Education Discussion (Scott James)

1. Our Chancellor has committed to funding a part-time position this year, but the position will need to be flown internally by Human Resources and needs to be better defined. This might be the position that would be advocated for in the future.
2. There are various aspects to the current position: administrative, instructional design, and training/support.
 - a. The administrative aspect would be to have a leader to connect with the state Chancellor's Office, disseminate information, and deal with accreditation.
 - b. The learning focus includes instructional design and support for faculty and students. This is not necessarily distance education specific. The position our Chancellor had promised to support was geared toward innovation on campus. Duties would include fostering relationships with faculty, researching trends, and launching initiatives such as OER and Gamification.
 - c. SCC can't currently afford multiple positions. Scott James recommended a faculty Distance Education Coordinator position which would perform like a department chair and would also work with administration to produce policy.
3. Questions from Senators:
 - a. *Why is the name of the faculty position being changed from instructional designer to distance education coordinator?* It can be either title. The positions really should be separate but SCC doesn't have the luxury of having two positions. The distance education coordinator title can encompass the instructional design piece.
 - b. *What do you mean by the phrase "compliance at the dean level"?* This position shouldn't be an evaluation or compliance position overseeing other faculty. This position shouldn't have tension with the faculty but should be a faculty advocate. Administration can take care of evaluation and policy enforcement.
4. Further Discussion led by Prof. Evett. There are two issues: what do we want the current part-time position to look like and what do we want the position to look like in the future?
 - a. Pros for a faculty position: better collaboration with faculty, can direct accreditation, harder to get rid of (more consistency), and better understands the classroom.
 - b. Cons for a faculty position: will still count on the non-instructional side which may divert money from classes, must have some sort of minimum qualifications because they must be able to go back to the classroom if necessary, the position has administrative responsibilities.
 - c. Other comments
 1. No matter the decision about distance education, someone needs to support Blackboard.
 2. If SCC keeps a distance education program, we need to adequately support it.
5. Straw poll (**not an official vote**):
 - a. Should the part-time position funded by our Chancellor for this 2012-2013 academic year be a faculty position? 11-yes, 0-no, and 5-abstain.
 - b. What should the title be? (DEC=Distance Education Coordinator and ID=Instructional Designer) 6-both, 4-DEC, and 4-ID.

E. Enrollment Management (Prof. Rutan)

1. SCC is discussing having an enrollment management committee on campus. The District Enrollment Management Committee, DEMC, has no faculty representation.
2. Apportionment is based on FTES. There are three primary categories for funding: credit, career development and college preparation (at OEC and Centennial), and non-credit (basically non-existent right now).

3. A basic calculation would be $FTES = (\# \text{ of students}) \times (\text{total contact hours})/525$. Contact hours can be difficult to define.
 - a. A 3-unit course with 50 students would be 5.14 FTES.
 - b. A 3-unit course with 24 students would be 2.47 FTES.
4. The state sets a target FTES that we want to meet. There is no monetary benefit in going over. If our goal is to generate our FTES target using least amount of money, it is to our benefit to increase class size.
5. However, there are other issues to consider:
 - a. Class size might need to be limited due to safety and pedagogy issues.
 - b. Special populations, like honors, might dictate smaller class size.
 - c. Room size is also a limitation.
 - d. Our primary function is not to generate FTES but to educate students.
6. Title 5 states that the CIC has full authority to recommend the capacity of any course based upon sound pedagogical reasons. The State Academic Senate adopted a paper about addressing course maximums which faculty are encouraged to read. If enrollment capacity is set for a course, it must be done for student reasons and it holds for all sections of that course.
7. There has been discussion about including recommended course capacity on the course outlines of record in CurricUNET. If so, there would be a form for departments to fill out justifying their reasons for requesting that number. However, administration has the ultimate right of assignment and can mostly ignore a capacity recommendation except for safety reasons and anything written into the union contract.
8. Faculty need to become better educated on this issue because our College needs to develop a balanced schedule. Educated faculty will be able to have better, open dialogue with administration.
9. Questions from Senators:
 - a. *If a cap is put on a course, are instructors obligated to not exceed it?* Yes, that is what we are saying.

F. Senate Funding Process (Prof. Wagner) postponed.

VI. Reports Discussion

A. Curriculum

1. Profs. Bailey, Roe and Martino joined Prof. Rutan at a regional curriculum meeting, which included discussion of CIDs, transfer degrees, implementing prerequisites, and repeatability.
2. CIC will have a 2nd reading of the Course Suspension Policy at their October 8 meeting.

B. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment and Review Committee (Summary report was sent out)

C. SAC Senate Report (no report)

D. Technology (no report)

E. Facilities (no report)

F. College Council (no report)

G. President's Report

1. The District held district-wide strategic planning meetings about a year ago in response to the ACCJC recommendation regarding planning dictating budgeting.
 - a. An RSCCD planning model was developed in which plans from the Colleges inform the District planning, which then comes back and informs the Colleges.
 - b. Our current and past Senate leadership were involved in these planning meetings.
2. The District has revised its governance structure.

- a. RSCCD has a District Council with responsibilities that have been revised to include a larger planning component, serve like a central hub to which the other District committees report, and provide recommendations to our Chancellor. The new structure of the District Council is analogous to our local SCC College Council.
 - b. BAPR will be renamed the Fiscal Resources Committee, and its responsibilities have been revised.
 - c. The Planning and Organizational Effectiveness Committee, a new District committee, will act somewhat like our EMPC. A preliminary meeting with Eva Conrad (a planning consultant with whom we worked during the earlier mentioned District strategic planning meetings) will take place Oct. 9th.
 - d. The other District committees reporting to the District Council will be the Human Resource Committee, Physical Resources Committee (previously called the Facilities Committee), and the Technology Advisory Group.
3. The restructuring plan was presented to the Chancellor's Cabinet, District Council, and BAPR, and the process of changing over to the new committee names and structure has begun. The document is a draft, and as the committees begin working with their new charges, it is expected that some of the plan will be revised.
 4. Prof. Evett will send out a copy of the "RSCCD Revised District and College Governance Structure" document to the faculty, and she asks faculty to contact her with any questions, comments and/or concerns that they may have regarding the document.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 (moved by Prof. Hovanitz and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi).

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Wagner
SCC-AS Secretary/Treasurer