

# 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

March 5, 2013

1:30 pm-3:00 pm D-221

#### **Present:**

##### **Senators**

Aguilera, Leonor  
Barembaum, Morrie  
Breedon, Emma  
Carrion, Rudy  
Cummins, Shawn  
Deaver, Doug  
DeCarbo, Michael  
Deeley, Steve  
Elchlepp, Elizabeth  
Evelt, Corinna

Granitto, James  
Hovanitz, Eric  
Martino, Danny  
Matthews, Evangeline  
Mettler, Mary  
Nance, Craig  
Salcido, Andrew  
Scott, Randy  
Shekarabi, Nooshan  
Sproat, Barbara  
Wagner, Joyce

##### **Non-Voting Members**

CIC: Rutan, Craig  
ASG: none

##### **Guests:**

Jordan, Ethel  
Smith, John  
Voelcker, Aaron

#### **Absent:**

Isbell, James  
Shields, Jolene

- I. Order of the Agenda (no changes)
- II. Approval of Minutes
  - A. The minutes of February 19, 2013, were approved (moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Deaver).
- III. Public Comments
  - A. Prof DeCarbo:
    1. The Commencement Committee is piloting a new process for the selection of the faculty commencement speaker.
      - a. All people interested in being nominated for faculty speaker at commencement can submit their own names or the name of someone who has approved the submission.
      - b. The list of people interested in speaking will be forwarded for a vote to the students who petition for graduation.
    2. The change in process is to avoid having people be selected and then decline.
  - B. Prof. Shekarabi: The Faculty Development Committee had sent out email asking for specific ideas for Fall 2013 Flex to make it more interesting. Please respond by March 8.
  - C. Prof. Nance: It is unprofessional for faculty to make statements like "I was never very good at math anyway."
    1. Similar statements are not usually made about other disciplines.
    2. It sends the wrong message to students.
  - D. Prof. Smith: FACCC had an Advocacy and Policy Conference in Sacramento on March 3 and 4.
    1. Even though our Union offered to pay room and board for attendees, few faculty from SAC or SCC showed up. It is important to become involved.
    2. Prof. Smith met with 3 of the 6 California representatives that directly affect our service area.
    3. He would like to invite all of these Representatives, on behalf of faculty, to visit SCC to see how well SCC is growing. If you have thought, ideas, or possible dates for such visits, let Prof. Smith know.
  - E. Prof. Deaver: Sustainability event, Tuesday, April 23, from 10-2.

1. The District Sustainable RSCCD Committee had a visit from representatives from the AQMD and the AQI last November. These representatives offered to visit SCC and SAC and talk to the students about good practices.
  2. There will be booths and demonstrations by Coast Keepers and other environmental groups.
  3. As incentives, there will be food trucks, possible Priuses to test drive, and maybe a raffle for a bicycle.
  4. The 288-person auditorium in the Humanities building may be available for two 1-hour presentations on air quality and water quality.
  5. Prof. Deaver is hoping that ASG will name the event and sponsor booths. A long-term goal is to encourage the formation of a student group focused the environment.
  6. If you have ideas and/or students that are interested in environmental issues, send them to Prof. Deaver.
- F. Prof. Jordan: Continuing Education wishes to invite faculty to an open house in the S-buildings at SCC on March 18 from 1:30-2:30. A challenge will be to see if you can find all the mirrors from the former fitness center.
- G. Prof. Hovanitz: The Chronicle of Higher Education had an article on March 5, 2013, about the disconnect between higher education and business. Businesses feel that students are not qualified for many of the available jobs.

#### IV. ASG Report (none)

#### V. Action Items

- A. Resolution SP2013.2: Resolution for Adoption of Revised Bylaws 2/2013
1. **Resolution SP2013.2 was approved without dissent** (moved by Prof. Granitto and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi).
- B. Resolution SP2013.1: Resolution for Adoption of Revised Constitution 2/2013
1. **Resolution SP2013.1 was approved without dissent** (moved by Prof. Granitto and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi).
  2. The Constitution will be sent out to the entire faculty for a vote.
- C. Resolution SP2013.4: Resolution in Support of Splitting the Department of Earth, Space, and Physical Sciences
1. Comments:
    - a. Since the Science Building has been completed, there is less need for the individual disciplines to work together as a group.
    - b. Each discipline now has multiple full-time faculty members.
    - c. The Geology faculty was against the split because they wanted to stay part of a group which can have a larger voice.
    - d. Release time has already been discussed.
    - e. The effective date of July 1, 2013 was supposed to have already been added to the resolution.
  2. A motion to suspend the rules and vote on the resolution was approved without dissent (moved by Prof. Martino and seconded by Prof. Deaver).
  3. **Resolution SP2013.4 with revisions was approved without dissent** (moved by Prof. Martino and seconded by Prof. Nance).

#### VI. Discussion Items

- A. Planning Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee (Prof. Evett)
1. Changes to the proposed committee structure document since the February 19 Senate meeting:
    - a. To maintain consistency with other documents, the Senate is pictured on the same line as the President.
    - b. A noncredit and an at-large faculty member had been added.
    - c. Three Classified member were added.
  2. Discussion:
    - a. Should a Library faculty member be added?
    - b. Should the Student services/Support services representatives be specified, and should they be faculty or classified?
    - c. Should the choice of the classified members be open to CSEA or should they be specifically delineated.
    - d. Will the PIE committee, as proposed, be too large?
    - e. The proposed committee membership would consist of more than 50% faculty. How will administration and classified feel about this?
    - f. The response to the above concern was that the committee just makes recommendations to College Council; it does not make the final decisions.
  3. Recommended changes:
    - a. Add a Library position.
    - b. Remove the at-large position.

- c. Include one faculty from Student Services, most likely a Counselor.
  - d. Include one classified from Student Services and allow the other two to be filled by CSEA.
4. Prof. Evett will make the changes and send out the revised document for more feedback.

B. Hiring Process Task Force

1. The HPTF will bring forward changes using the formal resolution process.
2. Today, the HPTF is asking for feedback about how the final ranking is determined.
  - a. The proposal is that faculty get packets, review and rank, submit, votes are made public, and that result gets added into minutes without further discussion.
  - b. Reasoning:
    - i. The current process was put in place to avoid the advantages of passionate appeals.
    - ii. Senators are supposed to consult with constituents before voting; so changing a ranking after additional discussion might not allow constituents a voice.
3. Comments and Questions:
  - a. The process should indicate the minimum number of Senators that either need to submit rankings or abstain in order for the Senate to consider the ranking valid.
  - b. Since the initial ranking is final, enough time needs to be given for Senators to respond.
  - c. A decision needs to be made about whether to include late ballots.

C. International Student Program (ISP) (Prof. Evett)

1. Power Point presentation:
  - a. Stage I: Serve F-1 Visa students.
    - i. These students need to be guaranteed 12 units, are interested in credit units, and are planning to transfer.
  - b. Stage II: Implement SCC American Language Institute (ALI).
    - i. The ALI will serve credit and not-for-credit students with primarily noncredit courses.
    - ii. Funding is similar to community services programs where students pay completely for courses.
    - iii. This is a one month program for visitors and will offer intensive ACE/ESL classes that focus on conversational English and cultural activities.
    - iv. Components will expand to serve to F-1 Visa students.
  - c. Stage III: Not-for-credit, community service type courses.
    - i. Grow classes in the summer for teen-age students.
    - ii. Faculty are involved in creating the curriculum.
    - iii. Grow into a more intensive education program.
    - iv. Could include business people who are interested in immersion in the English language and the American culture.
  - d. Who:
    - i. Stephen Zhang is helping with connections in China.
    - ii. Currently credit and noncredit faculty will have the right of first refusal.
    - iii. Otherwise, instructors will be paid like contract employees.
    - iv. A coordinator and adjunct counselor will be needed by 2014/2015 academic year.
  - e. Enrollment Priorities: Current SCC students will not be displaced. ISP student will be encouraged to take lower enrolled courses, like those in the afternoons and evenings.
  - f. Funding: Our Chancellor has provided start-up funds. No money will be taken from the general fund. Pres. Vasquez is arranging for a \$250,000 loan from the SCC Foundation.
2. Comments:
  - a. The minimum number of students needed for the program to break even has been quoted as either 25 or 50 students.
  - b. Not-for-credit courses cannot make a profit; it is against the law. However, not all the courses in this program are not-for-credit, and SAC's ISP has been able to make a profit.
  - c. Linda Miskovic has experience with ISPs and has done a lot of research.
  - d. In the paperwork, intersession was listed for the ISP and the not-for-credit courses. This does not mean that intersession is back for the credit program.

e. F-1 students do have to demonstrate that they can pay for education without working.

D. Accreditation (Assistant Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment, Aaron Voelcker)

1. The Federal Department of Education has developed new regulations. It is up to the regional accrediting commissions to monitor the compliance of these regulations.
2. One new regulation states that institutions are to develop institution- set standards for student achievement.
  - a. A standard is a goal for a particular measure.
  - b. Standards are to be reasonable and will be monitored through our annual reports and self-evaluation. If we don't meet our standards, we need to have a plan in place for improvement.
  - c. This emphasis on student achievement results does not replace outcomes assessment.
  - d. Institutions must set standards for the following five measures:
    - i. Student success
    - ii. Fall-to-fall persistence
    - iii. Number of degrees
    - iv. Number of transfers
    - v. Number of certificates
  - e. Other measures can be included.
3. RSCCD annually publishes *12 Measures of Success*.
  - a. This report includes all the required measures except for fall-to-fall persistence.
  - b. This report usually comes out in February, but is late this year.
  - c. SCC can choose to adopt all these measures along with fall-to-fall persistence.
  - d. SCC will have to determine standards for each measure it adopts.
4. Dean Voelcker is asking for a recommendation from the Senate on which measures to adopt and what those standards should be.
  - a. The ACCJC 2013 Annual Report, due on March 31, asks for the standards for the five required measures.
  - b. Since the Senate recommendation would go to College Council, there needs to be a recommendation by the March 19 Senate meeting.
  - c. The Senate will be provided the past data for the 12 measures, hopefully in table form.
  - d. One method of determining standards is to increase slightly the average of the past data.
  - e. Standards can be changed in the future with written justification.

VII. Reports Discussion

A. Curriculum

1. The first draft of the 2013-2014 college catalog will arrive at SCC on Tuesday, March 12.
2. The program section will be laid out differently and will include outcomes for degree and certificate awards.
3. The new catalog will be compliant with the new repeatability requirements and will thus include the two MUN courses that were recently approved.

B. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment and Review Committee (see attached summary)

C. SAC Senate Report (see attached summary)

D. Technology (see attached summary)

E. Facilities

1. The Humanities building is a week behind.
2. The District took \$5-\$6 million of Measure E funds from SCC and sent the money to SAC.
  - a. The reasoning was to split the Measure E money equally.
  - b. However, the funds were moved in December without processes being followed.
  - c. SCC administration and faculty leadership is looking into options, including addressing the board.
  - d. There is major concern that the processes put into place by the POE committee are not being followed.
  - e. The next Board meeting will be Monday, March 11, at 4:30.

F. College Council

G. President's Report

Meeting Adjourned at 3:00 pm (Moved by Prof. Hovanitz and seconded by Prof. Deaver).

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Wagner

SCC-AS Secretary/Treasurer

## **Summary Report**

**Committee: Budget**

**Meeting date: March 4**

### **Content**

#### **1 Discussion items:**

A revised mission and responsibilities document was distributed and discussed.

The committee suggested improvements on the revision to be brought back at the next meeting.

The removal of Measure E funds was presented and discussed, it was noted that the funds were moved on December 6<sup>th</sup> seemingly without going through any formal process.

#### **2 Duties met:**

Review of the February expenditures and current balances.

#### **3 Actions proposed:**

#### **4 Events Planned:**

#### **5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated:**

## **Summary Report**

**Committee: Santa Ana College Academic Senate**

**Meeting date: March 12, 2013**

Disclaimer: The following are extremely unofficial highlights of what was perceived to have happened.

- There was a suggestion for dropping some of their academic awards (not faculty excellence) because of the lack of nominations and the large amount of work involved in organizing the processes.
- Discussion about the elimination of English N50:
  - Students placing at this level would need to take N50 at SCC or at CEC.
  - 212 high school students that took the placement exam this semester, placed into N50. These would need to be accommodated somehow.
  - The CEC senator said that noncredit is not a holding tank for any credit class. It only has certain curriculum and programs. It doesn't yet have curriculum to match N50.
  - The SAC English department had voted to drop the N50. Only a small percentage (1-3%) of students makes it from N50 to a transfer level English course.
- Email addresses for new faculty may be their webadvisor ID.
  - Faculty felt that webadvisor IDs should be more protected and hidden.
  - It is easier to email someone using their name instead of needing to know their webadvisor ID.
- CurricUNET has issues: Textbook information has sometimes been dropped and some edits do not seem to be sticking.
- The SAC Bookstore made a presentation:
  - When a student uses the SAC Bookstore site, they can also see the prices at Amazon and other sites and go directly to these sites.
  - The SAC Bookstore sells about 24% of possible textbooks.
    - Many students don't buy books from anywhere.
    - Because of this, the SAC Bookstore doesn't order enough books for all the students in a course. 42 titles went out of stock in the first few weeks of this semester. (That was 5% of the total titles).
  - The bookstore across the street from SAC only sells about 5-10% of what the SAC bookstore sells.

- Students can swap/sell books to other students through the bookstore webpage. Books with access codes have no buyback value.
- The SAC Scholarship Office made a presentation about how to review and rank applicants using the new online system.
- There was discussion about the ASCCC papers on Student Success and Counseling.
- The moving of the Measure E funds and the lack of process involved was mentioned. Planning is a huge concern for accreditation.

## **Summary Report**

**Committee: SLOARC**

**Meeting date: March 7, 2013**

## **Content**

### **1 Discussion items:**

- A. The Sustainable, Continuous, Quality, Improvement Document was discussed further. Some concerns:
  - a. Should all disciplines be included as a program, whether or not they also do award program SLOs?
    - a. The assessments for a Math degree are different than the assessments for a student taking multiple math courses for other reasons.
    - b. Some disciplines like reading don't offer an award.
  - b. Should honors, basic skills, general education, student success center, etc., also be counted as programs? How do we make assessment of these sustainable?
 

Further discussion will continue at future meetings and perhaps at a Summer Institute.
- B. ACCJC Annual Report
  1. Still waiting for some departments to turn in assessments.
  2. The updated numbers will be available at the March 21 meeting.
- C. Program Assessment
  1. "Percent of all college programs with SLO assessment results available to prospective students" is a question on the ACCJC annual report.
    - a. Compliance at SCC: The OIE&A will put program SLOs linked to courses assessments online. Faculty names will be removed from the assessments.
    - b. Concerns:
      - a. There is not currently a map between course SLOs (not just courses) and program SLOs. The course SLO results don't translate up to results for specific program SLOs.
      - b. Some course assessment reports do not include the % of students meeting the SLO. We would need this number if we are going to aggregate to a result for program SLOs.
- D. Accreditation sub standards IIA.2.h and i.: The committee discussed what would compliance might look like.
  - 2.h. "The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course's stated learning outcomes...."
  - 2.i. "The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes"

### **2 Duties met:**

- The OIE&A worked with Administrative Services and developed outcomes, means of assessment, and criteria for success for eight administrative services departments.
- An article on SLOs appeared in the March 2013 Hawk Talk.

### **3 Actions proposed:**

Posters publicizing the LCATs will be posted around campus.

### **4 Events Planned:**

There will be 2 Faculty Inquiry Groups this spring: Arts/Music and Political Science/History.

### **5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated: (none)**

## **Summary Report**

### **Faculty Development**

**March 12, 2013**

#### **Actions Taken:**

- Cindy Swift presented the online collaboration features of SharePoint 2010
- Discussed results of the faculty survey on flex ideas
- Discussed new flex suggestions
- Discussed repeat sessions & new sessions planned for fall flex week

#### **Events Planned:**

- Week 9 (April 1<sup>st</sup>) Second general call for flex proposals  
Week 11 (April 15<sup>th</sup>) All proposals are due and finalized  
Put calendar together  
Week 13 (April 29<sup>th</sup>) Senate approval (depends on meeting schedule)  
Week 14 (May 6<sup>th</sup>) Send all faculty email with flex calendar

**Items for Recommendation:** none

**Other Resources needed/acquired/allocated:** \$300 funding request for the Safety Training session will be made to the SCC Foundation. Due to John Hernandez by 3/22/2013.

**Useful Information:** none

## **Summary Report**

### **Committee: Honors Committee**

**Meeting date: 3/13**

#### **Content**

##### **1 Discussion items:**

- Consideration was given to having a ceremony of some sort to accompany the President Scholar award. A discussion is to follow with Lori Jordan about doing this at graduation and to see if President Vasquez would like to participate.
- We reviewed Psychology 100H quadrennial. There was some concern on this about how to distinguish the content of this course from the non-honors version. Will follow up with course author.
- We discussed the use of the new honors classrooms and the need to adjust class size. As of now 24 students are allowed to enroll. However, the new classes were designed for only 20. Tuyen would need direction for any change by May 1.
- We hope to have each department that teaches honors courses request in their DPP to restore funding and put in a faculty coordinator as per our pre-budget crisis model.

##### **2 Duties met:**

##### **3 Actions proposed:**

Elizabeth Elchlepp and Scott Howell plan to present a resolution to the Senate to ask to reestablish the Honors Program along the lines of the earlier model.

##### **4 Events Planned:**

##### **5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated:**