

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

## Minutes of September 21, 2011

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
3:00	<b>Call to Order</b>		
	<b>Approval of Minutes from Sept 7</b>		<b>Motion</b> by P Buckley, for approval of the <b>Minutes of Sept. 7 2nd</b> by V Anemelu. <b>Voice Vote</b> - Ayes unanimous.
	<b>President's Report</b>	<p>J Stankas read his report (see attachment) consisting of Update from <b>State Chancellor's Office</b> - J Stankas read some the highlights from the Student's Success Task Force (draft report). The contents of the eight chapters included topics such as; a) requiring student assessment, orientation, and ed plan development, b) requiring students receiving BOG waivers to meet certain conditions, c) requiring students to begin to address Basic Skills deficiencies in their first year, d) aligning course offerings to meet student needs, e) improve the education of Basic Skills students (ie concerns about moving courses more than two levels below college level into non-credit), f) revitalize professional development, g) enable state-wide leadership and increase coordination among colleges, h) align resources with student success recommendations (ie consolidation of certain categorical programs), g) do not implement outcome based funding (use an accountability scorecard). The deadline for the report is Dec.</p>	

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>New Business</b>	<p><b>Parking Fees and Budget Considerations</b> - V Chancellor Fiscal Services Charlie Ng discussed issues of increasing parking fees and associated distribution, parking lot maintenance costs. C Ng reviewed the proposed increases in parking fees (to \$40/ semester and \$20 Summer). The origin of the current iteration of this topic began as a result of discussion at District Assembly in response to the District budget situation at that time. The resulting recommendation increased fees to \$30/ semester and \$15 summer pending a recommendation from an ad hoc parking committee. After reviewing the current revenues generated by parking permits, the eligible costs that could be charged to parking was forecast (May) to be \$1 million for the District. If the parking fees were maxed out the expenditures would still exceed the revenues generated. As a result of this analysis the ad hoc committee recommended to raise parking fees to the level described above in the Spring 2012. Before this change is to be implemented C Ng was charged with gathering input and comment about the proposal. C Ng added that even after parking fees are increased there will still be a shortfall of \$200k. In the meantime the State allowable parking fee charge has been increased to \$50/ semester and \$25 summer. Certified carpoolers qualify for a reduction in these fees. Discussion ensued. Clarification in response to P Buckley included that the parking fee increase would apply to both faculty/staff and students. There will also be an increase in the daily parking fees from \$1 to \$2. C Parish observed no parking charge at Mt SAC. C Ng explained that the State empowers Colleges to collect parking fees. In the absence of fees the parking lot maintenance comes directly from the general fund of the college. J Notorangelo enquired about constituencies not currently being charged for parking, and secondly is this increase connected to the decision not to build a parking structure. C Ng responded that there is no relationship between fee increases and the parking structure decision. As for uniform enforcement of parking fees there has been some inconsistency in the enforcement at District site locations. Plans are in place to rectify these inequities by Oct. C Ng is not aware of any policy identified constituents that are excluded from parking fees. R Pires enquired about the fate of parking fee revenues. C Ng reviewed that a Parking Fee Fund (a restricted program where revenues and costs must be balanced) exists (separate from the General Fund) and receive these funds.(Parking citations go into the General Fund) Any costs associated with parking lot activity are charged to the Parking Fund. Any excess costs must be covered by the General Fund. R Pires recommended since citations resulting from parking enforcement is a cost coming from the Parking</p>	

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>New Business cont.</b>	<p><b>Parking Fees and Budget Considerations cont.</b> - Fund any revenues generated by citations should go back to the Fund. C Ng related that this proposal is currently was already made to the District-wide Budget Committee. In discussions on this proposal the Parking citations are considered to be an unrestricted revenue source, if the citations are incorporated into the restricted Parking Fund then flexibility in moving funds to cover shortfalls in other areas is lost. The District-wide Budget Committee therefore did not support this proposal. C Ng (x4021) encouraged questions be directed to him on this issue. Campus parking issues should be directed to Jim Hansen's Office (VP Admin Serv @ Valley).</p> <p><b>Candidates for Academic Senate President 2012 - 2014 - V</b> Anemelu reviewed the procedure used to Call for Nominations for AS President. She reported that at the end of the interval there were seven nominees, of which only one did not decline. V Anemelu called for nominations from the floor in accordance to the By Laws of the Senate. Since J Gilbert was the only nominee that accepted a motion was made to accept his nomination by acclimation. Elections Committee will now send out a ballot with J Gilbert's name and a blank for write-ins. Any write-ins must accept nominations <b>before</b> being added to the ballot.</p> <p><b>Reports from Divisions</b> - R Pires reported that the discussions at their division meeting were connected with the stresses (on students and faculty) connected with the grim budget news.</p>	<p><b>Motion by Acclimation to forward Jeremiah Gilbert's name to the Campus</b> by K Kammer. <b>2nd</b> by E Szumski <b>Voice vote</b> - Ayes unanimous.</p>

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
3:30	<b>Old Business</b>	<p><b>Prerequisite Discussion (part 3)</b> - J Stankas summarized the pre-requisite discussion summary from the Sept 7 Senate meeting. He then tasked the Senate with developing a plan of action linked with each of the listed items.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Group I - Algje Au et al</p> <p>Student Support - more hours and staff available</p> <p>Instructional - <b>program specific basic skills classes</b></p> <p>Administrative - More <b>institutional research support, Cultural change in practices</b> (consistent, best practices in terms of retention of students, student success, etc), Utilize <b>faculty researchers in collaborative efforts</b> at institutional research projects.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Group II - Amy Avelar et al</p> <p>Student Support - a) During the process of increasing student success via pre-requisites, assessment, non-repeatability ensure administratively that low enrolled classes are not cut (in writing) for 2 to 5 years. b) Collect data during transition to assess whether classes need to be cut. Simple visual pathway for students to see the pre-requisite pathways through their course sequences (flowcharting), c) let the Dept content experts decide upon the pre-req appeal process, rather than appeals being administratively decided, d) the Dept meets to decide upon a course's pre-reqs in collaboration with other Dept members.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Group III - Nori Sogomonian et al</p> <p>Administrative Considerations - a) ensure adequate resources for student support (ie increased tutoring and library hours and personnel, adequate pre-req course availability), b) allow low enrolled classes to continue through the transition period, c) use consistent language when referring to processes (eg pre-req appeals, challenge etc) in the college catalog and schedule, d) revisit the appeal process and create an agreed upon appeals process and document these agreements</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Group IV - Joel Lamore et al</p> <p>Institutional Considerations - a) Basic Skills commitment that increases the stability of offerings over time, b) CTE courses - a study that identifies the needs for each of the courses,</p>	29:25

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>Old Business cont.</b>	<p>Group IV - Joel Lamore et al (cont)</p> <p>c) Short term and accelerated course offerings (eg 8 week reading course rolling into an 8 week English course).</p> <p>Student Support Considerations - a) complete the student support services promised.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Group V - Jeremiah Gilbert et al</p> <p>Student Support - Library needs staffing</p> <p>Organizational - a) Locally defined rubrics to identify required pre-reqs, b) dialog to support the development of rubrics occur during flex days or Special Topic Senate Days.</p> <p>Administrative - Determining the number of students needing a particular pre-req and linking to appropriate number of classes available. College commitment in writing.</p> <p>Instructional - wide array of pre-req offerings, low unit (1 or 2) pre-req course offerings.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>J Stanskas guided the Senate to distinguish between efforts requiring on-going funding versus efforts that could be initiated through one-time funding.</p>	

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>Committees</b>	<p><b>Ed Policy</b> - EDCT charge in AP 2225, R Pires reviewed the recommended changes to this committee (see attachment).</p> <p><b>Student Services</b> - Wait list. A Aguilar-Kitibutr reviewed the committees look into the wait list process and will involve DCS and other college entities (eg A and R).</p> <p><b>Personnel Policy</b> - Individual Faculty Development Plans - A Au summarized her committees review of these processes (see attachments). She presented the guidelines for IFDPs as articulated in the Flex Calendar Program and also review the new Reflection Summary form. She emphasized that the utility of the Reflection Summary form is to help guide the planning and presentation of appropriate professional development activities. J Lamore requested that there should be some informational sessions concerning the IFDPs. A Au added that Prof Develop Comm will be offering such sessions.</p> <p><b>CTE</b> - no report.</p> <p><b>Financial Policy</b> - K Barnett reported that \$400 million in revenues have been cut for CCC, increase in fees from \$26 to \$36 per unit (= \$110 million increase in rev), net cut \$290 million. Additionally \$129 million deferred payments statewide. Total state deferral = \$961 million (about 17% of current budget). District budget update - is balanced under the worst case scenario (7.7% decrease in state funded enrollment and revenue). Despite these cuts the college will still increase enrollment by 3%.</p> <p><b>Equity and Diversity</b> - no report.</p> <p><b>Legislative Policy</b> - no report.</p> <p><b>Elections</b> - no report.</p> <p><b>Basic Skills</b> - N Sogomonian was announced as the new Basic Skills chair.</p> <p><b>Curriculum</b> - L Hector reviewed the committees review of AP and BP in regards to pre-reqs. The committee is not currently ready to make a recommendation on these items.</p> <p><b>Program Review</b> - C Huston reminded Senators about the mini-needs assessment. She also provided a definition of equipment (= durable goods valued at over \$250 per request with one time funds, not to include cost of doing business items (eg toilet paper, etc).</p> <p><b>Professional Development</b> - C Hunter reported on the positive feedback from the flex activity day. 65 people participated in the Accreditation dialog activity. The summary of responses will be distributed soon.</p>	<p><b>Motion</b> by R Pires for approval of the Ed Policy recommended changes to the EDCT charge. <b>2nd</b> by P Buckley <b>Voice Vote</b> - Ayes unanimous.</p> <p>-----</p> <p><b>Motion</b> by J Notorangelo to direct Student Services Committee to look into the ramifications of the wait list process. <b>2nd</b> by R Pires <b>Voice Vote</b> - Ayes unanimous.</p>
	<b>Additional Reports</b>	<p><b>College President's Report</b> - no report.</p> <p><b>SBCCD-CTA</b> - no report.</p> <p><b>District Assembly</b> - no report.</p>	

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

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Further Action</b>
	<b>Public Comments</b>	A Aguilar-Kitibutr gave kudos to C Hunter for planning of Flex Day activities.	
	<b>Announce- ments</b>	G Kuck announced that Tre Glazatov has submitted her letter of resignation and is assuming new responsibilities at Loyola Marymount University. She will be maintaining her responsibilities on an hourly basis in association with the new DE administrator.	
4:31	<b>Adjourned</b>		