

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

Minutes of September 18, 2013

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	Call to Order		
	Approval of Minutes from September 4, 2013		Motion by J Hoyt for approval of the Minutes of September 4, 2013. 2nd by J Lamore. Voice vote - unanimous
	President's Report	<p>J Gilbert's report (attached) focused on the following:</p> <p>AB 955: many students and faculty attended the September 12 board meeting to express opinions. The bill has passed and awaits the governor's signature. Faculty are encouraged to convey their concerns. Last year, when Proposition 30 was being debated, the Executive Senate didn't take a stand but simply transmitted information.</p> <p>Employment Updates: several positions have been posted and will close on 9/23/13. Hiring committees have been formed except in the case of VPSS.</p> <p>K-16 Bridge Program: the Chancellor has informed Senate that the current MOU will not be moving forward or go to the Board. J Gilbert exhorts the Senate to stay vigilant in making sure its collective voice is heard. He noted that the Early Assessment Program was under President Buckley and a different Board.</p>	
	New Business	<p>K-16 Bridge Program Resolution (First Reading): Executive Committee was planning to write a resolution, but with the withdrawal of the MOU, voted not to proceed. The EAP will come to the full Senate through President Fisher's office. Any future K-16 initiative will not involve the Lewis Center; EAP will definitely go through the Senate.</p>	

**Academic Senate
SBVC**

AD/SS 207
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	New Business (cont)	<p>Campus Budget Committee: a handout (attached) was emailed to the Senate; it contains the Budget Committee's charge, membership details, and updated Collegial Consultation Flow Chart. The goal is to put a reconstituted Campus Budget Committee together. A Au looked through other campus's operations; it might be beneficial to spell out co- or tri-chairs as some others do. Also addressed are the time frames for members' terms. This would be a collegial consultation committee. Normally there are co-chairs: a manager and faculty member; two years is the normal term. G Fisher said the initial goal was to move forward with a Collegial Consultation committee. A problem is that with representation coming from each division, including VPs, now the number of divisions has changed. S Stark checked to see how other colleges determine membership. G Fisher agrees with J Gilbert that there must be a faculty co-chair. Existing committees are being weighed in the light of AP 2225. With many committees, information is out of date. She suggested that if we need a budget committee, and want to adjust the current document, we will have additional opportunities to bring all committees into line. She agreed that co-chairs be members of all collegial consultation committees. Following the successful motion, S Bangasser observed that Senate may wish to add the next layer of thinking and have a member from this proposed committee on the District Budget Committee.</p> <p>Mission, Vision, Values Review (attached). The Mission and Vision portions of the document were read by J Gilbert.</p> <p>Accreditation Standard 2A Small Group Review: Standard 2A was emailed to the Senate with various committee members requested to review select portions. C Parish, H Alexander, and A Au, all from Accreditation Committee, led the Senate in three discussion groups which addressed separate sections of the document. The goal was to gather feedback regarding word usage, omissions, and where to find missing evidence that substantiates needed information.</p> <p>Water Supply Technology Division Move: J Gilbert described how division changes often happen during the summer with little or no consultation; it is preferable to have an official presentation. Water Supply Department desires to move from Science to the Technology Division. H Kinde seeks Senate support for a number of reasons, which include increased efficiency, the necessity of program growth for this emerging program, and in order to be under the direction of a manager with firsthand experience.</p>	<p>Motion by C Huston to re-form the Campus Budget Committee. 2nd by G Mack, attending on behalf of J Schroder. Voice vote – unanimous</p> <p>Motion by C Huston to reaffirm the Mission, Vision, Values Document. 2nd by A Aguilar-Kitibutr. Voice vote – unanimous</p>

**Academic Senate
SBVC**

AD/SS 207
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	New Business (cont)	<p>In T Heibel's absence, A Au shared a list of concerns: lack of support staff; faculty office space; lack of appropriately-sized classroom space; existing mobile classroom distance from main campus; continued lack of program funds (WS is not a college-supported budget and must always rely on grant funds, unfortunate considering the FTE and high-income jobs generated.) H Kinde addressed many of the concerns, and pledged that whatever it takes to help the faculty chair, including assigning a co-chair, help will definitely be offered. The school's concern is placement of the program for maximum efficiency in all areas. Budget needs can be addressed through the normal Needs Assessment Review. A Aguilar-Kitibutr asked when the move will happen. Answer: by Spring semester. It is not anticipated that this move will impact Senate apportionment. S Lillard observed that Needs Assessment isn't designed to ask for permanent budgets. T Heibel arrived and discussion continued regarding the budget. H Kinde observed that if SBVC pays for a FT faculty member, that is essentially a budget; Needs Assessment is the process for addressing proven growth. T Heibel expressed that the two major concerns within CTU were lack of support staff and making sure the faculty member has appropriate space to meet privately with students.</p>	
	Old Business	<p>Committee Structure Review: J Gilbert wished to compile a review list of changed meeting times and resultant conflicts. Does a committee meet – or wish to meet – at a different time than currently scheduled? Also: should SLO and Accreditation be separate committees? SLOs are clearly under Senate preview; Accreditation is part of the Senate's 10 + 1. Some colleges don't have an Accreditation Committee; they put the VPI in charge. Others have a committee that reports to the President or the Senate. Campus-wide blocks of free time for committees still do not enable the VPI, for example, to simultaneously attend three committees. Departments like PE have a difficult time coordinating their demanding schedule with committee assignments. J Gilbert will research what CHC is currently doing. K Weiss reported that we used to have a full schedule on Friday, but went to the MTWH format in order to free up Fridays for committee meetings. G Mack said that in Nursing, required off-campus activities (in hospitals, etc.) must accede to their hours; faculty can't attend committees if there's an off-campus lab.</p> <p>Wait List Review: the two options are to extend the current wait time to two days vs. one, or to improve communication regarding the one-day window with better email forwarding, texting, etc. The issue goes to District Assembly October 1. CHC Senate is weighing the same two options.</p>	

**Academic Senate
SBVC**

AD/SS 207
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	Committees	<p>Ed Policy - Student Services - no report. Personnel Policy - no report. Career & Tech Ed - no report. Financial Policy - no report. Equity and Diversity - no report. Legislative Policy - no report. Elections - no report.</p> <p>Curriculum – L Hector reminded that Nov. 1 is the deadline to launch courses for inclusion in the Fall 2014 handbook. She will send out emails regarding courses that are due. There will be a Flex Day Curricunet open lab from 11-12.</p> <p>Program Review – S Lillard distributed a handout (attached) with the fall calendar needs assessment. Department heads and managers have received the necessary forms and instructions, along with EMP deadlines to all deans on the schedule. There will be workshops on Flex Day and October 25 to aid those writers who request assistance. Nov. 1 is the deadline for submissions. There is a Dec. 6 workshop for Efficacy Review, especially in programs on probation, conditional, or non-instruction. January 24 is the deadline for conditional reports to be received for review Feb. 7.</p> <p>Program Review proposes a change to a four-year cycle, which has been approved by their committee and also College Council. The current committee workload of a three-year schedule is simply not workable. CTE programs currently are required to go through a two-year review, as mandated by Title V, with a full efficacy review every four years. College Council has also approved having yearly EMP updates tied to Program Review.</p> <p>Professional Development -</p>	<p>Motion by A Aguilar-Kitibutr to approve the proposed four-year cycle. 2nd by K Barnett. Voice Vote - unanimous</p>

