

Senators present:

Leonor Aguilera
Morrie Barembaum
Shawn Cummins
Doug Deaver
Michael DeCarbo
Steven Deeley
Elizabeth Elchlepp
Corinna Evett
Jim Granitto
Jim Isbell
Eric Hovanitz
Danny Martino
Mary Mettler
Craig Nance
Andy Salcido

Randy Scott
Nooshan Shekarabi
Jolene Shields
Barbara Sproat

Non-Voting Members

CIC

Craig Rutan

ASG Representatives

John Grabowski

Guest(s):

John Smith
Lothar Vallot
Joyce Wagner

Call to Order

I Order of the Agenda

As set

II Guest Presenter – Lothar Vallot, Gemology

- 1 Gemology is the study of precious stones; exploring their color and worth.
- 2 SCC certifies students under the auspices of the Gemology Institute of America.
- 3 Professor Vallot is a professional jeweler and assists SCC students in their pursuit of occupations in the field.
- 4 The Gemology program is about jobs; Professor Vallot has been with the program for 32 years and highlighted the many SCC students that are employed in gemology throughout Orange County.
- 5 The District has committed a significant amount of resources for the development and sustainment of the program.
- 6 The Program has received significant donations from local jewelers and organizations.
- 7 The program has created a distinguished Alumni Association with approximately 150 members.
- 8 The Association raises funds to sustain the Gemology Program.
- 9 Annually the Program serves 50 to 60 students; prior to the budget cuts, the program served over 100 students.

III Approval of Minutes

A March 6, 2012

Professor Deeley moved to approved

Professor Deaver provided the second

The minutes are approved without dissent

IV Public Comments

- 1 Professor DeCarbo explained that AB 1826 is an attempt to put a cap on full time Faculty overload at 50% across the State. (Appendix 1 – AB 1826)
- 2 Professor Martino said that she will try to gather information about AB 1826 during Plenary.
- 3 Professor Nance discussed a presentation made to the Board regarding the Faculty salary freeze. (Appendix 2 – Salary)
- 4 Professor Evett discussed the need for Faculty to thoroughly explain items presented to the Board to ensure the clarity of the message. She further stressed the need for Faculty to talk amongst themselves prior to speaking at Board meetings to ensure the quality of the message and to prevent contradictory and repetitive messages.
- 5 Professor Evett encouraged Faculty to continue speaking at Board Meetings and to request that cuts be made to the District, not to the classroom.

V ASG Report – John Grabowski

- 1 The current focus of ASG is the organization of the Town Hall meetings in Strenger Plaza on April 10 and 11 in from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.; this will include a voter registration drive.

VI Action Items – No items for action

VII Discussion Items

A Senate Elections

- 1 The 2012-13 Senate Executive Board will be: President – Corinna Evett; Vice President – Michael DeCarbo and Secretary/Treasurer – Joyce Wagner.
- 2 Incoming Math and Science Representatives will be Professors Nance and Hovanitz.
- 3 Incoming Counseling Representatives will be Mary Mettler and Rudy Carrion.
- 4 Incoming Humanities and Social Sciences Representatives will be Professors Shekarabi and Deaver.
- 5 Incoming Business Representative will be Professor Deeley.
- 6 Adjunct representatives from credit and non-credit will be elected in the Fall if necessary.

B Honors Program (Appendix 3 – Honors)

- 1 Professor Deaver explained the need to include more members on the Committee primarily in order to remain aligned with a requirement from UCLA.

C Area D

- 1 President Barembaum said that he, Professor Rutan and Professor Martino attended the State Area D meeting on March 31, 2012.
- 2 Professor Martino said that the resolutions are not yet available online and that she will be running for Academic State Senate positions.
- 3 Professor Martino requested that the Counselors to read a proposed paper for adoption at Plenary and to provide her feedback.
- 3 President Barembaum announced that the Ventura C.C. District has been put on accreditation warning for recommendations made directly about the board.
- 4 President Barembaum announced that a discussion will begin about the viability of removing districts from the California Community College System.

D Distance Education (Appendix 4 – Goals)

- 1 Professor Evett presented her notes from a subgroup of the EMP; she asked that the entire Faculty become aware of the goals and to determine if the goals do indeed represent the goals of the Faculty.
- 2 She asked whether the Faculty were truly interested in investing money in Distance Education as outlined in the goals.
- 3 Professor Elchlepp asked if these goals were to take effect after restitution of lost classes and programs.
- 4 Professor Deeley responded that the two are not mutually exclusive; and while you cannot improve upon face-to-face instruction, it is imperative that we provide what future students will want.
- 5 Professor Evett pointed out that this is exactly the reason why this conversation must take place; that Faculty must determine if they are willing to compromise the pedagogical integrity of curriculum to accommodate the desire of students as consumers.
- 6 Professor Mettler explained that Professor Scott James is doing an incredible job with all of the demands placed upon him to perform many roles, however it is necessary for the College to have a full time Distance Education Coordinator; Professor Evett agreed that Professor James is doing excellent work assisting faculty with technology issues.
- 6 Professor Evett asked Faculty to determine whether the Distance Education proposal is indeed a priority or whether a counterproposal of hiring a full time Distance Education Coordinator would be best for the time being.

E SLO Assessment – Joyce Wagner (Appendix 5 – SLO Assessment)

- 1 There are 938 credit and non-credit courses at SCC and OEC.
- 2 100% have assessment of record.
- 3 392 courses have actually conducted assessment and submitted reports; however, some of these reports will soon be over three years old and must be re-assessed.
- 4 58% of courses have a report pending; however, some of these course are currently not offered and therefore not expected to be assessed yet.
- 5 Professor Shekarabi announced that the Faculty Development Committee is doing their best to create workshops for SLO Assessment and will have the Calendar forthwith.

F Joint Chairs Meeting Debrief (Appendix 6A & 6B - Guidelines)

- 1 President Barembaum reiterated the need to collegially determine where cuts will be made across the Colleges and District.
- 2 Professor Nance discussed the “Schedule Development Guidelines” and Professor Evett discussed the “SCC Enrollment Management Principles and Priorities.”
- 3 Professor Mettler asked and learned that cuts to the Summer schedule have been made.

VIII Reports Discussion

A Curriculum

- 1 No report given

B SLOARC

- 1 No report given

C SAC Senate Report

- 1 No report given

D Technology – Professor Scott

SCC Academic Senate Minutes – Approved April 17, 2012
Senate Business Meeting April 3, 2012

1 No report given

E Facilities – Craig Nance

1 No report given

F College Council – President Barembaum

1 No report given

G President’s Report – President Barembaum

1 No report given

Professor Deeley moved to adjourn

Professor Salcido seconded the motion to adjourn

The meeting is adjourned without dissent.

Date of Hearing: March 27, 2012

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION
Marty Block, Chair
AB 1826 (Hernandez) – As Amended: March 19, 2012

SUBJECT: Community colleges: full-time instructors.

SUMMARY: Prohibits a full-time faculty member of a California Community College (CCC) district from being assigned a workload that includes overload or extra assignments if the overload or extra assignments exceed 50% of a full-time workload in any semester or quarter (excluding summer terms) that commences on or after January 1, 2013. This requirement would not supersede a collective bargaining agreement containing restrictions regarding overload that are more stringent. CCC districts with collective bargaining agreements that contain 50% overload limits would be subject to this bill beginning January 1, 2014. The provisions of this bill would apply to the workload of supervisory or managerial personnel who are performing faculty work allowable under the applicable collective bargaining agreement.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Expresses Legislative intent and makes Legislative findings and declarations regarding temporary faculty, including that, whenever possible, CCC temporary faculty be compensated appropriately and extended certain professional privileges.
- 2) Requires the CCC Board of Governors (BOG) to adopt regulations regarding the percent of credit instruction to be taught by full-time faculty, and authorizes CCC districts with less than 75% full-time instructors to apply a portion of their "program-improvement" funds toward reaching the 75% standard (commonly referred to as "75/25").

A complete summary of existing law regarding the employment of CCC faculty is beyond the scope of this analysis; however, it is important to note there are extensive, complex statutes, many of which apply to regular, contract, and temporary academic employees in a wide array of situations related to multiple aspects of CCC district employment.

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS: Background. The term "overload assignments" refers to the practice of full-time faculty electing to teach additional courses, with additional pay, beyond his/her normal full-time teaching load. According to the CCC Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) Report on Staffing for Fall 2010, the average rate for overload instruction was \$68.36 hourly, while the average hourly salary for part-time/temporary was \$66.58. Salary schedules are a subject of collective bargaining. In the 2009-10 academic year 18,482 instructors taught 64,489 overload courses within the CCC system. For purposes of 75/25, in calculating the full-time/part-time faculty ratio, overload courses are excluded from the calculation.

Overload limits. Many colleges and universities have established policies regarding overload assignments. These policies appear to vary significantly among colleges and departments but are generally designed to ensure that the instruction, research, and service obligations of faculty are not compromised by the acceptance of overload assignments. Some colleges require individual

assignments to be approved by department deans while others have negotiated district-wide caps that range from one course to 60% of a full-time load. According to information provided by the California Federation of Teachers (CFT), the sponsor of this bill, at least 16 CCC districts have established varying limits on faculty overload assignments. This bill would establish a statewide limit of faculty overload assignments to 50% of a full-time workload.

Purpose of this bill. According to the author, "The quality of instruction at our CCCs is hampered when full-time faculty, by option, by administrative fiat, or to address the need for additional course sections, are assigned to teach course sections well beyond their already heavy teaching loads. The state has an interest in ensuring that our CCC students receive quality instruction." Additionally, CFT argues that when full-time faculty teaches overloads adjunct faculty lose income and potentially their eligibility for health benefits.

Unclear policy rationale. As previously indicated, overload assignment policies and limitations vary significantly among colleges and departments. Committee staff was unable to find research that identifies best practices for overload assignment limits. The author and sponsor have provided no clear rationale as to why the 50% limitation contained in this bill is the appropriate overload assignment limit.

Arguments in opposition. Antelope Valley and West Kern Community College Districts oppose this bill, arguing that a one-size-fits-all approach does not make any accommodation for geographical differences among districts, nor does it address unique needs in certain specialized subject areas. Opponents argue that this bill is particularly punitive to rural colleges where there are not a large number of part-time faculty members available to pick up extra assignments.

Related legislation. AB 383 (Portantino) would have provided a one-time stipend, amount undetermined, to a CCC district that entered into a collective bargaining agreement that prohibited a full-time instructor from teaching overload or extra assignments in excess of 50% of a full-time workload. This bill failed passage in the Assembly Higher Education Committee on January 10, 2012.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Federation of Teachers (Sponsor)

Opposition

Antelope Valley Community College District
West Kern Community College District

Analysis Prepared by: Laura Metune / HIGHER ED. / (916) 319-3960

Appendix 2- Salary

The example below does not matter where you start in the matrix. The step increase is basically the same throughout the matrix.
1/3 of the faculty are in the steps below 15 years

For Class 4 step 7

Fall	Salary	Money loss due salary freeze		Salary after 5% cut	Difference in salary freeze to a 5% cut	
2008	\$70,117					
2009	\$72,493	\$2,376		\$68,868.35	-\$1,248.65	
2010	\$74,874	\$4,757	Totals	\$71,130.30	\$1,013.30	Totals
2011	\$77,253	\$7,136	\$14,269	\$73,390.35	\$3,273.35	\$3,038.00
2012	\$79,637	\$9,520	\$23,789	\$75,655.15	\$5,538.15	\$8,576.15

Cost to District
2011

	No. of Faculty			
1/3 of the faculty	100	\$14,269	\$1,426,900	
1/3 of the faculty	100	\$2,376	\$237,600	This 1/3 are the faculty that are receiving anniversary raises every 3 years
1/3 of the faculty	100	\$0	\$0	This 1/3 are the faculty that are at the top of the pay scale that get an increase in salary only if there is a raise.
			<u>\$1,664,500</u>	

2012

	No. of Faculty			
1/3 of the faculty	100	\$23,789	\$2,378,900	This 1/3 are the faculty that are receiving anniversary raises every 3 years
1/3 of the faculty	50	\$2,376	\$118,800	This 1/3 are the faculty that are at the top of the pay scale that get an increase in salary only if there is a raise.
	50	\$4,757	\$237,850	
1/3 of the faculty	100	\$0	\$0	
			<u>\$2,735,550</u>	

I have been told by the union this is actual 2.3 million.

The example below does not matter where you start in the matrix. The step increase is basically the same throughout the matrix.
1/3 of the faculty are in the steps below 15 years

The Chart below uses rounded numbers

For Class 4 step 7

Fall	Salary	Money loss due salary freeze		Salary after 5% cut	Difference in salary freeze to a 5% cut	
2008	\$70,000					
2009	\$72,400	\$2,400		\$68,780	-\$1,220.0	
2010	\$74,800	\$4,800	Totals	\$71,060	\$1,060.0	Totals
2011	\$77,200	\$7,200	\$14,400	\$73,340	\$3,340.0	\$3,180
2012	\$79,600	\$9,600	\$24,000	\$75,620	\$5,620.0	\$8,800

Cost to District

2011

	No. of Faculty			
1/3 of the faculty	100	\$14,400	\$1,440,000	This 1/3 are the faculty that are receiving anniversary raises every 3 years
1/3 of the faculty	100	\$2,400	\$240,000	This 1/3 are the faculty that are at the top of the pay scale that get an increase in salary only if there is a raise.
1/3 of the faculty	100	\$0	\$0	
			<u>\$1,680,000</u>	

2012

	No. of Faculty			
1/3 of the faculty	100	\$24,000	\$2,400,000	This 1/3 are the faculty that are receiving anniversary raises every 3 years
1/3 of the faculty	50	\$2,400	\$120,000	This 1/3 are the faculty that are at the top of the pay scale that get an increase in salary only if there is a raise.
	50	\$4,800	\$240,000	
1/3 of the faculty	100	\$0	\$0	
			<u>\$2,760,000</u>	

I have been told by the union this is actual 2.3 million.

Appendix 3 - Honors

S2012.x RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF AMENDING THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE HONORS PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Whereas resolution F2011.7, regarding the creation of the Honors Program Committee as a formal senate approved committee, failed to include valuable members to Honors Program Committee;

Whereas the amended committee description document will be more inclusive and better represent a broader range of those with significant impact on the Honors Program;

Whereas the amended membership of the committee description will be more in line with our transfer agreements;

Resolved, that the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College adopt this amended Honors Committee description document in place of the previous F2011.7 Resolution for the Honors Program Advisory Committee (HPAC) to become the Senate approved Honors Program Committee description document.

Honors Program Committee

Mission

The mission of the Santiago Canyon College Honors Program Committee (HPC) is to oversee the Honors Program and work with the Honors Program Coordinator to establish the standards, procedures, and policies of the Program.

Responsibilities

- Assist the Coordinator in recruiting new students and in promoting and publicizing the Honors Program and its activities
- Review and approve projected offerings as compiled by the Coordinator and Counselor
- Review and approve the schedule of Honors classes as compiled by the Coordinator and Counselor
- Review and make recommendations for Honors elements of proposed Honors courses before going to division curriculum committees and the Curriculum Council
- Review existing Honors courses during their triennial review
- Solicit course development from other disciplines
- Approve or deny requests for exception to program rules and regulations
- Interview and select valedictorian for commencement
- Select Honors scholarship recipients
- Assist with Honors Program Retreat/Reception
- Assist with selection of Honors Program students to participate in the HTCC Research Conference

Chair

One faculty and one dean will serve as co-chairs.

Membership

HPC members are selected based on experience with and knowledge of the Honors Program and/or Honors classes. It meets from 1:30-2:30 on the second Wednesday of the month. The members include the Honors Program Coordinator, the Honors Program Counselor, a dean, and one representative from the disciplines with Honors curriculum. The membership includes the following:

Honors Program Coordinator (when position is restored)

Honors Program Counselor

1 dean

Arts

Biological Sciences

Humanities

Mathematics

Oral Communication

Physical Sciences

Social Sciences

1 EOPS faculty

1 at-large faculty

Registrar

Transfer Center Coordinator

1 student representative

3/26/12

Notes from Faculty/Staff and Campus EMP 2012-2016 Subgroup 3/16/12

Compiled by Corinna Evett

Numbered possible goals with lettered possible action items

1. Support high quality distance education program for students and faculty
 - a. Establish Distance Ed. Coordinator
 - b. Staff development and training
 - c. Instruction design opportunities/office
 - d. Technical support for students and faculty
2. Provide adequate technological infrastructure
 - a. Facilitate implementation of SCC Technology Plan, including staffing
3. Develop meaningful and comprehensive strategies for internal and external communication
 - a. Identify communication practices/modes/paths/problems/challenges
 - b. Develop and support an infrastructure related to web and social media
4. Maintain the facilities infrastructure
 - a. Identify and prioritize maintenance needs, including staffing
 - b. Prioritize staffing for buildings
 - c. Identify and prioritize technology needs, including staffing
5. Support and encourage focused “green” practices at the college
 - a. Establish a standing committee to explore and implement inexpensive and visible green practices.

COURSE SLOS

Totals using the 2011/2012 SCC Catalog**

	<u>Actual</u>	
Combined Total of Credit and Non-Credit Courses:	938	
Combined Total of Courses with SLO's:	938	
Combined Percentage of Courses with SLO's:	100.0%	
Combined Total of Courses with Assessments*:	937	
***Yes=	392	42%
No=	1	<1%
*Pending=	545	58%
Combined Percentage of Courses with Assessments:	99.9%	

*"Pending" courses are courses with assessments of record but no data collection/results yet.

*** yes are courses with reported data

1) 176 of the 545 "pending" courses have been explicitly stated in the assessment of record submissions as "CURRENTLY NOT OFFERED and are not planned to be offered in the foreseeable future.."

2) 78 of the 545 "pending" courses have been explicitly stated as "to be assessed in Fall 2011," but so far results have not been submitted yet.

3) 138 of the 545 "pending" courses have been explicitly stated as "to be assessed in Spring 2012."

"Explicitly stated" = assessment cycle/calendar is written in assessment report, assessment cycle, or assessment calendar form.

PROGRAM* SLOS

Number of degree programs	72	
Number of certificate programs	97	
Total number of programs	169	
With PSLO (in CurricUNET)	156	(92%)
With assessment of record	35	(21%)

SCHEDULE DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

Scheduling priorities to address State Budget cuts and workload reduction measures

TIER	General Education & Transfer Courses	Career and Technical Education (CTE) Courses	Basic Skills Coded Courses	NonCredit (Includes CTE, Basic Skills, Labs, other)
Tier 1 First Consideration	Personal enrichment courses that are primarily recreational or personal development	CTE Courses that are elective or stand-alone that mostly attract community members, not students training for jobs.	Courses that may provide useful content and practice but are not primarily focused on the pathway skills.	Courses that are primarily enrichment
Tier 2 Second Consideration	Sections that are restrictive electives within transfer majors and where other choices are available to students	Courses that are restrictive electives within CTE certificates and majors where other choices including variances, are available to students	Courses that may be useful and supplemental to the primary pathway but not absolutely critical	Courses that are supplemental to a noncredit pathway but not absolutely critical
Tier 3 Cut judiciously	Sections that are required for the general education or majors, or AA/AS degree requirements but multiple sections are offered, some of which can be cut	Sections of courses required for CTE majors or certificates but multiple sections are offered, some of which can be cut. Certificates/degrees must show a history of active student engagement and completion	Sections of courses in the primary pathway where multiple sections are typically offered, some of which can be cut	Courses that are part of a pathway where multiple sections are typically offered, some of which can be cut
Tier 4 Preserve if at all possible	English, math and reading pathway courses culminating in college-level academic skills. Critical GE areas such as Communication or Critical Thinking where only a few courses meet the GE area.	Required courses in CTE certificates/majors that offered on an approved rotation plan or that are critical for program completion Stand- alone courses required for industry certification leading to career entry. Courses mandated by regulatory agencies	Higher level basic skills courses leading directly into college-level work or job training	Higher level non- credit courses that articulate into credit programs

Santiago Canyon College Enrollment Management Plan

Fundamental Guiding Principles

- All classes and programs are important and valuable
- The State Chancellors Office Funding Priorities
- Title 5 mandated Community College Core Mission of **Transfer, Career Technical Education and Basic Skills**
- The use of concentric circles to prioritize the most core instructional activities

College's Current Instructional Priorities

1. Basic Skills Courses (Chancellor's Office Directive)
2. Career Technical Education Courses (Chancellor's Office Directive)
3. Key courses necessary for completion of degrees (Chancellor's Office Directive)
 - Courses necessary to meet math, reading, oral and written communication, and critical thinking requirements
 - Appropriate distribution of courses in areas B through E of the CSU General Education transfer curriculum
4. Support Programs and Services with demonstrated impact on improving student success
 - Persistence
 - Transfer
5. Maintain course offerings in transfer disciplines while decreasing FTES to align with State workload reductions
6. Meet institutional commitments honoring faculty contract loads
7. Maintain learning labs that support student success
 - Math Study Hall (MASH)
 - Writing Center
 - Academic Success Center (ASC)
 - Tutoring Center
8. Track data demonstrating student demand and the need for courses to maintain progress toward educational goals
 - Enrollment Patterns
 - Waitlists
 - Withdrawals
9. Maintain sequences of courses that allow students to complete CTE programs

SCHEDULE DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

Scheduling priorities to address State Budget cuts and workload reduction measures

TIER	General Education & Transfer Courses	Career and Technical Education (CTE) Courses	Basic Skills Coded Courses	NonCredit (Includes CTE, Basic Skills, Labs, other)
Tier 1 First Consideration	Personal enrichment courses that are primarily recreational or personal development	CTE Courses that are elective or stand-alone that mostly attract community members, not students training for jobs.	Courses that may provide useful content and practice but are not primarily focused on the pathway skills.	Courses that are primarily enrichment
Tier 2 Second Consideration	Sections that are restrictive electives within transfer majors and where other choices are available to students	Courses that are restrictive electives within CTE certificates and majors where other choices including variances, are available to students	Courses that may be useful and supplemental to the primary pathway but not absolutely critical	Courses that are supplemental to a noncredit pathway but not absolutely critical
Tier 3 Cut judiciously	Sections that are required for the general education or majors, or AA/AS degree requirements but multiple sections are offered, some of which can be cut	Sections of courses required for CTE majors or certificates but multiple sections are offered, some of which can be cut. Certificates/degrees must show a history of active student engagement and completion	Sections of courses in the primary pathway where multiple sections are typically offered, some of which can be cut	Courses that are part of a pathway where multiple sections are typically offered, some of which can be cut
Tier 4 Preserve if at all possible	English, math and reading pathway courses culminating in college-level academic skills. Critical GE areas such as Communication or Critical Thinking where only a few courses meet the GE area.	Required courses in CTE certificates/majors that offered on an approved rotation plan or that are critical for program completion Stand- alone courses required for industry certification leading to career entry. Courses mandated by regulatory agencies	Higher level basic skills courses leading directly into college-level work or job training	Higher level non- credit courses that articulate into credit programs