



## ACADEMIC SENATE

### Adopted Minutes

February 1, 2010

Board Room 626

3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

**1. Call to Order**

President Jeffrey Lamb called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

**2. Roll Call:**

Jeffrey Lamb, President

Thea Alvarado, Erin Farmer – *ex officio* and representing Humanities for Lisa Giambastiani, LaNae Jaimez, Richard Kleeberg, Jeanette McCarthy, Lou McDermott, Barbara Pavão, Karen Wanek, Darla Williams

Late Arrivals: Darryl Allen, Susanna Crawford

Absent: Lisa Giambastiani, Rennee Moore-*ex officio*,

Guests: Dr. Trudy Largent – for S/P Jowel Laguerre, Rob Simas

Connie Adams, Interim Admin Assistant

**3. Approval of Agenda – February 1, 2010**

Motion to Approve - Senator Kleeberg; Seconded – Senator Williams; Unanimous

**4. Approval of Minutes – November 2, 2009, November 30, 2009**

November 2, 2009 Minutes: Motion to Approve as amended – Senator Alvarado; Seconded – Senator McCarthy; Unanimous

November 30, 2009 Minutes: tabled until next meeting to review corrections.

**5. President's Report** - Available for viewing at [sccsenate.blogspot.com](http://sccsenate.blogspot.com) and attached to Minutes.

Comments/Questions: Regarding the current job campaign a suggestion was made to include the Transfer Center within the purview of the new Dean of Academic Success and Learning Resources.

In reference to SERP, President Lamb stated the figures are based on estimations of 11 faculty members retiring, one dean, and other staff. Dr. Largent stated that faculty will be eligible for STRS and PERS retirement along with the SERP plan. President Lamb stressed the importance of insuring the integrity of programs not be compromised in offering early retirement and the need to be mindfully working towards the 75/25 faculty ratio. He stated the Board will possibly be looking at 60-70 % of base pay depending on what makes good financial sense to entice people at the higher end of the scale who may be close to retiring so those at the lower end of the scale won't have to be laid off.

**6. Reports**

**6.1 President/Superintendent Jowel Laguerre**

Trudy Largent, Interim Director of Human Resources, gave Senators recruitment campaign summary packets for the Executive Director of Institutional Advancement and Vice President of Academic & Student Affairs.

Dr. Largent next reported for S/P Laguerre, who was with the College team visiting Sonoma State College.

- S/P Laguerre hopes to receive the letter from the Accreditation Commission soon.
- S/P Laguerre spent three days in Washington, D.C., where he met with Solano County officials and Congressional representatives. Included in these meetings were: Congressman John Garamendi who gave good advice to find resources to support programs; Congressman George Miller and staff, who expressed interest in some projects; Congressman Dan Lundgren who shared a vision for the Vacaville Center; Senator Diane Feinstein and Senator Barbara Boxer, impressed

with so many community college representatives there and whose staff encouraged the College to look for information and other resources to obtain federal funding; Congressman Mike Thompson who had visited the Vacaville Center and also gave resource information as to where to obtain federal funding.

- S/P Laguerre is interested in expanding international student programs and access to ESL faculty through a partnership being discussed with UC Davis.
- On Thursday, Feb. 4, College representatives will visit Sacramento State College and discuss the possibility of offering bachelor degrees at the Vacaville Center.

Comments/Questions: Senator Kleeberg inquired if anyone has brought up offering 2-3 years of extra service credit to entice early retirement. Senator Pavao answered that the union always asks for that, however; STRS rules are very particular requiring the College to buy an annuity, as well as prove and demonstrate the District would save money and it is quite difficult to do that. The District would have to certify the College would offer incentive money. The SERP plan would be a gamble with the District but no proof of savings is required. Senator Wanek inquired why anyone would apply for the currently open Vice President position with what seems to be a low pay scale and shared her concern that it might limit recruiting well-qualified candidates. Dr. Largent responded that it is the bottom step pay and the top step pays more than deans. In regards to who would apply at that figure, she stated that people apply for a number of reasons, not always based on the salary.

## **6.2 Subcommittee Reports**

None

## **7. Information/Discussion Items**

### **7.1 Senate Vice President/President-elect**

President Lamb expressed the need to have a sense of possible options on how to proceed and handed out a synopsis of his understanding articulated in different scenarios, which incorporated Senator Kleeberg's January 31 email. Another of the options, put forward by Senator Pavao was for the President to serve an additional year to get back on cycle, hold an election now so a new vice president might serve a year and gain experience and then become the Academic Senate President. Senators agreed to a 15-minute discussion on this topic. Senator Kleeberg suggested a change in the Constitution as the current method has not worked as intended. He stated that the VP would best serve as a helper and pitch hitter for the President and opined it would be best not to put someone into a 4-year commitment. He also cautioned that electing Senators for 2-year terms can be problematic as a division might decide not to send a representative back to the Senate or the person might not want to stay for two years. Senator Pavao expressed agreement and suggested the Vice President be elected as are the Secretary and Treasurer from within the Senate for a one-year term. President Lamb stated that the Vice President is an at-large representative, rather than their division representative.

Senator Pavao noted that the current structure doesn't clearly permit a sitting president to continue which might be the best choice at times with a willing president and supportive campus. She shared that part of the motivation at the last revision was a need for consistency of leadership, because of a huge disadvantage when a new person every year tried to figure out the job and know people while other groups had representatives in place many years. So the current requirements accomplished that, but it hasn't worked out overall. Senator McCarthy commented that it was logical at this point in time with a task force review of the constitution to have a discussion for constitutional changes, however; the current issue probably should be resolved staying as close as possible to the current Constitution. An election now would require the Vice-President to be President-elect. President Lamb noted changes to the Constitution require a vote by the larger body of faculty. Constitutional changes could be decided now, as an information item and then put out to faculty for a vote. So that process could be an election to amend the Constitution and an internal election for Vice President. There could be a redundancy if a campus wide vote negates change, as then another campus-wide vote would be needed to hold an election. Senator Williams stated her department rotates people because of schedules. She expressed concern about an election from within the Senate, if no one wants to be Vice-President or if no one is available, while there might be someone at large who would like to do that. Senator Wanek opined it could be a weak Academic Senate if someone is elected who isn't informed enough to represent. Senator Crawford shared that the current situation needs to

be rectified and one solution might be to alternate between Vice-President and President-elect elections to have both positions filled, maybe by a nominated Vice-President or appoint internally. Many people outside the current Senate have Senate experience. The current scenario was created because Senate had missed an election timeline, President Gail Kropp was exiting, current President Lamb volunteered, and there was no opposition and no one else interested, so there was an acclamation vote within Senate. President Lamb suggested that one solution for now could be an election for Vice President; the current President serves one more year after this with a new Vice President attending meetings alongside the President. That would get Senate back on the proper cycle and allow time to consider and decide before the end of the semester how to proceed with clear thought toward possible changes. With that scenario, President Lamb would be making a 3-year commitment. Ms. Farmer noted it takes a lot of time, knowledge and energy to work through and complete the Accreditation Self-Study and President Lamb would be able to complete his efforts towards that.

Overall, Senators felt that constitutional changes should be carefully thought through without rushing the process. Senator Jaimez suggested having minimum qualifications for vice president so that people could qualify and that to choose from the present pool might be limiting as there may be some past members and good talent who could serve. Regarding the Brown Act, President Lamb stated that Senate would have to state that the election is out of term, get information out and follow procedure, if everyone agrees to a plan. Senator Williams opined to not limit the office to one year, as President Lamb might also be interested in serving longer and a vice president could be interested in working with him. President Lamb expressed the importance to figure out how to do it right and the Senate can plan to take action on this item at the March 1 meeting. Senator Kleeberg reiterated the option of a faculty-wide call for Vice President, clarifying it as a one-year term, the Senate would be back in cycle, in a year hold another election, and in the meantime work towards updating the Constitution.

## **7.2 ARRC Narrative – Rob Simas**

Mr. Simas had forwarded the October draft and reported that the revised document would be ready and available on February 2. This 3-year comparative listing of rates and peer group measures is what legislature uses when discussing colleges and funding. The final executive summary is limited to 500 words. Deans and VP Lisa Waits reviewed, softened, and rearranged things. The College will have one month to submit the final document. Mr. Simas explained that the College response doesn't repeat data, but explains what to do and what has been done to address issues, and notes extenuating circumstances, etc., which is a challenge to put into 500 words. The legislative group looks at it to see what has been done. He will attend the teleconference on Friday to check for more information. Solano College numbers didn't change much except in ESL.

Comments/Questions: Senator Pavao questioned the College head-count of 18,000 students as compared to the 12,000 student number counselors had been given. Mr. Simas affirmed that 18,000 as the correct number of different students over the academic year including summer and it has been fairly consistent. Heads cannot be added as they are to be counted only once. Approximately 1/3 of fall students are not here in spring and some students here in summer aren't here in the fall. Mr. Simas asked Senators to look at the narrative and data sheets, and who is in peer groups for each factor when he forwards the document February 2. Look at what the Chancellor expects and what the College should address. Once verified this next year and published in March, one year is allotted to present to the Board and have some interaction in the study session. President Lamb expressed that when we get the full report it will be interesting to see how Solano College compares with other colleges, including exogenous variables which are the things we have no control over. Mr. Simas will need input probably before March 1 and he'll be back at the March 1 meeting for review. He asked that anywhere added words are suggested, it is important to cut words because of the 500 word limit.

## **7.3 Senate President's Participation in S/P Cabinet**

President Lamb has been asked by S/P Laguerre to sit on the S/P Cabinet. Senators will vote on this item at the March 1 meeting. Overall, Senators were in favor, but with the following concerns expressed: it

could be a difficult position if a Senate President feels beholden to the S/P; there may be necessity to keep some information “off the record”; and possible redundancy of discussion and review as the College has Shared Governance Council. Senator Kleeberg reiterated his appreciation that for the first time in College history the faculty representative will be involved early on and with opportunity to be a voice in major information, decisions, and ideas. Senator Kleeberg mentioned that other colleges often have executive councils with only 4-6 people and stated he has not been aware of any policy that Solano College SGC created that was in opposition to what any executive council or Board wanted. In fact, in most cases when an issue got to SGC, it was proposed and discussed long before. It was also noted that the S/P Cabinet is not a legislative body and, therefore, would not fall under the Brown Act.

#### **7.4 Transfer Center – Barbara Pavão**

Senator Pavao, representing the Transfer Center, was pleased to share information and specifics on its good work and many successes. She noted that everyone could look at the ARCC report in two places under Table 1.1 regarding students’ achievement of goals, earning degrees and certificates and also transferring. The numbers are going up which speaks to good work in the Transfer Center. While some people talk about problems in Transfer, it is doing well and flourishing without problems. Solano County does not have a California State University campus, other than the small Maritime Academy, so students have to leave to get degrees and they do so successfully. The demographics of this county show a low baccalaureate rate, and Solano has had many first generation students on campus, which is quite remarkable. Senator Pavao asked Senators to be advocates in the community and let people know what is happening here. She gave a power point presentation to confirm the success.

While Senator Pavao is the counselor responsible for Transfer Center, she stated it’s a tiny part of the program because it takes the academic and curriculum departments to make the program work. Students can’t transfer unless they have courses they need to transfer and Student Services is supportive. And what faculty do in the classroom is a critical part. It is important that faculty remind students that the College Transfer Center hours are posted on the web. She also shared that all counselors are well prepared and trained to help with the transfer process and all are committed to counseling the whole student. University representatives visit the College regularly and schedules are posted on the web. The College has a counseling course which has been changed back to one unit so more will take it. Senator Pavao handed out flyers for a UC Davis field trip scheduled. She tells students to talk to faculty regarding their absence while missing class for a field trip, in order to make up work they’d miss. She stressed the importance for students to get on a campus wherever they can, no matter which one they want to go to. She shared her joy as she sees the response in students when they visit a campus and considers these field trips one of the best uses of money. She reminded Senators that the faculty is the first line to encourage students. Breakfast, lunch and the bus ride are free for students and she spends her time talking with them during the ride, as well as staying connected with them during the visit. This gives them a face on campus and can talk with her any time.

Senator Pavao noted that there are no CSUs, to her knowledge, currently offering a guaranteed admission, as many already have enough workload and receive plenty of qualified applications. However, Davis does offer a guarantee to be admitted and into the university and a specific division to students who meet minimum eligibility. These students know in September, a year in advance, that if they finish classes, the UC will take them, if they apply. This opportunity likely increases the number of full-time students at Solano. Senator Pavao explained that major prep is critical and general education is secondary, even if a student has a 4.0 grade point. The College website shows the UC Davis courses and what Solano courses would be equivalent. UC and CSU transfers have been steadily increasing and attendance is up as well. Some factors involved in whether students transfer has to do with CSUs, as of last year, for the first time in history closed for applications for spring admissions. As CSUs are trying to cut enrollments and, like us, are educating more students than they’re getting paid for. This may be partly making a political point and is closing out opportunities. The good news is that there is increased opportunity for transfers rather than new freshman. Transfers give diversity and do well at the UC level. Senator Pavao noted that the Concord campus (CSUEB) has good programs for working students with evening and Saturday classes – just not as much available, although there are lots of courses interesting to Solano students. SF State remains popular for as well.

Senator Pavao spoke of forming a Transfer Advisory Committee to possibly meet twice a year as an advisory committee and share information on transfer. She requested feedback from Senate and faculty regarding representatives, general input and would like to have everyone on board to understand the big picture and pass information on to students. Senator Pavao will forward her power point presentation to the Senate.

**7.5 Update on Senate Goals**

No time - forward

**7.6 Strategic Plan Revision Follow-up – Rob Simas**

No time- forward

**8. Action Items**

**9. Action Reminders**

Senate Goals Task Force meetings

**10. Announcements**

Academic Senate Secretary position open  
Members needed for Accreditation Advisory Committee  
FaBPAC Representatives are needed

**11. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn – Senator Alvarado; Seconded – Senator McDermott. Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

**Senate President's Report – Feb. 1, 2010 - copied from sccsenate.blogspot.com.**

*Meetings:* In Shared Governance, Dr. Laguerre was out of town so the Interim Director of Human Resources, Dr. Largent, chaired the meeting. We were given a draft job description for the Dean of Academic Success and Learning Resources. The position still lacks input from the Library, but in essence it is completed. A partial list of responsibilities includes; library services, basic skills, distance education, and faculty development. What I have noticed today is that the original intent of the position was to spearhead the creation of a Center for Academic Success that oversaw the reading/writing/math labs and tutoring center. I'm checking now to see if this omission was by design or not. Dr. Largent also shared with us the tentative **timeline** for the VPASA and Executive Director of Institutional Advancement positions. Additionally, she shared that HR has spent about \$7,500 in advertising these two positions. I gave a similar PERT **update** to the one Rob Simas gave to the Senate; recommendations and actions by that group. I also gave a quick accreditation update. The Policy 500 series was up, but Dr. Waits was not there to bring the item forward. I imagine that it would have reflected the Student Conduct policies that we reviewed earlier. What needs to go to the SGC is the **Institutional Review Board** and the Strategic and Operational proposals (**1, 2, and 3**) that the Senate has approved. They should appear on the next SGC agenda.

In the Financial and Budget Planning Advisory Council (FaBPAC), VP Roth led us through some highlights of the Governor's Budget Workshop. The District is working on scenarios for a 0%, 3% and 5% decrease in State funding in anticipation of mid-year cuts. The jury is still out on this because the Governor has even spoken of a 2% increase. According to VP Roth, the general consensus among those present at the workshop was that there would be somewhere between 0 -3% reductions considering the State of California is experiencing a 21 billion deficit. In the FaBPAC, there was a presentation on early retirement incentives called SERP. This item is going forward to the Board at its next meeting/study session. What we got was an overview of what early retirement incentives might mean at SCC. When you calculate out the total number of early retirements, not replacing them all with new hires or factoring in possible substitutes/interims/consultants/ or adjunct faculty... the district could stand to save 3 million dollars over 5 years.

I met with Dr. Laguerre and he has asked that I invite all senators to attend the first regular **study session** of the Board of Trustees this week Wednesday at 6:00. In a previous SGC meeting and then the Board took action on changing the general set-up of the Board meetings. Big changes include having Closed Session at the beginning of

the meetings, reducing the number of regular Board meetings in favor of Study Sessions, and the addition of an information/action item spot on the Board agenda. The SGC expressed its concern about these changes noting that Closed Session at the beginning of the meeting is inconsiderate to the public because it is hard to know when they'll end, that study sessions are good they could potentially limit discussion as an item comes up for action and finally, that a combined information/action item might be a detriment to the reflection that having an item up for information then, a week later, up for action offers.

In the PERT meeting we reviewed all of the suggestions and recommendations that Rob Simas received regarding the District's Strategic Plan. The PERT considered all recommendations. Here is version **1** and **2**. We kept our eyes out for items that were more tactical rather than strategic, items that were subsumed under already existing goals and objectives, and we tried to be as respectful as possible to the process and the voice of those who were asked to represent their area in the Strategic Planning Workshops. We did make several changes and Rob will be forwarding the final document back out to the College. If you've got a constituent who wonders why their idea or suggestion was not included, please have them communicate with Rob Simas.

*Accreditation:* With Robin Steinback out with a hurt knee we are without our "quarterback", as it were. I'm trying to play first string and bring all the pieces together. I am currently coordinating the list of faculty who have volunteered and looking for gaps. The immediate goal is to identify those who will be part of the Accreditation Committee; this means co-chairs, ALO, Senate President, and Editor. I also have been asked to identify a few faculty to participate in the ASCCC Accreditation Institute in March.