



ACADEMIC SENATE

Adopted Minutes

March 1, 2010

Board Room 626

3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

1. Call to Order

President Jeffrey Lamb called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Jeffrey Lamb, President

Darryl Allen, Thea Alvarado, Susanna Crawford, Erin Farmer – *ex officio*, Lisa Giambastiani, LaNae Jaimez, Richard Kleeberg, Jeanette McCarthy, Lou McDermott, Sandra Rotenberg – sub for Barbara Pavao, Karen Wanek, Darla Williams

Absent: Rennee Moore-*ex officio*, Barbara Pavao

Guests: Superintendent/President Jowel Laguerre, Rob Simas, Robin Arie-Donch

Connie Adams, Interim Admin Assistant

3. Approval of Agenda – March 1, 2010

Motion to Approve as amended – Senator Kleeberg; Seconded – Senator Williams; Unanimous
Amended to remove January 19, 2010 minutes and add November 20, 2009 minutes for approval.

4. Approval of Minutes – January 19, 2010, February 1, 2010 (1/19/10 removed; 11/30/09 added)

Motion to Approve 11/20/09 – Senator Jaimez; Seconded – Senator Giambastiani; Unanimous
Motion to Approve 2/1/10 – Senator Giambastiani; Seconded – Senator Williams; Unanimous

5. President's Report - Available for viewing at sccsenate.blogspot.com (and attached to minutes)

Comments/Questions:

Co-curricular programs Regarding those programs that encroach on the general fund (programs that don't pay their own way with student enrollment) the following comments were made: it is important to 1) have awareness and a clear picture of how money is spent; 2) know what the College values-such as sports, theater, DSPPS, for example; 3) look at applying for more grants for nursing and other higher cost programs; and, 4) there should be a grievance process for Program Discontinuance. President Lamb suggested the Program Discontinuance Policy be placed on a future agenda for further discussion.

Academic Calendar Flex Days: President Lamb invited Senators to communicate their questions and input to Tom Grube.

6. Reports

6.1 President/Superintendent Jowel Laguerre (15 minutes)

Centers and Leadership: S/P Laguerre reminded Senators that over the summer a proposal came to the Board of Trustees to reclassify the center director positions to educational administrators from classified managers, affording an opportunity to work more directly with faculty and to better plan the development of the centers, which has become much more than as overflow of the main campus. The job description will go to the Board in March for approval. A master's degree will be required and a new Vacaville Center leader will be recruited.

Partnership Update: As discussed at the last meeting, Sonoma State University is interested in offering bachelor's degree programs at the Vallejo Center, beginning with liberal arts, which will benefit people who have an associate's degree and don't have interest in a particular area in Solano County for a bachelor's degree. The plan is to start this very popular Liberal Arts Bachelor's Degree program in January 2011. Sonoma State offers this degree at Napa Community College and they are also interested in offering it on the Solano main campus. S/P Laguerre has encouraged them to look at offering it as a nursing program. Sonoma State would like to offer a teacher education program and are interested in sending faculty, but are being encouraged to consider qualified faculty of Solano to teach for them. Sacramento State University would like to partner in a bachelor's degree program in Vacaville, because of proximity to Sacramento. Research has been implemented to see what enrollment would be like. As the College succeeds in these partnerships, concentration can be given to what the College does best. Solano representatives had the second discussion with Cal Maritime Academy regarding partnering in an international and engineering technology programs.

Dr. Laguerre met with two Trustees and the Dixon Superintendent of Schools. A couple years ago the College had a program there and a new partnership is being discussed. One possibility to explore in Dixon and later in Winters, would be interactive television or a newer technology, which could be a great way to provide access to education at these other locations. A group of College administrators will visit with Dixon School District administrators for more discussion. This Thursday, March 4, College representatives will meet with the Winters School District and City Council in Winters at 6 p.m. In response to Senator Crawford's query regarding types of programs to be offered with the districts, S/P Laguerre stated decisions haven't been made yet, but agricultural and fire programs are of interest and would be good feeder programs. The Dixon Superintendent expressed strong interest in a Learning Communities project.

Student Achievement: The College has experienced a great deal of achievement from students and alumni and S/P Laguerre asked Senators to keep sharing stories to inform community of student success.

Vallejo Expansion Committee: S/P Laguerre expressed interest in having one or two faculty members to serve on this committee.

Birthday Wishes were expressed for S/P Laguerre (Feb. 27) and President Lamb (Feb. 24).

6.2 Subcommittee Reports

6.2.1 Curriculum

Erin Farmer announced that on the March 17 Flex Day, the Curriculum Committee will be meeting and volunteers are being sought. Ms. Farmer noted that some long-held definitions and process in academic programs are not all up to standard. She is updating and revising these issues for the current accreditation work. Though the College is not out of compliance and is fine regarding Title 5, there are some things that can be done better, including finding better ways to actively discuss how curriculum proposed fits with the College Mission. Currently, courses are simply approved or denied based on brief discussion which is not very systematic. A few other things are planned, including: an update of some timelines to make curriculum move more quickly, as some are time restrained by requirements to go through Curriculum Committee, be put on the Board agenda for discussion and then again for Board approval; and some additional housecleaning. Ms. Farmer expressed that Curriculum is the heart of the College, affecting institutional programs, course offerings, quality control and other related items. President Lamb suggested an announcement be drafted and sent out as a call to volunteers and asked Senators to participate and/or find interested faculty to participate in the Flex Cal Calendar activity. He also noted the College will have Flex activities in the fall to orient people to the new system.

6.2.2 BSI

Senator Crawford reported that the BSI Steering Committee started meeting again. They will send out something shortly to faculty basically looking for anyone on campus who would like to submit proposals. The Committee will look at proposals in late March or early April, which will need a pretty quick turn-around. The focus will be on proposals of things that can be done without funding or with available BSI funding for Basic Skills proposals. Senator Crawford will send out a detailed request for input. One proposal is to start a new mini-grant program. She stated that one challenge with BSI funding is that it's only once a year and sometimes things come up in between where financial help is needed, without having a nine month lead time. BSI will begin working on a larger project, an Integrated Planning Process (IPP) association with a Center for Academic Success. This would happen over years and stages.

7. Information/Discussion Items

7.1 Strategic Plan Revision Follow-up – Rob Simas

Rob Simas gave an update and asked for support and concurrence from the Senate. He reported that the Strategic Plan (that the Senate approved) went to ASSC for their support and investment in it, which they shared at the Shared Governance Council meeting. They also requested an addition to reintroduce a core value to focus on students. Mr. Simas explained this would be in line with “student well-being”. Core Values are about how decisions are made and how people behave. ASSC would like to see something in regards to student well-being “considering and addressing the impact on students of any and all actions”. This ties into accountability and includes safety, health, and thriving. Core values are those we strive for and value as institutions and individuals. So the impact on students is considered in all words and actions. Senators concurred on this item and it will be brought to the Board on March 17 for approval.

7.2 Transfer Degree Legislation – Robin Arie-Donch (20 minutes)

Robin Arie-Donch reported on this time-sensitive issue. Local Senate presidents are asked to complete a survey by March 12, indicating how the college faculties want the State Senate to vote. She gave a synopsis as follows and asked Senators to read in depth the information she emailed: Legislators have decided that colleges need more assistance for transfer students, not enough degrees are earned, and some transfer students are choosing not to earn degrees because local community colleges are imposing requirements on their associate's degrees that are not required for transfer. In order to avoid legislators deciding what kind of degrees colleges are to offer, last fall the State Senate Transfer & Articulation Committee brought forth a number of resolutions to the State Plenary Session. One was a resolution saying “don't legislate to us” stating desire for local control of degrees, rather than the State mandating what colleges do. The other resolutions involved transfer degrees that, if brought into Title 5, would eliminate any need for Sacramento to be involved, as the community colleges along with the State Senate would already be taking care of the concern. Ms. Arie-Donch is on the Transfer and Articulation Committee that advises ASCCC and developed these resolutions that have been deferred to spring session. Now the problem is that California Senator Padilla's resolution is coming and by April it will be too late, and their legislation will tell colleges what to do. She told Senators about the series of conference calls to inform community colleges of the two choices: do nothing and let Senator Padilla push forth his legislation or, propose legislation to amend Title 5. Ms. Arie-Donch urged the latter, which is not a vote for any resolution as that will be decided at April Plenary. For now, if the State Senate chooses to change Title 5, Senator Padilla will withdraw his legislation and see what the Senate will come up with and if he doesn't like it, he may introduce legislation again next year, so this would, at least, be buying time. Everyone will receive the survey March 8-10, which will be quickly due back on March 12. Senator Crawford queried as to any reason why a senate of any community college wouldn't all want to vote that way. Ms. Arie-Donch responded that she doesn't see any. President Lamb asked Senators to review the documents forwarded from Robin and respond with opinions, thoughts, and comments. Senate presidents vote on these items at Plenary. President Lamb also suggested Senators speak with faculty and divisions and he will make a decision based on input he receives.

7.3 Senate Constitution Task Force Update

7.3.1 Roles of Senators

Senator McDermott queried as to why is it taking so long to amend the Senate Constitution. President Lamb noted that it has been a long time and he suggested that it might be best to look through the Constitution and reflect on the different parts in an organized way by dividing up for sessions and approve on the agenda. He opined that it never reached critical mass of importance, based on fires with Accreditation, etc. Senator McCarthy considered it a hardship for work to be done outside Senate meeting times, because getting people at same place and time to work on this has been difficult. She also stated it is much more complex than the Task Force had imagined. Senator Allen queried what the biggest issues are to change in the Constitution. Senator McCarthy reported that other colleges have their constitution and bylaws separate. She suggested that some of most burning issues are: what are the duties; name of local senate; how to do elections; proportional representation; handling situations that come up within the Senate; and complexities of issues brought last time. Also, the rules become more important as the institution is more under the microscope and there is a need to go through each item of the Constitution to see if it meets the demands of modern times. President Lamb concisely reiterated a need to clean up language, work on election procedures, representation, and duties of officers and senators in looking to examine the rigor and procedures of the Constitution. The original attempt took elections out of this and assigned to another task force and representation was designed to be a sub-discussion. President Lamb questioned if it was the will of Senate to clear all items and make Senate meetings working sessions? If so, it would be much more effective to come with processed information to work with, rather than word-smithing at the meetings. Senator Crawford suggested some overall discussion, and then some sub-set of Senate, followed at the next meeting by another brief discussion and decisions on options. President Lamb noted that the discussion item 8.2 is not to discuss processes around Vice President election but rather when this is to be done. The Senate has a Constitution, which specifies how we vote, yet is out of sync regarding holding an election, but not out of process. The next step would be to bring it forth to the next meeting or due date before a meeting to submit thoughts, followed by second discussion and then action. General Senator consensus was to spend approximately 30 minutes per meeting on Article discussions and these could be approved individually. President Lamb reminded Senators that changes in the Constitution require approval by faculty. At the next meeting, Articles I & II will be on the Agenda. He asked Senators to advise constituents of these discussions.

7.3.1.1 Processes for Information Gathering

The Senate agreed that input from constituents is necessary. While everyone is busy, this needs to be done. It was generally agreed that email could be useful to connect discussion and help the Senate discussions move forward. President Lamb stated that any action item needs to be presented for information, fleshed out, discussed, and highlighted and then it come up as an action item. He recommended that the Senate use technology to its advantage. *Senator Crawford opined that it is useful to have wording from certain sections, which are the main issues, brought to Senate as a short discussion, to clarify what are important points, what to consider, what to talk with divisions about.*

7.4 Faculty Role in Accreditation

President Lamb sent out an email a couple weeks ago. A comment came forward as he was giving a presentation in SGC about Accreditation; concerning how in some areas of the College in 2005, departments such as HR weren't as responsive to accreditation as they could have been. In SGC, he was not suggesting mandating participation, rather the importance of everyone being involved in the process and departments taking on responsibility in their areas of competency. In response to questions, President Lamb and Senator McDermott stated that Accreditation paper clearly stated that the union should be kept out of these issues and what they did was a violation of the labor rules of the state of California. The Accreditation Board is being sued by the union for statements like that. President Lamb strongly believes

that faculty voice in Accreditation is important. Senator McCarthy opined that each person would have their reason for not wanting to be part of that process. She stated there is no forum to discuss why she doesn't want to participate and said there are other people on campus who have clear reasons that don't want to participate which may have a great deal to do with fundamental problems in dialog. President Lamb, through all his Accreditation work, has not heard about that being a problem. He suggested that engaging the process needs to be done first to make things better, rather than disengaging. He shared the hope that faculty and colleagues will come forward to participate to the best of their ability in the writing of the Accreditation document as he works towards having that faculty voice come through. While there was some discussion on this topic, the final conclusion was that President Lamb would not take further steps to engage the union regarding faculty participation in accreditation.

7.5 Senate/Union Roles and Responsibilities

(See comments included in 7.4)

8. Action Items

8.1 ARCC

Motion to Approve ARCC Response Narrative – Senator Crawford; Seconded by Senator McCarthy; Unanimous

8.2 S/P Cabinet

Motion to Approve Senate President regular participation on the S/P Cabinet – Senator Crawford; Seconded by Senator Williams; Unanimous

8.3 Vice President/President-elect Election

Discussion continued on the three options on the table: 1) hold typical election - person who wins is vice president until the end of semester, then becomes president; 2) hold all-faculty election for vice president and the current president continues for another year beyond the current election cycle, in order for the new VP to have training and work with the President to be incorporated into meetings and activities; 3) wait until back in cycle.

Motion was made to eliminate option 3 – Senator McCarthy; Seconded – Senator Crawford; Unanimous. More questions were asked and comments made. A quorum was not available to vote on this item and it will be brought back for action on March 15.

9. Action Reminders

Senate Goals Task Force meetings

10. Announcements

Members needed for Accreditation Advisory Committee
FaBPAC Representatives needed

11. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Senate President's Report – March 1, 2010 – copied from sccsenate.blogspot.com

The FABPAC met on Feb. 3rd and 17th. The topics included a budget update, a discussion on programs that encroach on the general fund, internal controls relative to the district financial audit report, public records access request issues, and proposed facilities use procedures and fees. When discussion the budget, there have been some interesting comments regarding the inclusion of furloughs (a savings of around \$500,000 for the District) and early retirement incentives (another potential \$500,000 savings). As for the discussion on encroachment, the district "targeted" four areas (the theater, contract ed, community services, and SBDC) that encroached on the

general fund. While these areas no longer of concern, the question remains about what other areas of the college encroach significantly on the general fund. This item has been on the FABPAC agenda for almost a year now.

The **SGC** met on Feb. 10th and 24th. The topics included: a report from the PERT, SCC's "legislative platform", information on accreditation, revisions to job descriptions, a discussion of the academic calendar, strategic goals, the need for coordination between hiring and finance via a staffing master plan, the Institutional Review Board, the introduction of several strategic goals, and a look at the Governing Board agendas. Dr. Laguerre put forth his steps to connect with our elected officials to further SCC legislative initiatives: a Higher Education Center in Vallejo, build a new Library with 50% State matching dollars, build a new Science and Technology Center, and a new Biotech building in Vacaville. We have been discussing the Dean of Academic Success and Learning Resources, the Chief Information Systems Officer and Center Administrator positions. The Calendar Committee has been working with SCFA to fix the academic calendar. The issue revolves around the week of Thanksgiving (and only having two instructional days that week) and compliance with the State. The suggested solution is to take optional days from the beginning of the fall and using them to take the entire week of Thanksgiving off... the problem would be that the Senate, for example, relies on the optional flex at the beginning of fall to meet. A solution is forthcoming. The IRB was presented for information and will be voted on next time. As for the Strategic Proposals that the Senate forwarded to SGC, they will discuss them at their next meeting.

The **Board** has met for a study session (Feb. 3rd) and a regular meeting (Feb 17th). The study session dealt with: a program partnership with Bay Area Clean Water Agencies, SERP (early retirement incentives), a budget update, a discussion on the Strategic Planning efforts, SunGuard Higher Education Presentation, and Emergency Protocols and Incident Command Center Update. Highlights from the regular meeting included the announcement from closed session that the Board has authorized Dr. Laguerre to issue layoff notices to one faculty position (the person will not be laid off but rather reassigned) and three staff positions. The Women's Soccer team and the Speech and Debate team were honored for their accomplishments this year. Also, Ross Beck presented the opening ceremonies of the Vacaville Center. Of note, too, was a follow-up presentation by SunGuard regarding a two-year contract for our CISO position and other support services that will take us to a full Banner implementation. This was a 1.8 million dollar proposal

PERT: This group has continued to work on reconciling the former Strategic Plan with the new one. Additionally, they submitted a list of recommendations to Dr. Laguerre regarding ways to improve our Integrated Planning Process. The PERT is also discussing ways of soliciting input from the campus community on the metrics used to evaluate our progress towards Strategic Goals and Objectives. Finally, the PERT will begin its annual review of the IPP.

Updates:

ASCCC: As I'm sure you all read in the most recent ASCCC President newsletter, the Chancellor's Office signed a MOU with Kaplan University. This was done without consulting the ASCCC or any other statewide groups. The blowback has been noteworthy. The end result is that post facto, the Chancellor's Office may hold meetings with ASCCC and other groups for their feedback. I received information regarding a local Senate Resolution on course section elimination in hard budget times from ARC. It seems that they have experienced difficult cuts without input from faculty. If it pleases the Senate I can present you with the ARC resolution and we can have further discussions at a future meeting.

Accreditation:

As we look to solicit more fully participation and leadership in the accreditation Self-Study, it seems necessary to provide an update on the organizational process to date and the plans for the near and not-so-near future. The goal of this document is to give you a sense of how we plan to move forward and how you fit into the large picture.

Where we are?

After our January Flex Cal training in which we used the wiki to facilitate a better understanding of accreditation standards and to provide resources about accreditation, we have a fairly good idea where faculty and

administrators fit into the writing of the Self-Study. Cynthia Simon, CSEA President, is updating her list of which staff will participate where and will forward it soon. Ralph Myer, Local 39 President, will provide a list, as well. Nancy Blanc and Connie Adams have pulled together the sign-up sheets and those administrators who have been assigned to specific areas. We should have a comprehensive list for the entire campus shortly. We have also received the ACCJC response to our last Special Report. You can access their finding on the SCC website. In sum, they have eliminated recommendation seven on fiscal stability and we are on-watch for the other recommendations. While we still remain on sanctions, the good news is that the next Special Report won't be due until October 2010, one full year before our Self-Study. This means that they've given us one more extension on the two-year rule to resolve our deficiencies.

What's next?

In essence, we are moving ahead on two fronts; preparing for and writing a Self-study and responding to the ACCJC report with a Special Report with Visit. The plan is to keep these two efforts separate while at the same time ensuring that they are highly articulated. As for the **October 2010 Special Report**, the goal is to keep those Working Groups related to the recommendations for which we are still on sanctions moving and writing. Look for an invitation to participate, but know that those faculty, staff and administrators who wrote the last response are on the task. As for the **October 2011 Self-Study**, there are some basic ground rules in place that might be a good place to start. Based on what we've learned since our 2005 Self-Study we know that writing narrative and collecting evidence is the responsibility of all employees. If you are in the Widget Department, expect to work on the area(s) related to your specialty. Deans and other members of the Administrative Leadership Group have participation in accreditation as a part of the formal evaluation. Expect to have accreditation on division agendas. All faculty who participate as a Co-Chair will not have to worry about optional flex hours for the next year and a half. These items have buy-in from Dr. Steinback and Dr. Laguerre.

Organization

We are in the process of creating an Accreditation Committee. The membership of which includes the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), the Academic Senate President, the Director of Research and Planning, and the Editor (these individuals are the members of the Accreditation Steering Committee). Additionally, there will be Co-Chairs from each of the larger areas within the standards, eg. two Co-chairs for Standard I A, who are the additional members of the Accreditation Committee.

The Accreditation Committee will be responsible for providing input to the Accreditation Steering Committee and for reporting out to Working Groups, shared governance bodies, the Academic Senate, and the Board of Trustees. It will be asked to lead the College as we develop the Self-Study. This will include input on the pre-writing, writing, evidence gathering and postproduction phases. This group will establish and/or refine our timeline, expectations, and outcomes. They will also be a resource to the campus community regarding standards and "all things" accreditation.

Co-Chairs

The Co-chairs have been either selected or nominated by the Superintendent/President, the ALO, the Academic Senate President or the President of CSEA. In most cases they are a faculty/ staff and an administrator. Their job is to:

- Establish timelines
- Assign work
- Review narrative
- Ensure that evidence accompanies narrative
- Communicate and report-out
- Encourage participation
- Be available as a resource
- Use the wiki
- NOT do all the work

· NOT be an editor

In order to begin the process, co-chairs will be given a packet with the following resources:

1. Membership list
2. Timeline
3. Tracking Sheet
4. Style Sheet
5. ACCJC "Dos and Don'ts"
6. ACCJC rubrics
7. ACCJC "Questions to be asked"

Of additional importance as a significant resource for accreditation is that Dr. Laguerre has asked that we explore the idea of an Accreditation Self-Study Coordinator. This would be a one-year, 100% reassign time position that is to be filled by a full-time faculty member. This person would work exclusively on the Self-Study from the fall of 2010 to the fall of 2011. This represents a major commitment to the accreditation process.