

ACADEMIC SENATE
APPROVED MINUTES

Aug 14, 2009
Board Room 626
9:00 to 12:00

1. Call to Order

President Lamb called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m.

2. Roll Call

Jeffrey Lamb, President

Matt Borchert; Joseph Conrad; Lisa Giambastiani; LaNae Jaimez; Jeanette McCarthy; Lou McDermott; John Nagle; Carl Ogden; Barbara Pavão; Karen Wanek

Absent/Excused: Erin Duane; Rennee Moore; Thomas Watkins

Guests: Rob Simas, Institutional Research; Dr. Jowel Laguerre, Superintendent/President; Erin Farmer

3. Approval of Agenda – Aug. 14, 2009

Motion to Approve – Senator McDermott; M/S/P/ Unanimous

4. Approval of Minutes

There are no minutes yet from May 18 to approve.

5. President's Report

Available for viewing at sccsenate.blogspot.com

Introduction of new members, and discussion of Rostrum and the “10+1” mission, and State Senate Institutes. President Lamb informed us that our Senate budget has been cut, but that we still have money to send Senators to the Senate Institutes; we just need to inform him of our interest.

In answer to a request from Senator Pavão, President Lamb explained that the Senate has two funding sources, and agreed to get her a copy of the budget.

President Lamb gave a general overview of the responsibilities of Senators: to report to our constituents and make reports to our division, in whatever manner proves to be the most expedient and efficient. This is particularly important, as some faculty claimed that they heard nothing about the re-organization of Student Services and Academic Affairs (2009-2010).

At this point President Lamb requested that we adjust the order of our agenda so that we might accommodate our two guests. There was no objection.

6. Reports

Dr. Jowel Laguerre

In his welcoming remarks, Dr. Laguerre shared several of his goals:

- A) to allow the Academic Senate to be more active in the solving of problems and the creation of change
- B) to be a regular presenter to the Academic Senate, to promote more effective “two-way” dialogue
- C) to address our budget problems (categorical funding cuts that will mostly impact student services: a total of \$1.4 million for both AY 2009-2010, and AY 2010-2011, this year’s cuts being slightly offset by a grant from Federal Stimulus funds) by building a larger reserve than what we have now, by re-organizing at Executive level (2010-2011), and by engaging in more and more successful entrepreneurial fund-raising.
- D) to remain sensitive to the “fragile” jobs of both adjunct faculty and classified personnel (in response to a question from Senator Ogden about adjunct faculty job security)
- E) to work to grow FTES.

In turn he asked the Academic Senate to:

- A) help him gain the support of the college for these needed changes
- B) be attentive in FaBPAC
- C) use the Strategic Plan to propel us forward.

Discussion:

Senator Pavão expressed appreciation at the prospect of Academic Senate being in on the ground level of change and solutions, and Senator McCarthy asked for some specifics as to how to address concerns, as the “process” hasn’t worked too well in the past. Dr. Laguerre urged transparency again, suggesting many access points, such as retreats, strategy sessions with the VPAA, and inclusion of suggestions in yearly planning and in weekly or bimonthly meetings, then noted that leadership should then pilot these concerns and ideas through. President Lamb pointed out that the changes already in place with Institutional Planning--like SLO’s--should help with some of these issues, and urged close attention to Integrated Planning Process and our 3-Year Plans to as a way to insure accountability. Dr. Laguerre concluded his comments with a reiteration of his dedication to the practice of total accountability and transparency in all processes.

IPP Update – Rob Simas

Rob Simas explained the progress on the development and implementation of the Integrated Planning Process (IPP), and how it interconnects with PERT, division Program Reviews, Strategic and Operational Proposals, and 3-Year Plans, and how these all tie into institutional planning and accreditation issues.

Mr. Simas reported that since it received “conceptual” approval from the Senate in the Spring and from Shared Governance over summer, much work was done over the summer on the Integrated Planning Process. Erin Duane has created and put up an interactive “document” on her personal website with links to other documents (may be viewed at <http://metadatamaven.com/ipp/>)

Mr. Simas and President Lamb explained that the college needs a stronger and more interconnected planning and evaluation process, and that IPP and PERT work with the larger institutional process models to not only outline processes for planning from the faculty/staff level up, but to track implementation and establish accountability and evaluation standards and follow-through, through budget concerns and statewide Ed. Code goals. Mr. Simas reported that Dr. Laguerre had made some changes and clarifications in the document, and explained that in the past, the division Program Reviews were supposed to be on-going, but published every four years. However, partly due to ACCJC concerns, and Dr. Laguerre's wanting the college to be able to say what and how we are doing things, the reviews will be re-titled Annual Reviews and they must include actual plans –with names—to insure accountability. President Lamb pointed out that the inter-reliance of these processes will allow both for tracking and planning next stages, and Mr. Simas added that it allows for identifying any disconnect between faculty proposals and ultimate implementation as well.

Mr. Simas also reported on the concern about training, and that they had provided Deans and Directors with a “walk-through” on July 21st, and presented at Flex-Cal on Aug, 13th. He added that they are developing IPP Presentations On Demand (IPPODs) team to go to anyone, anywhere to explain the process in person in addition to the document prepared by Ms. Duane. President Lamb pointed out the opportunity these changes offered to faculty to create evidence-based cases for positive changes.

Discussion:

Senator Pavão observed that while Dr. Laguerre believes in his own accountability, that these expectations need to be transferred to his administration, to which Senator Conrad added that we also really need to address the “sea change” in the understanding of the content and purpose of the 3-Year Plans to other faculty and to the deans, and to emphasize that what had been viewed traditionally as a sort of “wish list,” is now an actual, definite, concrete suggestion with plan for implementation, “name-on” accountability, and required evaluation. President Lamb agreed, also noting that the 3-Year Plans before had stopped at the dean's desk; they will now go through a thorough planning process all the way up through FaBPAC and the other levels for implementation. Senator Wanek then wondered if this allowed for a type of “appeals” process for denied proposals, and while Mr. Simas urged that IPP isn't a way around the deans, he said that it does require that they provide some evidence-based rationale for their denial. And even then, there are other committees which can be presented with the ideas, as informal suggestions and the ideas can then be reviewed externally.

We then returned to President Lamb's report.

5. President's Report

FaBPAC

Noting that if something is school business, then it is the Senate's business, President Lamb urged the Senate to get more involved in budgetary matters; Senator Pavão agreed, adding that

we need to be even more aggressive in these matters. President Lamb said that we now have a very clear picture of the numbers, thanks to Dr. Jensen's leadership and Director Rinne's work.

Some of the matters FaBPAC is looking into are:

- A) There are certain programs on campus (Contract Ed., Small Business Development Center, Theater Youth, Community Services) whose funding sources need to be made more autonomous. FaBPAC will be looking into this, and also to see if there are any other similar programs.
- B) Dr. Jensen has gotten the college back in line for possible statewide reimbursement for a new library and theater refurbishment, funds which were earlier refused by then-S/P Fisher.
- C) Dr. Jensen has frozen Measure G funds; we are paying current bills, but no new money is being spent.
- D) Our enrollment has reached cap, with some growth (summer brought us up to 9142).
- E) Dr. Jensen denied the \$25,000 requested for the Umoja program, but Dr. Laguerre may review this decision.
- F) Dr. Jay Fields renegotiated our eCollege contract, saving the college \$150,000 and getting us unlimited class shells at a flat fee, not per student.
- G) Student tuition went up from \$20 per unit to \$26.

Accreditation

President Lamb detailed the following regarding the past report, and the work on the upcoming report:

- A) As a result of the Accreditation Forums held last semester, there has been an effort to provide more and different types of access points for input from faculty and staff, including modifying the wiki to improve accessibility, and continuing the forums.
- B) There will be the same working groups and the same structure with each group writing up their reports and submitting them to the editor.
- C) This is a very fast timeline (specifics to be discussed at afternoon Joint Meeting), but report will mostly be an update of ongoing improvements.

We now resumed the original agenda order.

7. Information/Discussion Items

Re-organization

President Lamb wishes to open the discussion on the re-organization of both the Divisions and the Executive Council.

Discussion:

There is still some confusion as to whether this is a proposal or a "done deal;" Senator Ogden points out that if the current VPs have been "pink-slipped," then that seems concrete rather than proposed.

Senator Pavão felt that it is not a good move, because the workloads seem too big, it doesn't seem financially workable, and that because of both these points, we may be seeing a move toward more director positions, and therefore less savings overall, and a more confused bureaucracy. Senator Conrad stated that in terms of accreditation, the timing is poor, as stability in leadership is one of ACCJC's concerns. President Lamb also noted that the job descriptions seem confusing, and that the outline for the Tech/Business/Fiscal VP has no technological requirements listed. Senator McCarthy was concerned that the "super-VPs" could increase the risk of dysfunction.

Senator Wanek claimed to be open to the change, noting that since the faculty must deal with more students and fewer services to assist them, then perhaps the administration should share in the sacrifices. She noted that it might be good to hire directors instead of having four VP salaries, and that it might be better for divisions. Senator Pavão objected, saying that the work still needs to be done, and Senator Borchert thought it might be best to keep the four VPs and reduce their salaries.

Ms. Farmer asked if Dr. Laguerre was going to present his rationale for savings and efficiency, and also what the Senate's role was at the other schools where this happened. President Lamb again urged the use of the Strategic Proposal model to support his decisions, and provide rationale. Senator Conrad agreed, also noting again that the college not only has problems with leadership stability, but with data-driven decision-making, and that he hopes that Dr. Laguerre would follow that process so we could have that evidence for the accreditation report. President Lamb also reminded us of Dr. Laguerre's other goal – to go down to three schools. Senator Pavão observed that this might have benefits for faculty – to be able to take on more responsibility, and therefore actually have a "training ground" for future administrators, among other things.

Senate Goals (Proposed)

President Lamb suggested that due to the time, that we table discussion of our proposed goals till next session.

10) Announcements

Senator McDermott is presenting a paper at U.S. Air Academy, Washington, D.C.

11) Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 12:10.