



## ACADEMIC SENATE

### Adopted Minutes

**Special Meeting  
February 13, 2012  
ASSC Room 1421  
3:00 pm –4:00 pm**

**1. Call to Order**

President Watkins called the meeting to order at 3:06 pm.

**2. Roll Call:**

Thomas Watkins, President

Kevin Brewer, Dale Crandall-Bear *ex-officio*, Tracy Fields, LaNae Jaimez, Richard Kleeberg, Amy Obegi, Scott Parrish, Melissa Reeve

Absent/Excused: Abla Christiansen, Joe Conrad *ex-officio*, Nick Cittadino, Susanna Gunther

Guests: Debra Berrett, Karen Cook, Marylou Fracisco, Ruth Fuller, Jeff Lamb, Roy Pike, Arturo Reyes  
Connie Adams, Admin Assistant

**3. Approval of Agenda – February 13, 2012**

Motion to Approve – Senator Parrish; Second – Senator Brewer; Passed – Unanimous

**4. Comments from the Public**

**5. Information/Discussion Items**

**5.1 LMS Resolution**

Motion to suspend Senate rules to hear the Resolution as a potential action item and choose whether or not to vote on it – Senator Kleeberg; Seconded – Senator Fields

Discussion: Senator Kleeberg clarified that since the agenda lacked the regular notice, suspension of rules is needed to hear the item and decide on action.

Passed – Unanimous

President Watkins reported the need to bring this up for discussion was because of faculty feedback. The Senate can proceed point by point on the Resolution paper that was emailed this morning and distributed at the meeting.

Senator Kleeberg explained that a resolution is the formal process and statement of Academic Senate opinion that most Senates use for significant issues to be taken to administration and the Governing Board. If a resolution deals with a 10+1 Senate decision, the Governing Board cannot make changes on those items unless by mutual agreement with the Academic Senate. This item had been removed from the Board agenda, in part because there was no recommendation from the Academic Senate. A resolution lets the Governing Board know the Academic Senate position so they know our recommendation on an item to reach mutual agreement.

Senator Reeve questioned the resolution process: being the first time voting on a resolution, she was shocked and blindsided; she couldn't open the attachment on her computer; thought it would first be drafted by the Senate; thought this meeting was to approve the LMS; seeing the resolution five minutes ago, there was no opportunity for consensus building or drafting the opposite intent; a vote against the resolutions doesn't move anything forward, and; if approved, the process would stop and reverses several steps. There doesn't seem to be a choice of approving the recommendation and moving forward. President Watkins noted that it has to start somewhere. Senator Kleeberg added that new information became known very recently and the recommendation was not sent to the Senate to bring back to faculty which caused some of this to occur. This would have gone to the Governing Board Wednesday without the Academic Senate considering or discussing it. As more research and information came out there are some serious questions about the financial figures.

DE Coordinator Crandall-Bear stated he had been told by administration that this was not a 10+1 issue. There needs to be clarification as the process has clearly been impacted and there seems to be a fundamental misunderstanding as to what the process is. The first “whereas” is accurate. The second one is incorrect because the LMS Selection Committee is not a subcommittee. The College is legally required to submit an RFP when financial expense is at a certain level. Several times Mr. Crandall-Bear briefed the Academic Senate and distributed handouts. An RFP is a legal written document specifying exactly what vendors are required to propose. The procedures must be outlined: selection committee; presentations; rank and score RFPs, and; make a first and second recommendation to S/P Laguerre and then to the Governing Board. The process information was from VP Yulian Ligioso. Similar to hiring procedures, the selection committee was required to meet before the RFP was created to decide on ranking and scoring. Even though the Academic Senate has purview over hiring committees, decisions aren’t brought to the Senate for vote. The DE Committee didn’t request a subcommittee; it was created as part of the RFP process. That essentially puts both the Senate and the DE Committee in a similar position as bodies that would be involved, advised, and updated by the LMS Selection Committee. The Senate was consulted, advised, and updated on the process and timeline, LMS presentation briefs were delivered at Senate meetings, and particular effort was made to involve the Senate by inviting the Senate President and Vice President to the Selection Committee meetings, neither took part in the process. Blank shells were made available to the Senate members and all faculty. No Senate member ever looked at shells. For the resolution to say the Academic Senate wasn’t consulted is offensive and misleading.

President Watkins responded that the concern is not with the selection. Senator Kleeberg refuted two points. First, Mr. Crandall-Bear forgot to mention that the DE Committee is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate; was created by and reports back to the Senate; cannot bring something directly to the Board without going through the Senate, and; the DE Committee cannot create a committee to work outside of its authority without approval of the Committee and the Senate. Secondly, in the analogy to hiring committees, Mr. Crandall-Bear didn’t mention that Hiring Policy 4005, where members are chosen by the Senate President, was reached by mutual agreement between the Academic Senate and the Governing Board. No change can be made unless by mutual agreement. There is no policy for LMS recommendations but there is a hiring policy approved by the Academic Senate and the Board. Mr. Crandall-Bear replied that the RFP Selection Committee was not created by the DE Committee. Senator Kleeberg noted he had seen all of the LMS demonstrations and was impressed with Canvas, however, evidence seems to indicate no savings at all and the numbers need to be reviewed. Senator Jaimez queried if the Governing Board removed the LMS item from the agenda because of this Senate meeting. Senator Kleeberg replied that S/P Laguerre pulled it, not because of the Senate meeting, but the Senate is meeting because the item was pulled. Other senators agreed with Senator Reeve that the topic of today’s Senate meeting is not what they anticipated.

Senator Reeve queried if there is an RFP process and a policy document related to the RFP information that came from VP Ligioso and what process was used to select eCollege. Senator Kleeberg replied that setting up a Solano online program and eCollege went through the Academic Senate for approval. Mr. Crandall-Bear, in researching that, considered there may have been a violation by not having an RFP process when eCollege was chosen. The LMS Selection Committee was created predominantly with members of faculty who were representative of the Schools, Senate, IT, and administration. In terms of numbers, clearly mistakes were made, migrated into the resolution and S/P Laguerre had incorrect figures in the memo. The correct base Canvas cost is \$162,000, plus \$30,000 for premium support, plus staff to field maybe a dozen calls a day. EVP Reyes explained that the RFP was very broad in terms of support, from systems doing everything to the College doing everything. Premium support was selected which resulted in lower support, to be determined, needed from Solano College IT. Mr. Crandall-Bear noted that the ability of batch transfers from eCollege and costs involved need to be confirmed, and could substantially reduce faculty and/or IT workload to migrate courses. Canvas included \$9500 for transfer assistance and training costs. Dean Lamb pointed out that additional expense with eCollege included a .4 faculty reassign time (about \$37000 per year), a student worker (about \$6000 per year) and the DE Coordinator intercession prep work of about 100 hours (about \$5000 per year). That additional

\$48,500 support cost using eCollege could cover what College support needed for College using Canvas. Though the cost of eCollege was negotiated down it could potentially go back up.

Ruth Fuller expressed concern that the Academic Senate is out of process and considered other areas may not have benefitted from presentations like the one brought to her division by Senator Reeve. She added that work needs to get done and this shouldn't be held up. Marylou Fracisco, a member of the DE Committee, was under the impression that the DE Committee was responsible for reviewing learning systems and she aired in several DE meetings concern that there was no input from members through the whole process, the survey sent to faculty was never reviewed or seen by members until it was done, it should have been reviewed to know criteria to look for, the RFP was finally seen after questions about it. The DE Committee discussed that members would write the criteria, weight it, and rank the systems, but never had that input. She expressed concern about the rushed process and changing platforms in July with no pilot classes to see how it works.

Mr. Crandall-Bear noted that everyone was invited. Ms. Fuller felt this confuses the role of the selection group and what choices administration will make with or without the Committee. The Committee was given the timeline and agreed to look at content and support and people shouldn't mix up this process with administrative choices because they are separate issues. The Committee could only make recommendations. MF doesn't premium support mean supports admin, not faculty or students. Senator Kleeberg affirmed he was very certain the Selection Committee acted in entirely good faith, but the first request from Dr. Laguerre to look into changing the system was for cost savings, not primarily for a better system. There is general agreement that Canvas has great features. The reason this discussion came at such a late point was because several members were very surprised seeing it on the Board agenda to consider and then follow with action. Mr. Crandall-Bear responded that the Senate said never let him know it was out of process over the months of reports, presentations, and emails. Senator Kleeberg replied that he had let Dale know several times in emails that the process must ultimately go through the Senate; and that his emails were copied to the Senate and Dr. Laguerre. The information process was not in question. Senator Reeve pointed out that doesn't speak to why this is happening so late and considered Mr. Crandall-Bear's reports were the very definition of due diligence. Faculty and DE members had the same opportunities.

Most people have agreed that the process has been compressed in a way that wasn't comfortable. If the questions are about cost savings, maybe it doesn't have to happen so rapidly. The committee was tasked with doing this to save money starting next fall. She added that Mr. Crandall-Bear brought print copies showing the timeline, questions were raised, but no resolutions came out at that time to stop the process, and she couldn't believe this body, after time the Committee put in, could say a process could have been better run. Senator Kleeberg responded that there was nothing to stop before going to the Board for approval and not the Senate. To address the issue of savings, a contractual offer from Canvas needs to be seen as well as figures from VP Ligioso regarding staff. A pilot program is needed to work out unforeseen problems. Mr. Crandall-Bear stated the total for Canvas is \$192,000, written in the RFP, plus minimal staff needed here. EVP Reyes called Canvas to confirm the numbers are accurate and they will send another RFP that shows what the College now needs for support.

Senator Obegi opined the Senate should not undermine the LMS Selection committee work nor begin the process over. She queried if Canvas would be open to contracting another semester to slow down the transition. EVP Reyes replied that the eCollege contract terminates on July 1<sup>st</sup> and the RFP process would have to be used. Dean Lamb responded to Karen Cook's questions of support, stating special attention for support staff planning and faculty training would be needed and added that Canvas has much online and video support. EVP Reyes explained that part of the problem is that clarity is needed on what is going to happen going forward. The premium service includes 24-hour call support that everyone can access. Local issues would go to the DE Coordinator or somewhere else at the College. Senator Reeve pointed out it doesn't state 24/7/52 phone support in the RFP. Roy Pike, a member of the DE Committee, expressed concern that the rush to get it done can miss points like that and corrections need to be made. It would be wise to slow this down and be clear that all the pieces fit together. Senator Jaimez added that it would be helpful to see costs written down and the questions dealt with now. She opined the RFP search and selection was done well. Dean Lamb explained the goal was

to complete this now in order to begin preparation for transitioning and training workshops. If it goes to the Governing Board a month from now, the training process can still begin but it will be more compressed. Canvas mentioned that sometimes the legal part is a little slow, but they can open up shells and have informal training opportunities before the Board decides. The Board is allowing us to go forth and negotiate.

Ms. Fracisco raised concern about starting new programs without time to work out bugs, considering the challenges when BANNER was launched. Student frustration could devastate a program. Though the answers aren't complete, she applauded work done. The DE committee as a group didn't look at and compare RFPs and there was concern that people believed the DE committee confirmed and approved everything. EVP Reyes stated that what went to the Board was the opportunity to enter into negotiations the range of \$160,000 to \$210,000. Because of decreased reductions in sections and potentially less students, the cost could be less.

Mr. Crandall-Bear agreed the timeline was too short and he heard from other colleges that a year and a half is a good timeline. However, the longer it takes to make a decision the longer it will take to get training workshops implemented. Ms. Fuller requested the Academic Senate advocate piloting classes over the summer. She would like to see what the three library courses look like before 32 come up in the fall, and training and IT support would benefit by beginning with pilots.

President Watkins summarized what needs to be done:

- ✓ Clarify if platform changes fall within Title 5 10+1. All the plenary sessions he has attended discussed platform changes within that scope.
- ✓ Is there an RFP Process Policy?
- ✓ Clarify and confirm cost figures.
- ✓ Piloting is important and the Academic Senate should advocate for that.
- ✓ Timeline – need to speak with administration about that.
- ✓ Support – clarify if the RFP information or the text message EVP Reyes received is correct.
- ✓ Stipends – the DE Committee was asked for input.

President Watkins concluded that these were the main faculty concerns heard through the Academic Senate and the DE Committee members and not complaints about Canvas. Mr. Crandall-Bear agreed the list is a good summary of issues and he suggested he and President Watkins proceed as a team with input from EVP Reyes and S/P Laguerre. President Watkins agreed they will meet.

Final points made:

- Costs won't be exact until the contract agreement.
- Money isn't really an issue as the Board of Governors won't allow more than \$210,000. Numbers should be seen that don't differ from source to source, including remuneration for faculty. Additional savings stated need to be visible. Costs can't be clear until the support language is clear.
- Issues with migration stem from eCollege challenges, not Canvas.
- The Academic Senate and faculty have a voice on what is done going forward. Faculty voice is about academic and professional matters and has come through clear on the choice.

President Watkins will email updates to the Academic Senate. Depending on discussion needed, a virtual or in-person meeting can be scheduled.

## **6. Action Items**

## **7. Adjournment**

Motion to Adjourn – Senator Jaimez; Seconded – Senator Reeve; Passed - Unanimous

The meeting adjourned at 4:57 pm