



## ACADEMIC SENATE

### Adopted Minutes

April 16, 2012  
Board Room 626  
3:00 pm –5:00 pm

#### 1. Call to Order

President Watkins called the meeting to order at 3:10 pm

#### 2. Roll Call:

Thomas Watkins, President

Abla Christiansen, Nick Cittadino, Kevin Brewer, Dale Crandall-Bear *ex-officio*, Joe Conrad – *ex officio*, Erin Duane, Susanna Gunther, LaNae Jaimez, Richard Kleeberg, Amy Obegi, Scott Parrish, Melissa Reeve

Absent/Excused: Tracy Fields,

Guests: Jowel Laguerre, Charlene Snow

Connie Adams, Admin Assistant

#### 3. Approval of Agenda – April 16, 2012

Motion to Approve – Senator Parrish; Seconded – Senator Gunther

Discussion: Senator Obegi asked to add a Program Review question. President Watkins replied that it could replace Item 7.2.3, since DE Coordinator Crandall-Bear will not be available to give a report today.

Motion to Approve as amended – Senator Gunther; Seconded – Senator Parrish; Passed – Unanimous

#### 4. Approval of Minutes – March 19 & April 2, 2012

Deferred

#### 5. Comments from the Public

#### 6. President's Report

*League Alert:* On April 15<sup>th</sup> President Watkins forwarded the League Alert email about AB 2591 Community Colleges: Property Tax Revenues which would create an automatic backfill system when revenues fall short of the estimated budget. He asked Senators to read the information and take action to ensure there is a financial reserve for California community colleges when facing budget challenges similar to the current situation. The Academic Senate could draft a resolution of support and forward it to people listed in the alert. A sample letter was attached and President Watkins suggested Senators could individually send letters as well as a Senate drafted resolution that would be meaningful and powerful.

*Pearson Tutoring Class:* Prior to this Senate meeting, representatives from Pearson proposed a self-paced tutoring session service. Students would sign up any time and take a self-paced class which would include tutoring help, practice quizzes and exams, and high stakes quizzes and exams (mainly multiple choice). We could equate it to one of our classes and have input. It is similar to the ACE or CLEP idea. This would be a way students could challenge a course, but the presentation was more rhetoric, didn't show how it works, and it didn't look like a course. It is online tutoring with a tutor attached from other colleges throughout the nation, would cost \$299 per student for each course. Dr. Conrad wondered how it could work from a Curriculum Committee or legal standpoint. Senator Gunther opined the only way it conceivably work were if a student chose to take something like this to brush up prior to an assessment test and then it might allow them to not repeat a required course and could be an advantage for all involved when a student has an extended length of time between classes. Senator Christiansen opined that students would not want to pay \$299 and there is no way around clearing prerequisites that have to be passed with a C or higher. General agreement was that there are better options for students.

## 7. Reports

### 7.1 Superintendent/President Jowel Laguerre

*Program Review Subcommittee:* S/P Laguerre noted that accountability would be one of the good benefits through reports and recommendation made to the Academic Senate.

*Budget Planning:* About a month ago Peter Cammish, Director of Research & Planning, shared budget planning information and the planning timeline. Administration is reviewing different resources available at the College that are not known to everyone, with an approximate total of \$500,000, and includes the following grants: SB70, a grant from the Chancellor's Office, run for many years by an outside source, now handled internally, offers close to \$500,000 per year (current 2-year run) with a focus on CTE and includes faculty and program development. About \$200,000 of the grant will be included in planning; the Perkins grant funding was increased by \$150,000.

Comments/Questions: S/P Laguerre responded to questions from Senators that the funds mentioned are categorical for CTE and are available every year to count on and tap into. This is a beginning and the College will need to dig deeper into the budget in coming years to ensure more openness to get what is needed. From an Academic Senate standpoint, Accreditation recommendation 2 or 3, addresses faculty positions incorporated into the whole planning process and S/P Laguerre would anticipate that each school will recommend what faculty positions are wanted and conversations can start early. The funds mentioned do not include additional positions: these positions are based on retirements, resignations, etc. He hopes everyone will be encouraged to stay active and remain in the process. The Accreditation report didn't compliment the budget process. The faculty hiring should be included with budget plans and as faculty positions go through the process, they will come to the Senate, which can influence the outcome. Conversations with EVP Reyes and continued discussion with the Senate is important to ensure Senate input and follow the general planning process.

Regarding the Curriculum Analyst position, S/P Laguerre reported that without summer school there will be staff from the centers coming to help in the Curriculum office and hiring will take place by August 1<sup>st</sup>. Dr. Conrad pointed out that essentially everything passed through the Curriculum Committee is on hold with no one to forward items to the Governing Board agendas and meetings or on to the Chancellor's Office. Programs that should be on the books this fall won't happen. S/P Laguerre noted there may be two different matters. Classified staff agreed they would sacrifice half-time positions for scheduling and have an actual input person for BANNER. The vacant Analyst position has been at different stages. Dr. Conrad pointed out that there was an overload of work in that job and Tina Abbate can't be expected to cover her own heavy workload and analyst duties as well. The College should proceed with the hiring process. President Watkins agreed and noted that conversations with EVP Reyes ensured it would be filled but there has been no further communication. He reiterated that the Senate considers this very critical. S/P Laguerre will meet with Dr. Conrad and look into the matter to make sure it happens before May 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Regarding the mention in S/P Direct about reassessing release time positions, having categorical funds, and maybe having approval through the normal planning process, S/P Laguerre opined it would be beneficial to have the budget process for categoricals more open and follow the same path as everything else. It wouldn't negate plans or committee decision making. The proposal/planning document could be the same but some review and approval committees might be different. The funding decision would be made where authority resides for the existing funds, rather than FaBPAC. There would be different routes for approval depending on the funding sources.

*Tiered fees:* The Legislature would need to free community colleges to be more independent to incorporate the Santa Monica tiered model. The Chancellor's Office asked the attorney general's opinion on whether Santa Monica College can move forward. S/P Laguerre found it a bit draconian to have students pay different amounts in same semester but a tuition increase could have been helpful for a self-funded summer. There is no point in putting much thought into that until there is a legal opinion.

*Community College Advocacy:* S/P Laguerre shared his concern that there are real threats to community colleges, whether through student success initiatives, disparities that exist with differing rules for CSU/UCs regarding tuition, or because there is no funding protection for community colleges. Continued advocacy is critical and needs to be done well.

Comments/Questions: President Watkins reported concerns from faculty regarding MOUs with private colleges, specifically the one with APUS, as well as questions today regarding the Brandman connection. Senator Christiansen expressed her strong concerns about private institutions, who they're benefiting, and promotion they receive through the College. S/P Laguerre understood her concerns but asked Senators to keep in mind that access to UCs and CSUs is limited and getting worse and, if taxes don't pass, they won't take transfer students in spring 2013. With state institution access closed to many students, the College needs to explore what can be done to help them, including looking into the difficulty to access Bachelor's degrees. Senator Gunther would like to know that, when MOUs are signed, the College will follow through with accountability data on how they are helping students. S/P Laguerre replied that his past experience has been to ask for aggregate reports regarding transfer students. He wasn't part of the Brandman agreement, but plans to request follow up data including GPAs and documentation of student success up to three years later. S/P Laguerre would like to schedule time to continue conversation with the Academic Senate. Senator Reeve queried what kind of front-end data Solano College requires when approached by private institutions, such as graduation rates, starting salary-to-loan debt ratios of graduates, and job statistics, if they're compared to state systems, and what they would be asked for to guarantee that they will serve and prepare Solano students. S/P Laguerre gave the following list: accreditation; degrees offered; graduation rates (also available through IPEX); employment information, and; costs to students. If the school is accredited, offers a good product and affordable tuition they could be considered and noted that Phoenix students get into lot of debt.

In conclusion, S/P Laguerre had originally brought the APUS idea as a partnership and partnership was what the faculty and Senate disagreed with. In terms of transfer, if a school is accredited, that needs to be looked at and is totally different than a partnership. S/P Laguerre noted that really good questions have been asked, but he doesn't know that he ought to be the person to decide on criteria and he reiterated that he would love to discuss this more with the Senate and work together. It is important for Solano students to have access somehow. Mutual discussion will help determine what to have and the process to go through. S/P Laguerre does not go easy on for-profits, but sometimes it is best to help students and have something to protect them or they do it themselves. To find a middle ground, the Senate should look at that.

Senator Cittadino noted that he read through the MOU and not much was there except a strong note that they can't recruit students to take classes offered here. Dr. Conrad agreed and added that it is very similar to state imposed transfer agreement, basically saying if a student takes a program here that they will recognize it there.

## **7.2 Sub-Committee Reports**

### **7.2.1 Basic Skills – Melissa Reeve**

BSI Coordinator Reeve reported in her email update, sent to all faculty before spring break, that the Basic Skills Steering Committee has been discussing how to operate in terms of: the Committee structure; cycles of funding, and; whether to continue funding smaller proposals or combine energy and funds towards one or two larger projects. A faculty survey will be sent out for input. Senator Reeve will meet with S/P Laguerre tomorrow to discuss his decision to cancel the ASC Coordinator position, scrutiny of other coordinator positions, funding alignment and process and how that could impact the BSSC Committee and specific BSI funds. She learned of the variety and similarities of other colleges in their basic skills work at a state BSI conference she attended recently and hopes to have a clear plan by fall, a good sense of how the College committees work, and clarity on the alignment of goals and processes within the institution.

### **7.2.2 Curriculum – Joe Conrad**

Curriculum Chair Conrad expressed strong concern that there is no one to interface between the College and the Chancellor's Office. Tina Abbate cannot be expected to cover the unfilled analyst job along with her own very

busy workload. Timely implementation of the ECE alignment project, Communications Associates Degree for transfer, new courses and other items cannot take place without someone in place to submit items to the Governing Board, the Chancellor's Office and follow up to completion. President Watkins reported that EVP Reyes had assured him that the Curriculum Analyst position would be filled. Dr. Conrad responded that, although there had been interviews, from reading S/P Direct, the position is on hold until fall. After passage by the Curriculum Committee, nothing official can happen with items that need to go to the Governing Board and the Chancellor's Office until the position is filled and, unless someone is very experienced and skilled, there could be a huge learning curve. Senators suggested President Watkins express the Senate's concern and first ask S/P Laguerre for clarification on the Analyst position status.

7.2.3 Distance Ed – Dale Crandall-Bear (no report)  
Program Review Question (see agenda Item 3)

Senator Obegi noted that, several meetings back, S/P Laguerre spoke of revamping Program Review. She was recruited to be involved in the process and, before she meets with S/P Laguerre, she would like to know if a Senate subcommittee for Program Review should be created. Senator Duane noted there needs to be communication between the Curriculum Committee and Program Review, something formal would be great, and she queried how it would function. Mr. Conrad has addressed this topic with people at conferences and sees much room for improvement here. Senator Obegi shared her experience working at another college: a program review committee included someone from every school; the dean of the current review area as well as the dean for the next scheduled review were on it; a format with what to do, how to do it, and a timeline was used; reviews were presented in front of the group when completed; reviews were read; commendations and recommendations for improvement were given; the reviews were tied into three-year plans, master plans etc., student surveys were taken; it was very comprehensive showing how programs were doing and where they were floundering; every division had a binder for documentation and each department had a camera for visual evidence, and; accolades were received from Accreditation. Senators agreed a Program Review subcommittee is needed.

7.2.4 Tenure Tea – Nick Cittadino & LaNae Jaimez

Co-chair Jaimez reported everything is ready to go, they will send out a Save-the-date this week. S/P Laguerre recommended inviting Governing Board members.

7.2.5 Distinguished Faculty Awards – Tracy Fields & Amy Obegi

Senator Obegi reported that a nomination reminder email will be sent out next week for the full-time and adjunct Distinguished Faculty Awards. Senator Parrish responded to Senator Obegi's request for volunteers and he will serve on the selection committee.

**7.3 Treasurer's Report**

**8. Action Items**

**9. Information/Discussion Items**

**9.1 SLO subcommittee – President Watkins**

President Watkins previously spoke about having an SLO subcommittee of the Senate with two reps from each school and a chairman elected by the committee. He spoke with Charlene Snow regarding 10% reassign time for the chair as the Faculty Association was against coordinator positions. This needs to be faculty driven. President Watkins spoke with DVC (commended for their SLO program by Accreditation) and learned that one of the ways they did that was with a subcommittee. DVC faculty was very involved in the whole process that worked out very well for them and it may be a good way here as well. They showed it was faculty driven and controlled and the chair reported information back to the Senate. Senator Reeve pointed out that DVC has bylaws and part of their tenure review process that compels full-time faculty to serve on committees.

## **9.2 The Reality of Shared Governance & Planning at Solano College – Susanna Gunther**

Vice-President Gunther queried what the Academic Senate can do, if Senators agree that there are continuing problems created by a lack of transparency in decision making at the College. Senator Kleeberg suggested: writing to S/P Laguerre; drafting a resolution and taking it to the Governing Board; regarding Flex-Cal issues, invite the four academic deans to a meeting and request they follow the rules, and; find if there is a group grievance process to follow if faculty are not being treated the same. He clarified that any rules regarding flex should be made by mutual agreement between the Academic Senate and the Governing Board. The faculty, not the deans, should set the rules. Melissa reported that Dean Lamb said he had shared the guidelines at a Liberal Arts meeting earlier in year but she couldn't imagine that it wouldn't have elicited an outcry. Dean Lamb also sent the Chancellor's Office document with examples of activities that would qualify and said that is it. Senator Kleeberg pointed out that flex activities can include anything related to instructional improvement. The College turned over Flex Cal to HR twenty-one years ago, but it is handled by faculty at most colleges. Senator Obegi recommended the Senate create resolutions regarding the items discussed.

Continued discussion included the following: Academic Senate is on the list as unapproved for flex; President Watkins recalled the previous agreement deans made at a joint meeting last year that the Senate and deans would meet to discuss Flex-Cal; the deans created a draft on their own, and; it might be best now to create a Senate draft to articulate with the draft created by the deans. Senator Reeve will forward the draft she received from her dean in response to questions she had regarding flex hours she was denied, including Senate time. She was told it had nothing to do with hours, only whether or not it is on the list. Senator Christiansen expressed concern that decisions like that get made and no one knows until something like this happens. Senator Gunther suggested the need to be more proactive, follow through with issues, and know recourse when needed. Senator Kleeberg pointed out that the dean's signature is only for verification that the form was turned in because the state requires the forms are kept in case of audit. The key term for acceptable flex is "instructional improvement".

Senator Parrish proposed Flex Cal credit be added for service on subcommittees, hiring committees, etc. Senator Kleeberg replied that has always been the practice until this just came up. Senator Gunther will attend ASCCC Spring Plenary next week and can request clarity on this issue.

## **9.3 Commencement – President Watkins (15 min)**

President Watkins, as a member of the Commencement Committee, presented slides to illustrate plans for this year's commencement which will be held in the stadium. The Commencement Marshals should attend the next meeting on Thursday, April 19, from 11:00 am – 12:00 pm. Faculty will not need to line up alphabetically this year and once seated, they will be facing the graduates. As the new Senate President, Susanna Gunther will be the Grand Marshal and will announce the Distinguished Faculty Awards.

## **9.4 Faculty Hiring Policy/Procedures V - VIII – Charo Albarran, HR Manager** Deferred

## **10. Action Reminders**

### **11. Announcements**

New Academic Senate officers and representatives will be introduced at the May 7<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting and they will be invited to attend the May 2<sup>nd</sup> Governing Board meeting to be introduced to Board members. The final 2011-2012 Senate report will be given at that meeting.

### **12. Adjournment**

Motion to Adjourn – Senator Gunther; Seconded – Senator Reeve; Passed – Unanimous  
Meeting adjourned at 4:59 pm