



ACADEMIC SENATE

Adopted Minutes

May 7, 2012
Board Room 626
3:00 pm –5:00 pm

1. Call to Order

President Watkins called the meeting to order at 3:08 pm.

2. Roll Call:

Thomas Watkins, President

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

Absent/Excused: Susanna Gunther

Guests: Peter Cammish, Arturo Reyes, Katherine Luce, Terri Pearson-Bloom, Roy Pike, Ken Williams

Connie Adams, Admin Assistant

3. Approval of Agenda – May 7, 2012

Motion to Approve – Senator Duane; Seconded – Senator Parrish

Discussion: President Watkins reported that S/P Laguerre ceded his report time (Item 7.1) for a Bond presentation. Peter Cammish, Director of Research & Planning, ceded 10 minutes of Item 9.2 as well.

Motion to Approve as amended – Senator Kleeberg; Seconded – Senator Duane; Passed – Unanimous

4. Approval of Minutes – March 19, April 2, & April 16, 2012

Motion to Approve the three sets of minutes – Senator Reeve; Seconded – Senator Duane; Passed – Unanimous

5. Comments from the Public

Scott Parrish presented gifts and expressions of appreciation from himself and Senate colleagues to President Watkins for his service on the Academic Senate.

6. President's Report

Flex-Cal Funding: President Watkins met with VP Ligioso to establish permanent funding for Flex-Cal of \$5000 per year. This is a required College function that should be properly funded without having to search for money each year. VP Ligioso agreed and added Flex-Cal to the budget, it was discussed at the last FaBPAC meeting, and it will be voted on at the next meeting to become permanent funding. President Watkins thanked VP Ligioso for his support.

Proposed High School Admissions Criteria: Dean Jerry Kea revised the proposal after discussion at the March 19th Academic Senate meeting. The revision was forwarded to Senators on April 19th. Dean Kea and EVP Reyes agreed that discussion between the Senate and deans will be planned in order to reach agreement.

Reality of Shared Governance Planning: Current plans are to address this topic at the September Academic Senate meeting and have an hour dedicated to discussion with S/P Laguerre.

Printed Schedule: President Watkins reported there has been discussion for and against printing of catalogues, full or shortened versions, whether or not to charge students for copies that could be made available at the bookstore, concern about the amount of errors in the catalogue and that it wasn't available until after registration began. The significant decrease in copies printed and the discontinuance of mailing saved the district \$25,000. Barbara Fountain plans to address the catalogue topic at the joint Academic Senate and Ed Admin meeting in August. Students' opinions will be requested as well.

Comments/Questions: Senator Kleeberg suggested that, along with staff who proofread, instructors should be given 48-hour access to proofread their own courses, which would significantly decrease the tremendous amount of errors. Ken Williams noted that classes are rolled over from BANNER one semester to the next, even if not offered in that semester. Senator Christiansen opined that the catalogue should be available for sale because there are always students who need it and she recommended including counseling, general education, and other information. President Watkins reported that Barbara Fountain plans to also speak with counselors. Senators can forward input to incoming Senate President Gunther for discussion that will continue at Enrollment Management meetings where the Senate President is automatically a member.

7. Reports

7.1 Superintendent/President Jowel Laguerre / changed to Bond Presentation by Bonnie Jean von Krogh of Lew Edwards & Associates.

VP Ligioso thanked the Academic Senate, S/P Laguerre, and Peter Cammish for providing time for this update on the bond potential. He noted that most faculty have a good sense of where the College is financially from presentations in other meetings. He introduced Bonnie Jean Krogh to provide an update and overview of the bond planning. She is from the Edwards Group; a strategy firm specialized in working with districts that are considering bonds. The firm has helped 19 college districts pass bonds, have been undefeated and plan to keep that record.

Ms. Krogh specifically talked about planning for the potential November 2012 bond and the external community survey done in November 2011. Outreach efforts have begun through meetings with community groups throughout the district, discussing priorities and fiscal challenges. A letter (copy distributed at meeting) will be sent out in the next few days to faculty and students.

The results of the independent survey of just over 600 voters district-wide included:

- A bond of up to \$350 million is potentially viable in November 2012.
- The community was most interested in job training, workforce preparation, four-year college preparation and access.
- A high level of fiscal accountability with any measure is important.
- Perception: 89% of voters see community colleges in general in an important role to train and retrain residents.
- Questions were asked in different ways to see if voters had a different take. Overall 80% were favorable of the College and 69% were favorable of the district. Even 69% is very high compared to what has been seen throughout the state and shows a strong overall support for the district.
- There was absolute consensus that the College offers access to higher education and serves residents well.
- Nearly 8 in 10 believe the College is in need of additional funding.
- Majority believe the buildings are in need of repair.

The next part specifically addressed the bond question with legal language that would be on the ballot as approved by the Bond Council: “Shall Solano Community College District issue \$350 million in bonds at legal rates, with citizens’ oversight, annual audits and no money for administrators’ salaries?”

- Over 60% are inclined to support a \$350 million bond measure.
- All ethnic groups are supportive of a potential bond.
- Renters and property owners showed support at 72% and 62%. The threshold to go forward is 55% for bonds.
- Voters placed the highest priority on workforce development, safety issues, and preparing students for university.
- Facilities should meet earthquake and fire safety codes.
- Increase public and private collaboration and partnerships.
- Prepare students for universities and jobs.
- Questions were posed with positive and negative points and still resulted in 62% overall support.

Ms. Krogh noted the question then is if the bond measure is a good idea at this time. The answer is “yes” because voters are concerned about rising college costs and are supportive of education here and economic downturn renews concerns the community colleges can address. There are a variety of items on the November ballot from state to local. Voters tend to look at local measures first and then think about how they’ll vote on state.

How you can help:

- ✓ Join district planning sessions during the summer
- ✓ Faculty in local communities participate in informational presentations
- ✓ Assist with circulating information about the needs

Additional comments, questions, and points:

Poll numbers at Solano are quite good in comparison to other colleges.

Direction is taken from the College District regarding bonding capacity.

Facilities plans: a new LRC, science center, theatre, and additional buildings at both centers to support student services as addressed in one of the Accreditation recommendations. The College is working with Kitchell to cost out.

Plans include Foundation funding for deferred maintenance needs in the future and alternative energy and greening buildings that can put money back into the general fund.

A \$350 million bond would cost \$12-23 per \$100,000 of assessed property value.

There is room for change, including the Shared Governance process, and this can be brought back to the Senate.

Voters become more engaged closer to Election Day. Poll tracking will be done after July 4th before the

Governing Board decision in August whether or not to be on the November ballot. If numbers wane much, the bond would be postponed.

Funds remaining from the Measure G bond are being spent on the 600 and 1300 buildings.

Ms. Von Krogh met with various groups on campus and asked for faculty opinion and input. Dr. Conrad raised concern about ill feelings concerning the previous bond, in particular how it was presented to the public, including modernizing science. There are still things not completed and substandard work and materials had to be replaced. He expressed concern that what is sold actually happens. Other Senators agreed and expressed concern about classes being cut and facilities being added. While there was general agreement with what is needed, the reality of the College staffing and continuing programs to serve the needs of the community was questioned. Terri Pearson was glad to hear the bond could finance construction and move money around in a smart way, which could free up money for other things. Ms. Von Krogh confirmed that bonds can only be used for facilities, but can take the weight off the general fund and can also backfill it through alternative energy and greening of buildings. Voters were specifically asked about the green aspect which is a little harder mental leap than preparing students for university. She added that CTE, firefighting, nursing, energy jobs and biotech are popular among voters. Senator Parrish suggested that tutoring rooms near CTE classrooms would be beneficial.

VP Ligioso requested questions and comments be forwarded to Janet Leary. He distributed a facilities update draft memo that will be sent campus-wide tomorrow and an invitation to the two Facilities Master Plan Community Workshops. VP Ligioso encouraged everyone to participate in the workshops to help define the future College environment. MIG engaged the entire College community in the educational planning process and recently presented an overview of goals. A continuation meeting will be held on May 9th and additional sessions on May 15th and 16th are planned to discuss how to implement the three-prong approach to the state-refined mission: transfer, basic skills, and CTE. Concurrently with that, facilities planners will be participating in the meetings with MIG and architects to translate wishes to actual brick and mortar. VP Ligioso again urged attendance at these planning meetings.

7.2 Sub-Committee Reports (15 min)

7.2.1 Basic Skills – Melissa Reeve

Melissa reported that the Committee put a lot of energy to defining roles and structure in terms of decision making and how to manage the BSI budget. An announcement for grant proposals was emailed to all faculty members with a deadline last Friday for summer proposals and a May 11th deadline for fall proposals. The Committee will review summer proposals at tomorrow's BSI meeting. They agreed to retain the Basic Skills Math and English Coordinator positions because human resources are very important and must be a top priority to support the direction of Basic Skills and student services. Announcements were sent out for both positions with a closing date of May 15th.

7.2.2 Curriculum – Joe Conrad

Chair Conrad reported that Curriculum Review is a good idea, it is also required by law, and he hopes to meet with the deans this week to discuss it and get the regular five-year Curriculum Review rotation back on track.

Dr. Conrad attended the regional ASCCC Curriculum meeting and reported: Solano College has met the expectation to have two transfer degrees in place; a third one has been approved by the College but has not been submitted to the Chancellor's Office; several others are in process; one college submitted ten; ASCCC urged colleges to continue working on and submitting degrees, and; Dr. Conrad encouraged the College as well. There was a proposal in the legislature to require all colleges to develop a transfer degree for every major for which there is transfer model curriculum. The state Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office hopes that, if colleges show in good faith that they are trying to develop them, the legislature won't mandate any number by any particular schedule.

Finally, and most significantly for some instructors, ASCCC expects that there will be a final decision this summer to end the traditional role of course repeatability. By summer 2013, the College will probably have to remove repeatability from all courses that have it. That will entail a tremendous amount of work for the Curriculum Committee and especially faculty teaching courses that have been repeatable, such as performing arts and PE. There will be some exceptions, including adaptive PE, intercollegiate athletics, music, and anything that is required by law to be repeatable. Dr. Conrad advised caution regarding creation of course levels because of a regulation that no more than four courses of the same type can be taken. Schools will have to decide what is called a "family of courses". While there could be twelve in a "family", students could only take four that the school would receive appropriation for. Once the repeatability decision is made, a lot will have to be done quickly but, hopefully, there will be time from the notification to work through all the courses on the campus. As with course repetition, there will be no "grandfathering in" with course repeatability either.

7.2.3 Distance Ed – Dale Crandall-Bear

DE Coordinator Crandall-Bear reported the Governing Board approved the LMS last week and S/P Laguerre stated at that meeting that this is a transitional phase and the College will move to Canvas in the second year of the Pearson contract. Pearson publisher reps are not part of the Pearson division that proposed the LMS, they hadn't been informed until very recently of specifics, and weren't happy with the contract regarding materials. Pearson arrived at \$80 as an average for digital materials, instructors have the option to discourage students if it would be a price increase for them, and they can opt out of the program. The Canvas pilot is moving forward with a group of 15-20 faculty and training workshops will begin next week. Pearson brought another proposal to the College for a Pearson online course with tutors not trained or hired by the College. Faculty were deeply disturbed by this proposal that feeds into the canned courses issue. A focused task force has been proposed to study issues of publisher materials, canned courses, workload issues etc., and draft a policy as there isn't one currently in place to address issues like this recent Pearson proposal. Beginning next semester, the task force will be made up of people from the Academic Senate, Distance Ed, the Faculty Association, and the Curriculum Committee.

Plans have been discussed to implement Program Review for Distance Education and Chair Crandall-Bear looks forward to having data to compare online and face-to-face courses.

7.2.4 Tenure Tea – Nick Cittadino & LaNae Jaimez

Senator Jaimez reported the event went well, the music was a hit, and overall positive feedback was received.

7.2.5 Distinguished Faculty Awards – Tracy Fields & Amy Obegi

Senator Fields reported: Senator Obegi got information out in a timely manner; nominations closed on May 4th; three, possibly four, nominations were received, only one is for an adjunct, and; the five-member committee will meet next Wednesday to choose the winners. President Watkins noted adjunct nominations have been a problem in the past, sometimes with only one or even no nominations received, and it is important to look at the criteria to decide if someone meets it and should receive an award. Senator Obegi queried if committee members can nominate faculty. General Senate agreement was to allow that, noting that the voting should be balanced with five members on the committee.

7.3 Treasurer's Report

Senator Kleeberg reported a balance of approximately \$8000, with some checks to be deposited. He will turn over all treasury information to the next Secretary/Treasurer, to be elected in the fall.

8. Action Items

8.1 Program Review Subcommittee

Senator Obegi emailed a proposal (May 7th) to create a program review subcommittee of the Academic Senate. S/P Laguerre brought forth discussion previously about revamping the Program Review process. He and Senator Obegi have met to discuss how to ensure it is faculty driven. Program Review has not been integrated with other planning processes and reviews have not had direction to implement beneficial changes. A new Program Review process would highlight strengths of programs and advocate for support. A Program Review subcommittee of the Academic Senate would basically be a task force to set up policy and procedures, separate from committees that would actually review programs.

Motion to establish a Program Review subcommittee of the Academic Senate – Senator Jaimez; Seconded – Senator Reeve; Passed – Unanimous

Senator Obegi will forward a request for faculty interested in serving on the committee to President Watkins to be emailed to all faculty.

9. Information/Discussion Items

9.1 SLO Update – Peter Cammish, Arturo Reyes

EVP Reyes reminded Senators that accreditation and SLO reports will be submitted in October to the Accreditation Commission. Over the past few years, the College has submitted reports to the Commission showing nearly 100% completion status for SLOs and SAOs. Research & Planning Director Peter Cammish and EVP Reyes reviewed everything and their report reflects a more realistic 60-80%. It is important between now and October to complete the work needed and have accurate reports. EVP Reyes noted that his broader question is how to get this work completed between now and October.

Director Cammish spoke about the process to implement for this term and the immediate future. Time was dedicated to SLOs at the spring Flex Cal day and some deans are moving forward. He noted that part of the problem the Commission had was not readily finding information. Director Cammish presented screen views of the new forms that were filled out at Flex. When the online forms and network drive are ready, he will give faculty access to go in and update their programs. He explained how to access information and noted that, each course had just one outcome on the form, but in this program there can be a description, success criteria, cognitive process, assessments used, links to program outcomes, and links to core competencies. The links don't mean a lot for each course, but when mapping the curriculum, it will show how it builds up and if students are having a chance to develop skills and master them by the end. There is an assessment diary to keep track. Reports at program level bring together all courses in the program. One advantage to having this database, information related to courses can be pulled in from BANNER. No matter what course is picked, all information will be available going back five years. Faculty will maintain their information and reports will generate automatically from the database. Over the summer, information will be input into the database for access by fall.

Comments/Questions: Senator Cittadino suggested having an SLO/SAO link for faculty on the home page. Director Cammish replied that could be done with static information only. EVP Reyes reported that clerical personnel will transfer information from word docs into the program during the summer and he hopes to eventually have faculty input their information directly. Once the information from there is in a form that makes sense, it will be available for public access. Faculty should let deans know of any more changes they need to make before the end of the semester so work is coordinated and not duplicated. The process will be made as easy as possible. In response to Senator Reeve's question about the functionality of linking outcomes to courses, Director Cammish recommended focus on the most important outcomes. Quality could be lost by trying to link to them all. EVP Reyes clarified that reflections would be integrated at the course level which would then be included in the program as well.

9.2 Faculty Hiring Policy & Procedures – Peter Cammish, Thom Watkins (30 min)

President Watkins reported that S/P Laguerre wants to make sure the faculty hiring procedures are integrated with the campus proposal process for faculty, equipment, staff, etc. Proposals come from the schools, go to review groups, Shared Governance Council to be prioritized, FaBPAC for funding information, and then to S/P Laguerre. A proposal for new faculty would be submitted and forwarded to the Academic Senate for prioritization, then to Shared Governance for information only. The Senate prioritization cannot be changed by any other group.

Dr. Conrad opined that the current faculty hiring process is set up under the assumption that particular hiring is going to happen. There hasn't been anything to get to the point of who will be hired. President Watkins replied

that is a discussion the Academic Senate should have that S/P Laguerre wants to happen. Staff would go through same process all under one umbrella. Director Cammish clarified that there will be a transparent process for people to see. FaBPAC cares about funding, not order. President Watkins pointed out that the process is separate from faculty hiring policy and procedure. Senator Jaimez queried if priorities should be addressed in policy. That would precede what is being worked on. Director Cammish noted that SGC proposal decisions were quite varied and a more formalized process for prioritization needs to be created. President Watkins and Director Cammish looked at that. SGC will use something like survey monkey and generate a chart for a clearer process. Faculty hiring priorities will be sent to SGC for information only. President Watkins stated that current faculty hiring will go through the regular process.

9.3 Flex-Cal Resolution – Richard Kleeberg

Senator Kleeberg emailed a resolution draft that was also distributed at the meeting. There seems to be agreement with some deans and S/P Laguerre to meet, discuss Flex Cal activities and resolve and clarify how decisions are made and where authority lies. S/P Laguerre agreed no one will lose sick leave hours and credit will be given for attendance at the Academic Senate meeting. S/P Laguerre would prefer to have an agreement in August that would be retroactive. Senator Kleeberg advised faculty who lost sick leave hours should contact S/P Laguerre, who stated that no one will lose those hours. President Watkins reported that S/P Laguerre was surprised to hear of this issue, agreed it was not right and it needs to be fixed. Senator Reeve suggested Senators inform their constituents to carefully watch their paystubs.

9.4 Matters of Concern – Susanna Gunther

In VP Gunther's absence, President Watkins shared the following: faculty interested in working on Accreditation and SLO tasks over the summer should attend a meeting next Monday, from 3-5 pm in the Boardroom. VP Gunther will notify all faculty about the potential summer work for which faculty chosen would be compensated an hourly wage. The student equity issue has been discussed and Senators were asked to consider if a student equity task force or Senate subcommittee should be created. This topic will be revisited in the fall.

10. Action Reminders

11. Announcements

11.1 Welcome New Senators

President Watkins welcomed the incoming Senators: Katherine Luce, Part-Time Rep; Ken Williams, Part-Time Rep; Terri Pearson-Bloom, At-Large Senator, and; Roy Pike, Vice President.

12. Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn – Senator Kleeberg; Seconded – Senator Reeve; Passed – Unanimous Meeting adjourned at 5:07 pm