



ACADEMIC SENATE

Adopted Minutes

September 24, 2012

Board Room 626

3:00 pm – 4:00 pm

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call:

Susanna Gunther, President

Abla Christiansen, Nick Cittadino, Kevin Brewer, Dale Crandall-Bear *ex-officio*, Joe Conrad – *ex officio*, Erin Duane, Tracy Fields, LaNae Jaimez, Katherine Luce, Amy Obegi, Scott Parrish, Teri Pearson-Bloom, Melissa Reeve, Ken Williams

Guests: Annette Dambrosio

Connie Adams, Admin Assistant

3. Approval of Agenda – September 24, 2012

Motion to Approve – Senator Duane; Seconded – Senator Jaimez; Passed – Unanimous

4. Approval of Minutes – August 20 and September 17, 2012

Deferred

5. Comments from the Public

None

6. Action Items

6.1 Accreditation Draft Approval

Accreditation Co-chair, Annette Dambrosio, reported that the Mission Statement is in place but it will be refined and the report will show it as a work in progress. The important thing is what has been done so far. Recommendation 2 addresses planning and has ongoing updating in a good way through attempts to bring together all the planning related pieces on the campus. If the Senate approves the draft today, changes will occur as data continues to be collected. Feedback is still requested. Co-chair Dambrosio asked everyone to read the document and report any corrections that should be made and send additional relevant input. She noted that the IPP flow chart is a good visual and it will likely be included after she speaks with Peter Cammish. Program Review Task Force and SLO Committee information will be included to show what has been accomplished.

SLO work has continued on outcome portions. Co-chair Dambrosio has continued to take notes on what everyone is doing with SLOs and the outcomes package. A difficult part is the history on how the College got on warning. As an example, a document that was created and intended to be a good document wasn't used but maybe should be left in. The Accreditation team cannot be contacted regarding the information they are seeking when they do the accreditation visit. She has reviewed reports from other colleges but has to look at what is relevant here. She found new guidelines that just came out in September that are much more prescriptive, especially the follow-up. The guidelines can be met, but getting it written now is the challenge.

Recommendation #3 is still under construction. Institutional research and culture of evidence is almost complete; equity is still in process; DE is close to completion but could include more on professional

development and connection with the Academic Success Center (ASC); SLO and contracts are done; service at centers looks pretty comprehensive but could use everyone's review; ethics and mission are as discussed. Submissions can still be added.

President Gunther pointed out that the Academic Senate is one of few places where there are faculty members from every area and it is very important for Senators to read what is associated with their areas so all relevant information can be included. Fact finding and evidence are needed.

Professor Dambrosio will email the report draft today so everyone can read it while Banner is down. The evidence will not be included as it cannot be downloaded but can be viewed next week online. The evidence is embedded as hypertext in the document, but it now has to also be a separate document for ACCJC. She will have to go back and put it together as many ways as possible for ease of use and there will be hardcopy here for the Accreditation Team. Before the visit an email summary of additional information added after today should be sent to everyone. A suggestion was made to have S/P Laguerre send it out in his S/P Direct.

Motion to approve the Accreditation Report Draft – Senator Parrish; Seconded – Senator Duane; Passed – Unanimous

6.2 Mission Statement Approval

The Mission Statement was submitted to Shared Governance Council (SGC) and the President's Cabinet. It will be sent to some English faculty to improve the flow. Comments and suggestions from the Senators included: the continuous assessment part should be later because it is relevant to everything; assessment is also about services and another sentence about assessments could be made; it should be ordered differently; services that are responsive to the needs of students are part of assessment results; it shouldn't end with life-long learning which is not a State focus, and; modify to identify the intended student population.

From the discussion input, Senator Reeve suggested:

“Solano Community College prepares a diverse and dynamic student population from our local communities and beyond to achieve educational, professional and personal goals through the provision of basic skills, workforce development, and transfer-level curriculum. We achieve this by providing quality teaching, a broad curriculum, effective transfer preparation, and lifelong learning. We ensure that our services are responsive to the needs of our students through continuous assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness”.

Motion to approve the rearranged version – Senator Duane; Seconded – Senator Brewer; Passed – Unanimous.

6.3 Code of Ethics Approval

President Gunther reported that neither the Code of Ethics nor the Code of Conduct (see documents from Sept. 17 meeting) is identical to what will become the final version. This is not actually an action item today, only information and discussion. Comment and input should be given to the committee that will be formed to create a finalized version which will probably go forward from SGC.

Comments/Questions: Senator Luce sent out information from two other community colleges based on the American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics. She noted that the AAUP statement is totally conceptual; some parts, such as research, are not as relevant for the College; both colleges used that base and then got much more specific, and; both seemed solid and gave ethical guidance. Senator Duane commented that those versions stuck to ethics and not practices and she personally thinks that would be best.

Senators commented that: the College drafts include a lot of things that aren't about the ethics of teaching and are too large; there is nothing in the drafts that specifies what staff are supposed to be doing and nothing that is enforceable; questions were raised on what is to be accomplished and how practical to be; ACCJC asked for creation of a comprehensive code of ethics for employees; how to act as professional employees; state clearly practical statements; don't include anything that people are not comfortable with or don't want to live with; be short and obvious; there is nothing to argue with in the skeleton of the Pierce College code and it could be a good starting point; in the one-page SCC version the appropriate use of social media doesn't make sense; Pierce was just faculty, here it will include everyone and may need to be specific per group; ethics should be timeless; everything that will happen can't be anticipated; it needs to have overarching timeless ethics that everything can be organized under; can have broad comments that aren't vague but also don't need to be too detailed; the Pierce code seemed as much interested in the process as the actual code; practices should be separate from the code; stick with more general one-page basic ethics;

Professor Dambrosio explained that there was a misunderstanding in the beginning of the College's process regarding the ethics code that resulted in a late start. The code won't be ready for the report but will be shown as a work in process. ACCJC is interested in a more unified, inclusive approach on how this campus operates.

Senator Cittadino warned against contract implications. Senator Luce queried if the code would have a formal force. President Gunther noted that SGC will probably create a committee and the code will return to the Senate and SGC.

7. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn – Senator Cittadino; Seconded – Senator Reeve; Passed – Unanimous
The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.