



ACADEMIC SENATE

Adopted Minutes

October 15, 2012

Board Room 626

3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

1. Call to Order

President Gunther called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Susanna Gunther, President

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

Absent: Abla Christiansen, Katherine Luce, Scott Parrish

Guests: Jowel Laguerre, Gene Thomas, Samanda Dorger

Visitors: Annette Dambrosio, Ruth Fuller, Roy Pike

Connie Adams, Admin Assistant

3. Approval of Agenda – October 15, 2012

Motion to approve – Senator Fields; Second – Senator Reeve;

Corrected date from Oct. 1 to Oct. 15; Passed – unanimous

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

Deferred

5. Comments from the Public

6. President's Report Regarding Shared Governance

President Gunther noted that the intention of AB1725, approved in 1988, was to change the way community colleges did business to include effective faculty participation in decision-making processes. Her report included the following examples of items that involved little or no consultation with College faculty or the Academic Senate:

- Adoption of a new DE platform
 - The DE committee, as well as a subcommittee of the DE committee, spent many months carefully evaluating which DE platform would be best for Solano College. They decided that Canvas was the best option after much careful consideration.
 - Then Dr. Laguerre apparently unilaterally made the decision that eCollege be continued as the DE platform with some possibility of later canvas adoption.
- The administrative reorganization
 - A reorganization committee chaired by the VPI and with both faculty and staff representatives met for over 30 hours to come up with a proposal for an administrative reorganization plan. During this time, the committee took input from both the deans as well as the Superintendent-President.
 - The final Reorganization Plan brought forth to the college substantially changed the reorganization committee's proposal and did not reflect their suggestions.
 - One result of this reorganization was that an academic dean was hired without an academic dean hiring process, and although this academic dean was said to be hired as an interim, he was given a two year contract and is only now being evaluated after almost two years.

- Decision to buy an auto dealership
 - Dr. Laguerre decided that Solano College should spend several million dollars to purchase an auto dealership. This was first brought to faculty in an Academic Senate meeting after the decision had already been made. The decision did not reflect any previous planning documentation as far as the faculty was aware.
- Addition of full-time Aeronautics faculty to the hiring list without proper procedure
 - An Aeronautics Full Time permanent hire was added to the priority list by the administration without being submitted for consideration by any level of shared governance. The reason given was that it was a necessary hire to prevent the discontinuance of the program, but if this were the case then the position should have been vetted through our normal faculty hiring process in any case.
- MOU signed and marketer hired for International English Program
 - An MOU was signed and a recruiter was sent to Asia to recruit international students for Solano College to start an International English Program which may lead to these students transferring to Solano College as international students to grow an international student program at Solano.
 - In spite of the fact that “Educational Programs” is #4 of the 10 + 1 topics for which Academic Senate has purview, this topic was never brought before senate, and only a handful of ESL faculty were even informed about these plans before the MOU was signed and \$50,000 was approved by the governing board for to the recruiter.
 - A proposal was submitted through the integrated planning process seeking \$100,000 for creating a more robust international student program, but this proposal was entirely denied funding in both SGC and FaBPAC, thus going forward with this endeavor at this time is in direct violation of both shared governance and our integrated planning process.
- Substantial change to the strategic proposal application
 - Peter Cammish and the administration created a substantially different new format for the strategic proposal application without Academic Senate or other significant faculty input.
- Recent positions hired or planned for hire
 - Many recent positions have come through committees without as purely information items, with the decision to hire already made, and without any known written document describing a plan for which the position is necessary nor the expected outcomes from hiring these positions
 - Examples include but are not limited to: Public Relations, CTE Coordinator, and Programmer
- Football, aquatics, and actor training programs were cancelled without faculty or academic senate consent or input
 - All of these programs include for-credit courses which are now unable to be offered
- A Strategic Goals and Objectives presentation at the Oct. 3rd Board meeting included a goal with the deans to create a policy for class cancellation
 - No mention was made of including the academic senate in the development or adoption of such a proposal
- The Accreditation Report
 - The Accreditation report writer was hired and then became Accreditation Co-Chair without any apparent process or input from the senate
 - The Accreditation Committee which is cited in the Accreditation Report has never met
- Faculty Hiring
 - Administration met with only one faculty member in an attempt to create a temporary full-time position without following procedure. The union prevented this due to obvious contract violations.

- Administrators and other meeting attendees spend time on cell phones, texting, or emailing.
 - President Gunther felt that this appears to be a result of overworked administrators as well as too many required meetings which are either entirely or mostly informational only in nature, with none or extremely little real shared decision-making power.
- PERT, Shared Governance, and FaBPAC appear to be primarily “shared reporting” sessions.
 - Committees associated with planning or budget are essentially powerless except for some input regarding \$200,000 (out of a \$30-31 million budget). Items are mostly brought forth for information only.
 - These committees’ agendas are filled with “Information” items for which the committees have no real input.
 - Even FaBPAC, our finance committee, seems to have real input regarding only the \$200K associated with our strategic proposals out of a total school budget of around \$30,000-31,000K
- The Senate has not been consulted regarding the Educational or Facilities Master Plan.
 - Neither of these important plans have been presented to the academic senate in spite of the fact that the Educational Master Plan is being presented in other committees as being almost completed. President Gunther claimed that when she brought this up to Dr. Laguerre recently, he seemed genuinely surprised and some effort has since been made to bring these plans through senate in the future.

President Gunther opined that the process of shared governance is routinely not being observed at the College. That was also the opinion of SCFA President, Gene Thomas. President Gunther asked the Senate to consider creating a motion to be voted on later and brought to the Board of Trustees to request a change in board policy from “mutually agree upon” to “rely primarily on” for all or at least most of the 10 + 1 Items. The Academic Senate should be granted important and meaningful input and joint decision making as part of shared governance. She referred Senators to the Academic and Professional Matters Power Point she emailed on Aug. 8 and Oct. 12, for a good description of what it means to “rely primarily on”. President Gunther summarized her concerns, noting three patterns associated with the lack of shared governance:

1. Decisions are made by faculty committees and then disregarded by upper administration.
2. Little or no initial Senate and/or faculty input solicited until after decisions are made.
3. Little or no Senate or faculty input sought for decisions on items that do not appear on known planning documentation.

7. Reports

7.1 S/P Jowel Laguerre’s Report Regarding Shared Governance

S/P Laguerre responded that he was hearing about most of these items for the first time and he would like to come back again to respond to those. He asked how President Gunther and the Senate would like to see some of these things done by addressing examples given and, if having the Senate President on committees is not enough to bring information to the Senate for discussion and input, what particular format or vehicle could be used. S/P Laguerre’s reports give updates rather than actions to be taken and he would be happy to consider if there could be a different way to have things done and ensure the Academic Senate is included in the process. An example might be as he has done with the hiring process: it goes through the Senate and, if changes are made, he will provide that information and rationale. It would be helpful to him to know the best timing and way to do that. When he began here Marc Pandone suggested at a division meeting that the Academic Senate President be included on the President’s Cabinet so the Senate could be fully informed. S/P Laguerre added that a lot of these concerns are more about having the best communication.

7.2 SCFA President's Report/Comments Regarding Shared Governance

SCFA President Thomas noted his concern at a recent Shared Governance meeting when a job description for Public Relations was put forth. He raised a question about approving it and S/P Laguerre replied it was on the agenda as an information item. President Thomas has requested that information be sent ahead of time for discussion but, if there is no ability to approve or disapprove things, it is just shared reporting. He opined that Research & Planning needs another position, rather than public relations. He would have suggested that, if there had ever been opportunity to do so and stated that R&P Director Peter Cammish has put in more work than anyone to help with the Accreditation and SLO evidence and reports.

FaBPAC operates the same way. President Thomas has asked VP Ligioso for information that has never been presented. Communication could be improved, but wouldn't change the lack of opportunity to bring input and vote. On the other hand, the Facilities Master Plan has been covered many times over in both committees, but the Board ultimately makes the decisions. President Thomas disagreed with S/P Laguerre regarding communication being the problem and opined it is more a problem of presentation of information and no opportunity to take timely information from most items to constituents and bring back input for decision making. Administration has two empty positions in SGC, one of them since June. President Thomas opined administrators have been disrespectful and disruptive by texting and emailing at the meetings.

S/P Laguerre pointed out that, in terms of SGC, Board policy defines what it does. If people agree that recommendations should be made to change decision making, policy would need to be modified. He added the need to ensure that the intent of everything is considered. When speaking of decision making, everyone is making recommendations to somebody and all need to be cognizant of that.

8. Information/Discussion Items

8.1 Shared Governance Discussion

President Gunther read from the Shared Governance Board policy which states "reasonable consideration" defined as "input into policies at an early stage, adequate time to review and respond to concerns raised, commitments to reach closure, and it doesn't necessarily mean agreement". However, information has routinely been given after decisions are made. President Gunther opined it is not a board policy problem. S/P Laguerre reiterated that, as far as voting and other items, policy would need to be changed. President Gunther acknowledged the problem predates S/P Laguerre. President Thomas noted that Dorothy Hawkes had coined the term "shared reporting". Ruth Fuller thought the College had some of the best language in the state on shared governance and believed through Senate discussion that it was primarily relied upon. President Gunther shared her perspective based on two times that language may have been changed in Board policy. The policy on the website is dated 1992, but there was likely a change 3-5 years later to "rely primarily on".

Roy Pike opined there is a problem with communication; many meetings are held; few minutes are seen from the meetings; no action items are put forward; no information given on reports to be made; he has been to meetings where administrators aren't paying attention; administrators have to attend too many meetings which denies faculty the right to consult with them, and; transparency would help to make things better. Professor Pike shared a communication example from previous work experience: every year his chiefs would have three days to meet, confer, plot out, and give answers to each problem; the promise was that he would answer each and every issue, and; he would work to solve them. This up-flow worked well. At the College, no one is consulting faculty on problems they have answers for. Also, up-flow doesn't always get to S/P Laguerre, if deans or others feel threatened. He doesn't hear all the problems as described earlier with shared governance.

FaBPAC is also an advisory body, rather than decision making. President Thomas noted that committee members didn't do all their work and rate strategic proposals that went through SGC and FaBPAC and

S/P Laguerre made some good decisions. VP Ligioso asked to present solar update information at FaBPAC, but this is after decisions have already been made.

Other comments and concerns included:

- It is frustrating to get passionate in discussions to find it doesn't matter when decisions have already been made.
- There seems to be different hiring processes for every area on campus except full-time faculty. Suddenly positions other than faculty open up without knowing where they're coming from. While strategic proposal and planning processes may have been streamlined, it is a detailed and slow process by which anyone in rank and file has to go through documenting and justifying proposals for small amounts of funding; it can take 1 ½ years, but; much bigger decisions were made by the administration, seemingly by fiat without rationale, justification, or planning. During the last accreditation visit, questions were asked about that. The College has gotten in trouble for not having good planning processes or adhering to them, such as hires that can't be found on any planning document; who has input and decision making power, and; is there a process by which decisions are made uniformly at every level of the campus similar to faculty hiring.
- Rationale would be helpful for how decisions were made for the CTE Coordinator (or director?) and Public Relations Officer. Plans and timing need to be in line with the administrative hiring policy.

S/P Laguerre stated that a policy on hiring administrators doesn't exist, but a process whereby every related budget item regarding positions was presented to the Board of Trustees by Director Cammish after many discussions. So now there is a way, but new processes aren't discussed with the Senate that don't involve faculty. Before this change HR had a form that the cabinet would generally approve. The position description is brought to SGC, but S/P Laguerre has argued that a creation of the position, rather than the description, should be brought to Shared Governance or the Board of Trustees.

Regarding outcome and assessment methods for administrative hiring, S/P Laguerre responded that it will be part of the new strategic goals and objectives process. Senator Reeve queried if there is an assessment cycle to review if expected goals for new positions are reached. That would help with reports to ACJCC. Faculty have raised concerns that the previous reorganization wasn't evaluated before the next one took place. Decisions were made without a clear sense of desired outcomes and no pre-determined way to see what was or wasn't working for effective decisions. S/P Laguerre replied that not many organizations question decisions in a year or two after new positions are in place. Tenure is to evaluate people, not positions. The reorganizations have mostly been around budget and money has been saved. Maybe evaluation tools should be developed, but more personnel would be needed to effectively make that happen. The ideal of evaluating everything would benefit decision making, but the workforce is not in place to do that. S/P Laguerre agreed that would be worthwhile to review every decision made, not just administration. Senator Reeve opined that some groups seem to be held more accountable than others. President Gunther added that the Senate is mostly concerned with administrators and administrative decisions centered on academic programs. Faculty could have lots of input regarding deans and reorganization that shifts them around. There are problems in many divisions now and faculty could address that.

Accreditation Co-Chair Dambrosio clarified her position regarding President Gunther's list of concerns: there were mishaps with receipt of her application; upon return from a trip overseas, she checked with EVP Reyes to get clarity on the report writer and co-chair tasks; he affirmed the job would include both; she came on board very late (July); she was informed it was customary to set up a committee; it would have been good to have questioned the meetings, and; she reported no mis-intentions were made in the focus to get the work done.

Senator Pearson-Bloom addressed communication problems and how that is intertwined with accreditation issues: progress was made through the last accreditation at the College but there has been much turnover; it is important to learn from everyone's mistakes and move forward; many of the same

issues return due to the turnover which also leaves out institutional memory; leadership stability is needed and is in place now with S/P Laguerre, but the deans are on overload which doesn't help leadership; a great administrative dean left because she couldn't be successful in the task given; huge breakdowns occurred in communication; solutions were not carried forth; people do not work as a team; representatives need to report back to constituents, and; there is a disconnect between the Superintendent/President and the EVP and deans. Senator Pearson-Bloom gave an example regarding the money for professional development. Money was awarded last year, but there is still no process in place to administer it. President Gunther noted that many meetings are informational, there is not much impetus to serve on committees without input to make a difference, and administrators are on overload so she doesn't fault them for distractions at meetings while trying to get things done

S/P Laguerre concluded with these points: He agreed that people are too much on electronic gadgets at meetings in terms of not engaging; as Senator Pearson-Bloom noted, people don't often report back to constituents; agreement to do things and follow-up is not there; he is very interested in terms of how to move forward with the Academic Senate in order to obtain the right input and make decisions by consulting the Senate as needed. S/P Laguerre asked everyone to seriously consider: when a Senate rep is on a committee, will the Senate be apprised, or will he, a vice president, or someone else need to come formally to the Senate regarding decisions.

Ruth Fuller explained she had been on PERT with Tracy Schneider for years. At first they felt they were getting somewhere, plans looked good, but people didn't know about them, so they began letting everyone know. She and Tracy decided not to attend anymore after seeing that nothing would move forward if no one was sitting there who could actually implement things and move forward. Faculty had to go through all the bureaucracy but no one else did. The accreditation team would come down on them with how their planning wasn't good and then a vice president would tell them to fix everything. They couldn't represent faculty and come up with ideas, when nobody knows about it. Those who have power to make it happen have to show up, implement, and follow through. Director Cammish has been great and given excellent input, but he is running into the same problems. Also, while there has been progress, the same faculty driven proposals cannot continue to be cited. Senator Reeve noted a recent proposal for \$75,000 went through the process and came out of FaBPAC decreased to \$12,000. President Thomas reported that there was not enough detail and planning. Senator Reeve continued that, after proceeding through all the proposal groups, the President's Cabinet approved it for \$50-75,000, but it never came to the Academic Senate.

8.2 Program Review - Amy Obegi

Senator Obegi reported a couple meetings have been held. Information needs to get out to all constituents and feedback from the Senate is needed before moving forward. Peter Cammish and others have been very positive about the template. There will be something in place where faculty can input their data in and get it out, have links to planning, annual reports, links to finance, and it will provide institutional history. Senator Obegi asked Senators if Program Discontinuance should be linked to Program Review. Some colleges have that linked and others don't. S/P Laguerre recommended linking for effective decisions. Gene Thomas, President Gunther, and Senator Obegi will discuss this with S/P Laguerre on Friday. Barbara Paveo, task force member, had questioned if faculty would be as honest in their reporting without the fear their program might be discontinued. Discontinuance has been vetted and there are a lot of provisions, but this doesn't have that and could undermine some of the safeguards. S/P Laguerre was also concerned that if not linked, faculty would have to redo their work.

Continued discussion included the following points:

- Clarify "linked to Program Discontinuance". The discontinuance policy should inform the review, Program Review could get Program Discontinuance started as a "link", but would not be the process. The group involved as the program standard bearer should decide.
- EVP Reyes suggested a six year cycle tied to accreditation; do reviews during the first four years; data will all be in the database when time to write self-study report; with four schools there would be

one reviewed each year, then none for two years, and; an update would be done every year. EVP Reyes will be invited to the next Senate meeting to explain current reorganization plans.

- Tie Program Review to the SLO cycle as well.
- Someone additional will be needed in Research & Planning.
- The College needs to commit to reassign time for people in the program to work on the review, and possibly a coordinator for the schools working on it. It would be appropriate to create a strategic proposal once plans are decided.
- Create a visual to show programs and cycles. Every program may not need review and each school should decide on their preference.
- The academic component of counseling should be included in the review plans.
- Everyone should solicit input from their colleagues.
- An effective review process will take care of planning, SLOs, etc. Assessments can happen, but reviews are needed.

8.3 Tempest Kiosk – Samanda Dorger

Samanda Dorger, Tempest Advisor reported that kiosks on campus have been vandalized. The auto body shop repaired some of them. Professor Dorger emailed a Q&A flyer on the Adcamp kiosks. The Journalism Program would receive \$200 a month from advertising on the kiosks. Many community colleges, CSUs, and UCs have them. S/P advocated putting this item on the agenda so everyone will be informed. Professor Dorger would like to see revenue go to Tempest fund for conferences, supplies etc. Tobacco, weapons, and sexual material would be excluded from advertisement as well as other items the College would want excluded.

The contract will be review by the College legal advisor. Adcamp stated that language can be changed. Senators agreed that political advertising should also be excluded. As a military community, military advertising would not be excluded. The Tempest is separate from ASSC. Journalism students could decide to use one side of kiosks for local advertising revenue for the program or public service messages. President Gunther recommended there be a committee on campus to vet advertising, have veto power, or at least be able to object to something and not have repeated. Four kiosks would be placed on the main campus only, based on the student population. Some of the repaired boxes could be placed at the centers. Professor Dorger will contact the rep regarding political ads and vetting of ads. Senators expressed concern that nothing be placed on the kiosks that would show intolerance to any subset of College students. The placement of ads could make it appear positions are endorsed by the Tempest or the College. If there is anything against anything or anyone, it would take away the feeling of safety. Anyone can call or email the Adcamp rep with questions. Professor Dorger will address questions and send responses back for the Senate.

9. Announcements

9.1 Committee to Draft Emergency Hiring Policy Proposal

Committee has been created.

9.2 Committee to Draft Flex Cal Proposal

Committee has been created.

10. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn – Senator Cittadino; Second – Senator Brewer; Passed – Unanimous
The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.