

SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL MEETING

Minutes – December 10, 2008

Board Room 2:30 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present:

Academic Senate–Jeffrey Lamb
CCA/CTA/NEA–Tom Grube
Minority Coalition–Sal Alcalá
CSEA–Cynthia Simon
ASSC–Lillian Nelson, David Brannen

Management–Shirley Lewis, Esq.; Erin Vines
Resource Persons–Don Mourton; Rich Christensen, Ed.D.; Robin Steinback, Ph.D.; Charles Shatzer, Ph.D.; and Nora O’Neill
Interim Supt./President– Lisa Waits, Ed.D.

Members Absent: **Minority Coalition**–Kevin Anderson
Local 39–Jeff Lehfeldt
Resource Persons–Mazie Brewington; Jay Field

1. (a) **Call to Order**

Interim Superintendent/President Lisa Waits called the meeting to order at 2:39 p.m.

(b) **Approval of Agenda**

It was moved by David Brannen and seconded by Lillian Nelson to approve the Agenda for this meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

(c) **Approval of Minutes**

It was moved by David Brannen and seconded by Lillian Nelson to approve the Minutes of the November 12, 2008, SGC Meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

2. **Accreditation**

In line with the decision by the Shared Governance Council, at their November 12, 2008, meeting to hold 2-3 Shared Governance Council meetings focused solely on Accreditation, this meeting was chosen to be one of those meetings.

IS/P Waits began this accreditation-focused session by stating that she had not received the Report of the Accreditation Visiting Team to review for any factual errors. She advised that Mr. Jack Pond, of the ACCJC, told her the Commission has received the Team Report; and, they expect to send it to IS/P Waits on December 12 or 13. IS/P Waits pointed out that the report she receives for factual approval is not a public document at this time, and only she reviews it for fact. She stated that the Commission meets January 7-9, 2009, and we could possibly know their decision by the end of January, 2009.

The ACCJC “Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions” was distributed to the SGC members by IS/P Waits. She directed everyone’s attention to Page 52 of the document, specifically Item III.C., Sanctions. IS/P Waits advised that VP-AA and ALO Robin Steinback recently attended an Accreditation training and will be bringing some ideas forward from that training.

IS/P Waits informed the SGC that she will be sending out a \$ALL email to the campus community concerning the budget, and she will add information about the Commission's meeting schedule. IS/P Waits commented that, in her exit meeting with the Visiting Team, they were very complimentary of things they learned that were going on in the classroom and told her that she would not be surprised by the report. She asked the SGC members to think about how they would rate the College.

The chronological order of the Accreditation visits and decisions since October, 2005, was reviewed as follows:

October 2005	Self-study Visit.
January 2006	Results: 8 Recommendations and a Progress Report.
April, 2007	ACCJC Progress Report Visitation Team.
May 2007	Results: SCC to complete a Progress Report by October 15, 2007, focusing on the 3 Recommendations from the Visiting Team.
November 2007	Evaluation Team Visit in connection with SCC's October Progress Report.
January 2008	Issued a Warning asking SCC to correct the deficiencies noted and complete a Special Report in conjunction with the Midterm Report by October 15, 2008.
October 2008	Accreditation Team Visit (5-member team).
January 2009	Results of October Team Visit will be announced.

Jeff Lamb inquired, "Is there any question about how we are doing?"

IS/P Waits asked, "Since SGC is the group that will serve as the overall steering committee, where do you think we stand, and what would be our action plan?" Pointing out that the College is currently on Warning, she outlined SCC's options with regard to the outcome of the ACCJC Team Report:

- They can take SCC off Warning
- They can continue SCC on Warning
- They can impose Probation
- They can order Show Cause

IS/P Waits stated that SGC is in agreement that we do not think we will receive clear status from the ACCJC.

Tom Grube said he would be pleasantly surprised if SCC stays on Warning. He said the Team saw a lot of instability at the top, specifically stating Gerry Fisher's sudden resignation and VP Brewington being out on Administrative Leave while the Team was here was more proof of the constant turnover at the College. In addition, the Board continues to point fingers at each other and not look inward to see what they can do individually to help the situation. He said he is expecting Probation.

Lillian Nelson asked if the report only covered the time period up to the visit or does what we do after the visit count? IS/P Waits asked Robin Steinback to answer that question.

VP-AA Robin Steinback stated that the recent visit was a follow-up to their visit last year; so, they were checking to see how we progressed since their last meeting. Have we resolved the 4 issues that placed SCC on Warning the previous year (November 2007)? The Commission has given SCC until January 2009 to resolve the 4 recommendations. She said the Commission monitors the website, newspapers and media.

VP-AA Steinback advised that she received a call from the ACCJC reprimanding her for SCC improperly referring to its accreditation status as “fully accredited.” The Commission informed her that a school is either accredited or it is not accredited.

Lillian Nelson stated that, since the Commission is looking at newspapers and media, the College should get positive things out to the newspapers.

David Brannen stated that things are not calming down at the College and pointed out that the Faculty’s vote of no confidence in the Governing Board at this critical time only made matters worse. Tom Grube advised that he held off releasing the information about the vote of no confidence until after the ACCJC Team left. He said that the Faculty did what it felt it had to do to try and push the Board, and he still stands behind the resolution about the Board.

IS/P Waits commented that the College has not grasped the importance of this issue as constituent stakeholders. She said that, aside from the Board, there are other issues that the College still grapples with regarding the institution. She asked, “If SGC thinks the College will stay on Warning or, at best, Probation, what will be our stand – what will our action plan be?”

Jeff Lamb distributed notes from the November 21, 2008, meeting of the Accreditation Ad Hoc Committee of the Academic Senate. He directed SGC members to look specifically at No. 7, Next Steps, and referred to the following suggestions contained in the document:

- Increasing participation is a key element to the success of this document.
- Participants must know that their time and efforts are valued.
- How can technology be better used in the process?
- Consider using the “Strategic Proposal” model.
- SGC is the body that needs to be continually informed about the progress being made on Accreditation.

Shirley Lewis inquired as to how will the SGC address Accreditation over the summer when it does not meet. Don Mourton said that if SCC has a short timeline, the luxury of taking the summer off will not be an option.

Jeff Lamb said the Academic Senate was looking at this as a model to work towards a self-study and pointed out that the College will have something to do in January, and it will have to be done quickly. He wondered if there was a way to use the Strategic Proposal model when a quick response is needed.

Cynthia Simon asked for volunteers to help with the Ad Hoc Committee.

Tom Grube asked, “What can we do as a group, a faculty, a family of SCC employees regarding a couple of these issues?” He stated that, although the budget says do not hurry to fill every position, Accreditation might be a priority to get things done fast and look stable. He said progress is being made toward financial stability and pointed out that SGC cannot do anything about the Board problems.

Jeff Lamb stated that the work should be divided into two groups: (1) a way or mechanism for producing the next Self-Study due in 2011; and (2) answering the issues that the original Self-Study brought up. He said, in the production of the document we want to answer some of the problems that were initially brought up and make sure what we do encourages a reflective dialogue. We can be involved in the process of the budget. We can be involved in the process of articulating things to the Board. He suggested that perhaps the Academic

Senate needs to do more outreach and work with the Board on certain issues and stated that the teachers will, most likely, engage with budget matters.

Shirley Lewis suggested the SGC start identifying chairs and co-chairs. She inquired as to how using the strategic proposal model would work and asked if it correlates with the Planning Agendas at the end of each standard.

Jeff Lamb stated that the strategic proposals can be submitted by anyone, the proposals then go to the Review Group, then SGC, then FABPAC. At each step of the process, the proposals are either approved to move forward, returned for changes to be made, or declined. He said that the Chair and Co-Chairs would identify people to work on a specific standard. The committee would identify a person that would be considered the author of that part of the document and would work with a focus group. He said he was not sure how this would apply to the Planning Agendas.

IS/P Waits asked if it would be helpful to create a workshop on the standards to help everyone understand the standards. She said that part of what the SGC members are struggling with is that perhaps they are not 100% sure of what SCC's goal is and stated that a basis of understanding as a group is needed.

VP-AA Robin Steinback stated that there is a model that the Commission recommends and said that SCC's next Self-Study writing will take place in 2010. There will be a technical visit in the previous semester. Before that, in Fall 2009, SCC has awareness. She said it gives the College the spring to get its ducks in order.

Jeff Lamb mentioned that Rob Simas and Sandra Rotenberg developed a training matrix.

IS/P Waits asked VP-AA Robin Steinback if she was suggesting that this spring would be when SCC identifies a trainer to come in and work with the SGC and others. Robin Steinback commented that, if SCC does not begin in the spring, momentum will be lost.

Tom Grube pointed out that the newspaper headlines and reality have everyone focused on economics, and he wondered how this was going to affect the economics. He said that, beginning with the S/P address to faculty in January, everyone needs to start looking at how SCC can generally improve things so it is a better institution and more like the institutions that the Accrediting Team wants to see. He asked how SCC could shift its focus and play up what we do right.

Jeff Lamb stated SCC should celebrate its successes through the Accreditation document.

Shirley Lewis proposed that the training not be limited to just SGC. Have the training in the theatre and invite the whole college. She said it is necessary to provide opportunities for the whole college to get involved, including the students.

Erin Vines stated that almost every meeting he attends seems to have a lot of negative comments and pointed out that a negative attitude will not fix the problem.

Jeff Lamb agreed that there is a lot of negativity in the work environment.

IS/P Waits stated she will advise everyone now that SGC is addressing Accreditation.

Jeff Lamb suggested that the Board be invited to participate in the training sessions as well. He stated that it would be necessary to have process guidelines for each standard; e.g., create an idea sheet to pass out in the

training to capture people's collective thoughts, give participants a checklist of how to write documents, and check out the accreditation documents of other schools to see what is considered good. Jeff also suggested looking into the possibility of having a College Hour. Shirley Lewis advised that SCC used to have College Hours on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Charles Shatzer pointed out that the 11:00 to 1:00 time frame would be taking up prime teaching hours.

Lillian Nelson stated that a College Hour should be scheduled at a time when the greatest number of students can attend as well.

Tom Grube suggested that it would be better to schedule College Hours on MWF when there are 6 slots rather than on TTh when there are only 4 slots.

Charles Shatzer advised that, in the past, College hours were good for the first 6 weeks.

IS/P Waits pointed out that this meeting was the last SGC meeting of the term and stated that she wanted to have some action steps to give the College; e.g., (1) SGC "To-Do" List (2) Flex Cal focus on Accreditation, (3) Spring Awareness Event.

Tom Grube stated that, regardless of the report, we know what the problems are and said January could be a good kick-off point.

Jeff Lamb commented that, if SCC continues in its current mode, it will be limping through work to get the College towards a good accreditation place.

Tom Grube advised that whether or not CTA accepts the offer that came to the table, they see progress. He stated that one may agree or disagree with the "work to rule" issue, but it was a response to what was going on. He said now that "it is in," there will be two faculty members participating in the Health Care meeting tomorrow. He is not waiting for the ink to dry on the contract. The District is showing good faith now, and the faculty and Association want to be team players at the College.

IS/P Waits stated that the Board asked her if SCC could get a different Accrediting Commission, other than ACCJC, and she told them no. She said that accreditation is core to what SCC does.

Jeff Lamb advised that the State Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is having an Accreditation Institute January 23-26, 2009, in San Jose.

David Brannen stated that it is crucial to mitigate this behavior and buy in. He said the way to address these issues is here, in SGC. If SGC leads, the Board will be swayed to concur.

Cynthia Simon pointed out that SCC is accountable to its stakeholders.

IS/P Waits advised that the next SGC meeting will be on January 28, 2009.

3. Governing Board Agenda

IS/P Waits distributed the Governing Board Agenda for the December 17, 2008, meeting. She advised that Tom Henry will be making his report to the Governing Board at that meeting. She said he will share the report with her to respond for factual errors and stated that copies will be delivered to the Governing Board on Tuesday, December 16, 2008. She said it will become public information on Wednesday, December 17. IS/P

Waits also stated that the December 17 meeting will be the organizational meeting for the Board and it will be the first meeting for new Trustee Rosemary Thurston.

With regard to the budget, IS/P Waits advised that she is taking a balanced budget to the Board. She said there are 1.2 million dollars in deficit spending and that EC worked to bring that into balance.

Sal Alcalá suggested that it would be helpful if IS/P Waits indicated to the Board that the SGC is concerned about what will be contained in the Accreditation report. He said there is an element that includes the Board and suggested IS/P Waits tell the Board that the SGC feels the Board should become highly involved with the issues. He said it is important to plant the seed with the Board.

Jeff Lamb stated that the Academic Senate has considered mentioning in the report that the Senate would value any efforts the Board will make to fix that situation. He pointed out that there are several opportunities to report to the Board; e.g., Academic Senate, ASSC, President.

IS/P Waits stated that it is not just the Board but also how staff, faculty, and administration interacts with the Board. As she has worked with the Board members closer, she really tries to know that individually they bring passion to what they do. They have a strong caring for the institution. She pointed out that, while there are concerns about how some Board members behave, their genuine passion for the institution should not be questioned.

Jeff Lamb said he would check with the Academic Senate to see if they would want to join the SGC in speaking to the Board.

Tom Grube stated that the Board seemed to respond favorably to the ACCT in selling themselves for the S/P search. They were impressed with Pam Fisher's bluntness in telling them they have to clean up their act. He said it might be money well spent to contract with ACCT for training.

IS/P Waits stated she will take that forward at the Board Retreat in the spring.

Erin Vines suggested the training be done during one of Pam Fisher's visits to the campus.

4. College Area Reports/Announcements:

Cynthia Simon advised that the CSEA Installation Dinner is scheduled for January 24, 2009, at Stars restaurant in Vacaville, and they want to invite IS/P Waits. She also stated that the Leadership Institution in March for Area B Leadership Team will be held at Konocti Harbor Inn. Cynthia said they honored Sally Bailey and Janice Larson for their dedication and hard work for the Association, and stated they will both be sorely missed. Cynthia will be sending out the list of new executive members and advised that she will still be President.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

LW/no