

SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL MEETING

Minutes – March 10, 2010

Board Room 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present

Minority Coalition: Kevin Anderson, Shirley Lewis

Faculty: Jeff Lamb, Tom Grube

Classified: Cynthia Simon

Students: Tara Norman, Lillian Nelson

Resource Persons: Dr. Jowel Laguerre, S/P; Carey Roth, VP-ABS; Trudy Largent, Int. Dir HR;
RossBeck, Dir PR, MKtng & Comm;
Connie Adams, Note Taker

Members Absent

Administration: Erin Vines, Zandra Gilley

Classified: Ralph Meyer

Resource Persons: Robin Steinback, VP-AA; Jim Ennis, Int VP-T&LR; Lisa Waits, VP-SS;
Nalini Srinivasan, Dir FS; Nora O'Neill, Exec Coord; Rob Simas, Dir R&P

Guest: Bob Meyers

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

Dr. Laguerre called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

(b) **Approval of Agenda**

It was moved by Kevin Anderson and seconded by Cynthia Simon to approve the Agenda. The motion was carried unanimously with these changes: Jeff Lamb announced that Bob Meyer would be available at 3 pm for item #7- Strategic Proposal. Ross Beck requested time to give a brief update on the current activity with class schedules under #10.

(c) **Approval of Minutes**

It was moved by Tara Norman and seconded by Jeff Lamb to approve the SGC Minutes of February 24, 2010, as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

Cynthia Simon asked for a correction to the CSEA report on page 5, first sentence: “with Dr. Laguerre and the CSEA President and Vice Presidents”.

2. **PERT (Process Evaluation & Review Team)**

Jeff Lamb reported that he and Rob Simas have completed production of the second of five planned training videos. This one covers the process for faculty and staff to put forth operational proposals. The next will be strategic. The Process Review Team evaluates the planning processes with rubrics and checklists and has given their approval to the training video. Mr. Simas will send an email request to “\$all” for a campus-wide gathering of ideas on performance indicators associated with strategic goals and objectives.

3. **Accreditation – Writing Reports (October 2010 & Self-Study October 2011)**

Accreditation: Jeff Lamb reported working with Nancy Blanc and Connie Adams, along with input from Robin Steinback, VPAA, and the Accreditation Steering Committee to organize an orientation for the larger Accreditation Committee, comprised of the ALO, Academic Senate President, the Director of Research and Planning, and the most recent report editor, Tracy Schneider, as well as organizing the rest of the Committee which includes all the co-chairs of the different standards. Dr. Lamb shared the informational packet contents at the Feb. 24th SGC meeting. He held meetings on February 25th and March 2nd, to provide co-chairs with guidance on how to move forward on the accreditation document in order to be prepared for the Self-Study Report due Oct, 2011. These meetings were productive and co-chairs have a clear picture of their next steps and have started the process. They’ve held meetings, organized and communicated with their groups, and some have begun writing. Time is scheduled at the March 17 Flex-cal for an Accreditation Update for co-chairs and their working groups. The goal is to provide

structured activities to facilitate brainstorming, evidence gathering, writing of first drafts, and to train people again on standards and the wiki. S/P Laguerre, based on his experience and looking ahead at what needs to be done in the best interests of the College, has put forth an Accreditation Self-Study Coordinator position. This person would shepherd committees and be responsible to answer questions and organize resources. S/P Laguerre drafted an outline and received feedback from SCFA on March 9, which is not reflected on the draft handed out today. Hours would vary from full-time to part-time, depending on work to be done. Tom Grube had suggested these SCFA changes to Dr. Laguerre: the 1st bullet point - Summer 2010 to Summer 2011 and stipend to be determined, dependent on workload, currently expected to be half-time; 2nd bullet point - Academic year 2010-2011 – 100% release time; and 3rd bullet point - Fall 2011 – release time to be determined, expected to be approximately 50%. Additionally on the front page, first paragraph, last sentence, a small edit will be forwarded to Dr. Laguerre. Tom Grube invited Dr. Laguerre to attend the SCFA meeting on March 9 and most members were supportive at this first review. He emailed Dr. Laguerre before sending the slightly revised draft out to the entire community. He stated that the union is to have input on this and asked for any comments or suggestions to go through faculty representatives on the Executive Board, expecting to have the final revision to Dr. Laguerre at the SCFA March 23rd meeting.

Cynthia Simon questioned use of some of the language under “experience”. To clarify “staff” questions, Dr. Laguerre explained wording has been changed. He shared the first choice would be full-time faculty; second choice would be part-time faculty and the third choice would be staff/retired faculty. Tom Grube’s concern was around how to solve issues that might come up as to where the person fits into contract release time. Dr. Laguerre will pass a revised job description over to Trudy Largent. Dr. Laguerre stated that while the new VP of Academic & Student Affairs may be expected to chair the Accreditation Committee, the new coordinator would be supervising staff and reporting to the Vice President and might also act as co-chair. Jeff Lamb suggested the 6th bullet point state: “review and disseminate all information and resources from ACCJC” as the College can’t dictate who ACCJC sends information to. He also asked “Faculty Senate” be corrected to “Academic Senate” on the 8th bullet point. Cynthia Simon suggested making the coordinator position permanent as the College is always in some part of the accreditation cycle. Dr. Laguerre agreed that the position could be joined with other tasks, but that will have to be looked at later. Tom Grube expressed hope that the coordinator position can serve as a bridge to provide continuity and eliminate some of the overload experienced by Jeff Lamb and VP Robin Steinback in their hard work in Accreditation.

4. **Institutional Review Board**

Jeff Lamb asked for input on the IRB policy. Shirley Lewis recommended the first paragraph on the first page be deleted and simply say Solano College Institution. The policy would establish the IRB as a group. The Board will vote on Policy, not procedures. Jeff Lamb recognized that there are many procedures and asked for feedback. He will bring this back to SGC with a revised first paragraph and final draft for action.

5. **BANNER**

The BANNER contract approval has been placed on the next Governing Board agenda in order to implement several modules not currently in place, add Module 8, and for support to make the project successful. Sun Guard will bring forth support to insure the rest of the implementation is successful and personnel will be well trained. There will be additional training at the March 17 Flex Cal workshops. Kevin Anderson expressed the need for assistance from Sun Guard to train technical staff to handle new revisions. Dr. Laguerre stated that is the goal to have this opportunity and then Sun Guard won’t be needed when the program is fully implemented and staff trained, although programmers will be available to help with issues. Lillian Nelson suggested the College connect with other colleges using BANNER for cooperative support. Dr. Laguerre explained how the current Sun Guard contract differs from the original: the task for them to place an interim CISO has been removed and some modules have been added. Dr. Laguerre intends to ask the Board to allow Jim Ennis to continue for another 1 ½ years as the Chief Information Systems Officer. Because his salary as an interim is less than what we’d be paying a permanent full-time CISO, the money saved will provide backfill for staff to learn and implement what is needed for BANNER. He stated that the goal is to engage the Governing Board in the future only for maintenance type issues. Ross Beck shared the strong enthusiasm expressed at the morning BANNER Committee meeting. They see this as a top priority for the College. With training manuals and the future completion of staff training and implementation of modules, the College will be able to stand on its own.

Other points were made and questions were answered:

- The BANNER Steering Committee has seen the plans and details of the Sun Guard contract. Dr. Laguerre agreed that it should be shared so that everyone can understand the plans.
- Dr. Laguerre addressed the concerns of possible employee lay-offs because of costs to train staff. He stated that the CISO savings of \$200,000 is the only money being spent. The BANNER project is funded by measure G
- In regards to Measure G funds which were awarded for technology in general: There was \$500,000 already budgeted for BANNER.

- Jim Ennis is planning a new presentation for the Board. Dr. Laguerre suggested arranging a college-wide forum to share the information so that everyone will see the details of what the College is getting and also how everyone will know how to use it.
- Dr. Laguerre stated the College can have someone rotate to different areas to help in on-going training, until money is available to hire extra staff.

6. **Governing Board Dinners with Faculty, Student, and Staff Leadership**

Dr. Laguerre shared the plan he had presented to the Governing Board, whose members have been invited to join in dinner and conversation with College leadership. The Board has agreed to the following dates: March 31 with faculty leaders, May 5 with student leaders, and June 2 with staff leaders. Dr. Laguerre and Dr. Lamb are planning these events and invited ideas from everyone.

7. **Strategic Proposals**

Jeff Lamb asked for impressions from everyone in regards to the review and ranking process and suggested it would be good to discuss the proposals and be sure the ACCJC can be shown Solano's progress in moving forward. Kevin Anderson commented that he'd rather wait to take action until he knows what district is planning with respect to lay-offs. Jeff Lamb agreed that the district shouldn't make decisions about new programs unless funding is available for what is currently on the table. However, the purview for SGC is to look at different components of proposals in the broad scope of impact and feasibility and how realistic they are. SGC considers a proposal's strength, how it fits into the larger campus, what will be affected. FaBPAC decides how to fund or not. These two groups should be kept discreet. Bob Myers noted that even if funds aren't currently available, it is important for Title 9 compliance to at least have plans in place for programs that will help bring or keep the College in compliance. Proposals should be reviewed for viability and it is important not to stop the mechanism of process, ideas and new plans. Shirley Lewis suggested that this be made clear to campus committees, because when proposals are approved by SGC, many people think they've been financially approved. Jeff Lamb recommended that when SGC approves proposals and moves forward to FaBPAC, to strongly recommend the proposal but advise that the College not lose people over this position. Dr. Laguerre agreed to the importance of moving forward in terms of planning and shared that sometimes resources are generated from having a good plan in place. Also, once projects are clearly planned, the College can pursue grants, Congress, or donors to raise funds. It makes sense to have something tangible and planned. He cautioned to not limit motivation, innovation, and the desire to move the College to a higher level. It is important to be active and prepared, and it takes things like this to get people excited. The premise is to not put what is currently working and getting results in jeopardy of something else, but invest a lot so that other resources can be brought in. Lillian Nelson added the benefit to have plans ready and waiting so that as people come and go, it won't be necessary to reinvent the wheel. She noted the benefit to shepherd good ideas, as well as to improve and strengthen them and not let them fade away, rather than waiting until the last minute to pull something together when funds are available. Bob Myers agreed and noted that sometimes it takes a few years or more for funding and implementation time adds to that. He shared that at the end of March, a new statewide process for Title 9 process throughout the state may be implemented. Each college will have to go through an internal investigation of certifying which prong qualifies the colleges for compliance. The College could be placed on sanctions and could be eliminated from financial aid, though that probably wouldn't happen. It is important to work towards compliance. For example, even though women's water polo might be a \$50,000 loss right now, other consequences might be incurred and programs cancelled, if not in compliance. Dr. Laguerre suggested that the College needs to make extra efforts to talk to staff and faculty in planning for future and he will write something on that to promote conversation.

To clarify, Bob Myers gave a recap: Title 9 compliance is based on 1 of 3 prongs: 1) proportionality of full-time female to male students. The College comparison of student athletes to that number does not meet compliance. This is true in approximately 90% of colleges, mainly because of football. This is partly why the State Commission on Athletics is putting into effect new regulations to make sure colleges are in compliance with state rule so federal problems don't occur; 2) show a past history within the last five years of adding female programs. It has been seven years since the College added women's soccer, however; if we can show the College has followed the planning process and it has been approved and waiting for funding and implementation, that should cover compliance; 3) demonstrate that the College meets the interest areas or abilities of students. To prove that, the State has put in question on CCC applying: "Are you interested in being an athlete with a sport offered at Solano or another California college?" New legislation could be voted on at the end of this month. Then Dean Myers would take the data and contact all students interested by sport, and would ask if they're clear on the inter-collegiate sports requirements. Many students may not know, and it will be his responsibility to contact and meet with students to determine how many are really interested. They may be interested in sports that facilities are not available for. That would go into calculations as to what it would cost to have the program. If the College can show that interests are being substantially met, then Prong 3 compliance is met. If this new legislation goes into effect, the state will put colleges on probation that are not in compliance and federal aid could be imperiled. Sometimes a sport is decided at the last minute, depending on costs/facilities/faculty costs/equip costs etc. Some colleges

advertise certain positions and choose by the best candidate they get. Dean Myers noted that the numbers he submitted are for an adjunct hire. A suggestion was made to Dean Myers to put in writing for everyone, the information he conveyed. Dean Myers agreed to add a cost benefit analysis.

Jeff Lamb noted the ultimate purpose is for SGC to vote on adding a women's sport at the next meeting and if approved, to rank the three proposals presented. He will forward a summary of discussion points and suggestions to Dean Myers, so that when the proposal is moved forward to FaBPAC, it will be strengthened as much as possible. Members agreed with Tom Grube on the excellent work completed by Dean Myers. The next meeting should allow 20 minutes discussion time for the three proposals.

8. **Policy 5000 - Series**

Tabled

9. **Governing Board Agenda for the 3/17/10 Governing Board Meeting**

Dr. Laguerre distributed and reviewed the agenda. The next meeting, to be held in Vallejo, will start at 6:30 p.m., rather than 6 p.m. The regular meeting will convene at 7 p.m. (change on agenda)

Tom Grube suggested to move item 5 and make it 8 ½ or allow for comments both before and after the closed session as two windows of opportunity would be ideal. Dr. Laguerre offered to look into that.

Changes and/or notations to agenda:

9c: Dr. Laguerre asked Trudy Largent to give the March SGC (9c) report, and Carey Roth to give the April SGC report

9d: Accreditation Update: No report

9d: BANNER Update: No report (will be included with 12g)

11a: moved to April

12c: The Strategic Plan is going forward without the metrics/measures component.

12e: Dean Rota, Jeff Lamb, or Erin Farmer will give this report

13a: Changing Solano Center administration to dean positions to give more autonomy to make academic decisions. The search for a Vacaville Center Dean will begin March 18.

13b: Compromise – meetings will now start at 6:30 p.m.

Dr. Laguerre will cover Strategic Proposals at the March 24th meeting, so they can move forward to the next FaBPAC meeting.

10. **College Area Reports/Announcements:**

Superintendent/President:

Ross Beck reported, in the past, 155,000 College class schedules were mailed to households and another 5,000 were distributed in other ways. The College needs to transition to the digital age. There will be 18,000 schedules printed, 13,000 for Solano College students, 4,500 will be delivered to high schools to get the target audience nailed down while making this transition. There will be 500 for faculty, staff, and reserve. There will be 150,000 four-colored postcards sent out to direct people online to the PDF version of the printed schedule, as well as to the My Solano portal to look at it live. A news release will be sent to local Chambers of Commerce, television, radio and websites. In this transition, advertising has been cut and the College will save approximately \$40,000 per class schedule or about \$80,000 a year. Mr. Beck shared that some of the biggest and smallest colleges have made this transition. He shared this report with the Enrollment Management team.

*(No reports given on the following due to time constraints)

ASSC:

Academic Affairs: absent

SCFA:

CSEA:

Local 39: absent

Management: no report

Minority Coalition:

Student Services: absent

Human Resources:

Academic Senate:

Technology & Learning Resources: Absent

Administrative and Business Services/FaBPAC:

11. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 pm.

(cadams)