1. **Call to Order**
   Secretary Richard Kleeberg called the meeting to order at 3:12 pm

2. **Roll Call:**
   Richard Kleeberg, Senate Secretary
   Darryl Allen, Alena Hairston – sub for Michelle Arce, Abla Christiansen, Nick Cittadino, Susanna Crawford, Erin Duane – *ex officio*, LaNae Jaimez, Richard Kleeberg, Lou McDermott, Karen Wanek
   Absent/Excused: Michelle Arce, Kim Becker, John Nagle, Thomas Watkins
   Connie Adams, Interim Admin Assistant

3. **Approval of the Agenda**
   Motion to Approve – Senator Crawford; Seconded – Senator Wanek; Unanimous

4. **Comments from the Public**
   This meeting has been scheduled to allow more comments in Item 5.1

5. **Information/Discussion Items**
   5.1 **Reorganization**
   Senator Kleeberg announced that this special Senate meeting is being held in response to the request from many faculty members to discuss the proposed reorganization and thanked EVP Reyes and Academic Senate Past-President Jeff Lamb as well as the faculty members who are present for attending this meeting.

   Erin Farmer and Michael Wylie from the Humanities Division delivered a Power Point Presentation requesting more thorough information. Ms. Farmer prefaced the presentation by stating that, while they’ve been concerned about transparency, planning, and deliberations on the proposed reorganization models, they have faith in the integrity and goodwill of their colleagues who represent faculty on the Reorganization Committee. The concerns they raise about the process therefore are not intended as a criticism of faculty representatives. They also recognize that a design of reorganization is fully within the purview of the administration. She further explained that they are not objecting to reorganization, rather to urge the Senate as the official representative body of the faculty to request a more thorough analysis based on data and to point out potential impact on areas primarily within the Senate’s purview. The Power Point will be forwarded to Senators and filed with these minutes. An additional concern Ms. Farmer raised was the extra workload that will trickle down to many people and impact faculty teaching and instruction time and along with larger divisions will likely have a big impact on students. Mr. Wyly shared his concern regarding how the Shared Governance Council, the Academic Senate, and the subcommittees’ constituent representation would be affected. He added that the truncated timeline appears to be reactive and all faculty need to be part of the plan going forward in order to have representation.

   **Comments/Questions:** Responses to questions Senators asked were as follows:
   Senator Cittadino queried if this presentation represented all faculty in Humanities and if they are content with the current organization. Ms. Farmer, Mr. Wyly, and Josh Scott responded: A vote was not taken; twelve
Humanities faculty conferred; a position paper by the English Department was submitted in agreement; the idea behind this is to consider how to create the best reorganization with as few flaws as possible; harder questions need to be asked, and; the last reorganization had never been evaluated for effectiveness.

Senator Crawford queried where this presentation had been submitted. Mr. Wyly responded that this is the first. Senator Allen pointed out that the Academic Senate is not rubber stamping the reorganization, as seemed to be implied, and added that it is not the Senate’s position to approve. Mr. Wyly responded: the impact on curriculum could affect how the College teaches and maintains students; it is a responsibility of the Academic Senate to say so; the opinion of the Academic Senate is important regarding accreditation, and; Senators should ask hard questions to determine how, when, and if the ability to deliver sound instruction to students in a meaningful way is impacted. Alena Hairston added that AB1725 is a big deal to inform and counsel on curriculum, instruction, and professional standards and not debatable or a matter of opinion. Mr. Wyly added that the Governing Board relies on guidance or mutual agreement from the Academic Senate. Senator Kleeberg pointed out that the Governing Board chose “Mutual Agreement” on all the Ten plus One items in 1990, and to “Rely Primarily” on Item 1, 2 and 3 in 1993, but the Re-Organization is not one of the Ten plus One items.

Senator Wanek clarified that questions have been asked at every Academic Senate meeting as the reorganization plans have unfolded.

Senator Jaimez queried what faculty in attendance would like to propose if there were a longer timeline. The response, in summary, was to develop stronger rationale, representation, and time for implementation.

Additional comments and questions:

Melissa Reeve, Humanities – Will there be a parallel process to see how different reorganization plans will affect Academic Senate representation? Senator Kleeberg explained that the recent Senate revision of the Constitution and Bylaws transferred a provision on Senate representation to the Bylaws to cover necessary adjustments that will be needed now and in the future, as final division reorganizations are known, and representation decisions should not be a big problem if the faculty approves the revised Constitution and Bylaws when put forth soon for a vote.

Ms. Reeve – Changes should be the result of assessment. Will the new reorganization be measured and evaluated? Was a pre- or post-assessment completed and what inadequacies is this reorganization addressing?

Senator Jaimez – current Senators whose terms are to expire this semester have agreed to remain, if needed, until at least the beginning of August.

Senator Kleeberg – the Senate is responsible to present curriculum changes and modifications to the Governing Board, yet the Senate is not relied on for where programs or disciplines are housed (dean or division).

Ms. Farmer – the objection is based on areas of curriculum that have had labs separated from their departments. Co-requisites will be reduced by drastic reduction of staffing in labs, a program discontinuance without the correct process.

Senator McDermott – the Senate was not consulted on any of those items, including any assessment of the floating dean position.

Ferdinanda Florence, Fine & Applied Arts/Behavioral Sciences – This is a diverse division, the Dean is retiring because of this reorganization plan, and the division could be put into a difficult situation. Deans have potentially important points of view and she finds the quick responses to make changes disjointed and hazy.

Tracy Schneider, Accreditation Coordinator – Concerns relevant to the Accreditation Self-Study standards Ms. Schneider expressed: the reorganization process has nothing to do with the Integrated Planning Process (IPP), which is how decisions are said to be made on campus; a review of the standards and sub-standards that could be negatively impacted by reorganization and should be carefully considered; ACCJC will look at how the reorganization serves the College, and; relevant eligibility requirements regarding staffing. Ms. Schneider will forward the document read for the Academic Senate records.

Additional concerns were raised regarding: reorganization decision-making representation; transparency; limited student involvement and knowledge of the process, and; impact on students.
EVP Reyes responded to faculty input at the meeting, acknowledging that the points have value and have been or will be considered. He queried what criteria were expected to determine impact on curriculum, instruction, and other academic matters. Rather than spending a full day, as Ruth Fuller spoke of from a previous reorganization, he is taking two months to do what they may have done in a day. Opinions, ideas, and input have been requested and it isn’t about just throwing ideas together and putting on a chart. EVP Reyes further stated that each time he goes to constituency groups good feedback has been received and, whether agreed upon or not, it is taken back to the Committee, then back to the campus and the cycle continues. He would like to hear how to incorporate curriculum matters into this. When the final Committee recommendation is presented to S/P Laguerre, EVP Reyes believes he’ll follow a similar process. S/P Laguerre’s final proposal will determine how many coordinators, chairs, staff will be needed and the costs will be figured before the plan goes to the Governing Board. Every dean will work differently with coordinators so the tasks and staff will vary. The goal is to present a plan to S/P Laguerre by the end of the week. He’ll see all of this, minutes, power point, etc. for his review. Please send any other comments to EVP Reyes.

Senator Cittadino requested timeline clarification, queried if there was a specific limit on number of deans, and specifics on cost savings to be met. EVP Reyes responded that: S/P Laguerre will use the month of April for further review; the position of a floating dean was changed to executive director, and; there was not a set target given regarding cost reduction. Classified staff can’t be reduced. The process is evolving and if the plan shows $200,000 in savings, it will be considered, if only $50,000 in savings, it probably won’t be worth it. EVP Reyes added that the Committee is looking at faculty and sections at Solano and are not looking at information outside of the College.

Senator Wanek raised the concern that the current timeline, the plan could be implemented in July when the majority of faculty are away and coordinators would be faculty positions. After more discussion, EVP Reyes assured that the moment S/P Laguerre makes the decision; action will take place to move quickly. Senator Wanek reiterated concerns about the Accreditation visit in the fall. EVP Reyes responded that he has shared that concern. Ms. Farmer queried if administration would defend declaration of a hiring emergency in a worst case scenario and expressed the concern that people often seem identified in secret for hiring positions. EVP Reyes replied that he would much rather compensate people to stay or have hiring happen by May and he will follow the process he’s addressed.

Senator Crawford reiterated a concern from her department is to not separate labs from their departments. She also noted that her constituents think the reorganization plan looks better for a small college, rather than one of this size and it seems to be a step backwards. The idea of hiring coordinators was also felt by some that it could lead to an environment of cronyism and a lot of divisiveness in departments and divisions. She added that a coordinator having scheduling power is a concern and queried why the floating dean would become an executive director, while a center dean would become a director which would seem to place that person under another dean.

Senator Crawford stressed that the Reorganization Committee has spent many hours during many days each week addressing all the comments that have been received. It was a much bigger commitment than originally expected. While it may be a task that is not ideal or the best process, that is part of the growing pains, it is functioning as well as it can, and the process could be much longer and unwieldy. She added that the different models aren’t far enough along to do financials.

Ms. Hairston noted that teaching and educational plans have been expensive to put together, so it is important to follow the proper process. She opined there is a lack of transparency and faculty are demoralized.

Senator Jaimez questioned the difference in stipend versus release time for coordinators. EVP Reyes replied that the creation of clusters came from the first forum. The intention was to find a way that the compensation would equal the responsibilities, but it wasn’t practical to know release time until it is clear what departments
will look like. Combined departments could lead to higher compensation. Faculty, sections offered, and the complexity of departments must be considered. Smaller departments might have stipends and larger departments might have release time. This same process will decide whether to retain existing coordinator positions. Senator Crawford added that from requests to have numbers run, they compared release time versus stipend to have some idea of costs. That will go to finance to cost out. In response to a query on how dean positions will be populated, EVP Reyes explained that Center Deans weren’t considered until that brought up, after which discussion produced consideration to have one, rather than two center deans. He added that decisions have not been made, current deans may be put into positions, or some may be hired from outside.

Senator Kleeberg thanked everyone who came to express their concerns and opinions.

6. Action Reminders

7. Announcements

8. Adjournment
   Motion to Adjourn – Senator Wanek; Seconded – Senator McDermott; Unanimous
   The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm