

SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL MEETING

Minutes – March 11, 2009

Board Room 2:30 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present:

Academic Senate–Jeffrey Lamb
CCA/CTA/NEA-

Minority Coalition- Kevin Anderson

CSEA-Debbie Luttrell-Williams

ASSC-Lillian Nelson, David Brannen

Local 39 – Jeff Lehfeltd

Management–Shirley Lewis, Esq.,
Erin Vines

Resource Persons-Dr. Robert Jensen

Rich Christensen, Ed.D.

Jay Field

Don Mourton, Ph.D.

Susan Rinne

Charles Shatzer, Ph.D.

Robin Steinback, Ph.D.

Judy Anderson

Members Absent: **Resource Persons**–Lisa J. Waits, Ed.D., Ross Beck, & Nora O’Neill

Guests: Judy Anderson-Recorder

1. (a) Call to Order

Dr. Jensen called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

(b) Approval of Agenda

It was moved by Rich Christensen and seconded by Debbie Luttrell-Williams to approve the Agenda for this meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

(c) Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Rich Christensen and seconded by Lillian Nelson to approve the Minutes of the March 4, 2009, SGC Meeting with the following amendment: on page 3, second paragraph, Charles Shatzer stated that the Board sets “annual goals,” rather than 18-month goals. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Draft of Shared Governance Council Code of Conduct

Dr. Jensen began by announcing that Jeff Lamb had previously introduced a draft of a Code of Conduct for faculty and staff just as the Board adopted a Code of Conduct for itself. Previous discussions centered around on whether to adopt this concept collectively, i.e., all constituent groups endorse it. Dr. Jensen believes this is a good idea. It’s a way to establish a standard for relating to the Board, and it may be good as a way we, as faculty and staff, deal with each other, because it’s a very low percentage of employees who have any interaction with the Board.

Jeff reported that he, Erin Vines, and Cynthia Simon met Tuesday afternoon and thought maybe a “preface” or “preamble” should be inserted. The proposed Code has four points now rather than six, plus

an epilogue was added. He stated the Code is largely in response to Accreditation Recommendation #1-Campus Dialogue. He said they expressed some concerns on potential adverse response to it from email feedback he received and changed some language such as using the term “employees,” rather than “faculty & staff.” Jeff presented the revised Code on a power point slide and read the draft to the members.

Kevin Anderson commented that never revealing confidential information should be extended to family and others. Other member comments included: a family member is part of my bargaining unit. Another member thought it was a stretch to extend it to family and others.

Dr. Lamb said that the Board’s code reads like it’s what they’re guilty of. Our proposed Code about not revealing confidential information is because we have done this, and we also don’t want certain behaviors to continue. It’s included because it is behavior we want to stop. Discussion ensued on whether it’s enforceable—can people be called on it. We want people to be called on it, but not disciplined on it. This should be a new way of engaging—this is like new guidelines. He says just because it doesn’t have “legal teeth,” doesn’t mean it has less “moral teeth.”

Jeff Lehfeldt said that Local 39 has a Code of Conduct in its agreement. Shirley Lewis gave an analogy to our smoking policy. It’s not legally enforceable, but “violators” don’t know it and most observe the rules—although there’s always some who won’t abide no matter what.

Dr. Lamb said the proposal originated from seeing what the Board has taken a step to do, and it’s like a gesture of goodwill for employees to do likewise. There are those who typically go to the Board, but this is a way to take a stand as faculty & constituent leaders on Shared Governance as this is how we should conduct ourselves.

Dr. Jensen added that this is an “end run,” whereby the Board could be alerted that a person or group is going around the established process and expectations, and we would hope the Board will encourage the person or group to return to the established process. It’s an appropriate enforcement.

Jeff also added his colleagues, when drafting the Code, tried to take the long view so that in the future the code may still exist. Dr. Mourton said this is a major cultural shift for the college and hopes it will change the way things are done. He stated the preface could be re-phrased and begin in a more positive tone—the current wording sets a tone of “negativity” that already exists on campus, but don’t take away the spirit of it. Shirley suggested, “To encourage.....” Discussion on verbiage ensued.

Debbie Williams said that her union has a code of ethics and standards that its members are expected to adhere to, so how does the proposed Code relate to it? It’s basically symbolic. It’s not a Board policy or part of any employee contract.

There was discussion on whether the draft applies to interaction with the Board only, or also with each other as employees. Jeff Lehfeldt said he has some apprehension because the Local 39 contract has language in it establishing standards for dealing with each other. Debbie Luttrell-Williams said that we need a way to address issues with each other, too. Some colleges, the Chair answered, have an ombudsman who intercedes when problems arise. He went on to say that we can disagree without being disagreeable. All groups, whether formal or informal, have a way, again, either formally or informally on how to deal with concerns. There will be people who won’t adhere to it—nobody will get fired for it, however. He asked the group if they want to move forward with the concept. Jeff Lamb and group did a nice job on it.

Jeff Lehfeltdt retrieved a copy of the Local 39 agreement and read the statement contained within about interactions with others. He feels his members will say: our code already exists. Rich Christensen emphasized that the Shared Governance Code is for the entire campus population and how it deals with the Board—not just with each others' own units.

Dr. Jensen asked the group to pause word-smithing for a moment and wanted a feel for support of the concept. Ms. Luttrell-Williams said CSEA is still discussing the wording, but support it in concept. Mr. Lehfeltdt agrees in concept—he'll meet with his group tomorrow. Jeff Lamb presented the first draft to the Academic Senate and there wasn't large opposition to it, but also want to tinker with wording. The Chair said it sounds like there's broad support for the concept and endorse crafting a code. Dr. Jensen said in the next two weeks, he'd like the group to draft the next version and SGC to vote on it—we need consensus. We need to empower the constituent reps. because we won't get 100% agreement.

Dr. Jensen said the way we're working, at the end of June, we assume the college stops working when some segments leave for the summer. It's problematic because we have lots happening—our last meeting for the semester is May 13. There's a lot happening between then and the fall—we cannot just shut the college down. The institution needs to build some trust and establish a protocol on how we're going to do things.

We designated a group to create the Code—they gave it their best shot. They want feedback if something needs changing, but feedback must be received so a decision can be made. The Chair asked the group how they want to roll this out, a statement to the Board on why we did this. Ms. Luttrell-Williams said the Board has a nice plaque on the wall, and we should have a nice presentation also as part of the goodwill gesture.

One of the major dilemmas right now is what are the budget numbers? Dr. Jensen asked Susan Rinne to prepare a report on where we are relative to the deficit. Ms. Rinne distributed two handouts: one is a timeline of the deficit and its components and components of the revenue side. The Chair said we cannot cut enough to minimize the shortfall—we have to increase revenue.

Ms. Rinne said we need to begin by not calling the budget situation a “structural deficit.” It's simply a deficit: current expenditures are over the current revenue. “Structural” means the deficit will be incurred indefinitely. A consultant is assisting Fiscal Services in fine-tuning the numbers: all the contract ed. dollars, student workers, any new revenues we knew about: theater ticket sales, etc. The VPs met with the Deans to make any budget corrections.

Ms. Rinne reviewed the following deficit figures and the components behind it:

11/19/08 Board Presentation: (\$1,269,570)

- First draft of working budget
- Little input from Deans & other staff

12/17/08 Board Adoption: (\$71,848)

- Salary savings +417,000
- Increase non-resident tuition fees +100,000
- Expense bond-related personnel to Measure G budgets
- Bill CTA for release time +300,000
- Reduction in gas & electric +200,000
- Update local revenue +180,722

02/11/09 Board Presentation: (\$1,678,606)

- Retiree health benefits JPA -233,000
- Measure G, one-time -217,000
- Accreditation -40,000
- Unrealized electric savings -200,000
- Cost of TRAN issuance -10,000
- Special Trustee -130,000
- Power outage repair -95,000
- Fiscal Services consultant -100,000
- Legal fees -60,000
- Vacaville assessments -21,758
- Interim Supt/President -100,000
- CMF site clean-up -100,000
- Banner -300,000

03/18/09 Board Presentation: (\$1,750,466)

- Elimination of COLA from State apportionment -308,213
- Decrease in prior-year lottery allocation -60,646
- Extended audit -15,000
- Measure G one-time reversal +217,000
- Power outage repair out of Measure G +95,000

Susan Rinne reported that although the State will not impose mid-year cuts, it will instead defer apportionment. The monies are being halved in January, February, and March. In April, May, and June we will receive the remainder. The State is holding back the revenue so it can lower its Proposition 98 base cause they're moving those expenditures off their books—not ours—it allows them to lower their obligation to us in the future. Plus, they draw interest on the money and pay their bills with it. We won't be whole until October of this year. She has received comments that we announce steps we are going to take and then don't do it, but it's because the State has changed its direction.

The college is entitled to the revenue, but we need to take a Tax Revenue Anticipate Note (TRAN) to “borrow” money so we can continue to pay our bills. When the revenue finally comes in, we pay back the TRAN. It's a cash flow issue—not a budget issue.

The college had a specialist perform an energy usage and spending analysis and determined we were paying too much and had proposals on reductions but it never happened. The retiree health benefits contribution is ongoing. The added Banner expense will be determined by whether we have the in-house talent to get the system rolling and if we have skills and talent to keep it going—to maintain it. If we don't, how much augmentation will it take? Dr. Jensen used the analogy describing whether a person buys a car or leases a car.

Shirley Lewis asked Dr. Jensen how confident are we in tracking Measure G expenses and if there's enough money. There is a specialist who is looking at the entire Measure G budget. Dr. Jensen added, however, there is a good resource in redevelopment funds—it's not general fund—it's capital outlay money and to be used for facilities only. Additionally, he said Solano College has never participated in the State building program when the State passes building bonds. We need to get in line to obtain the dollars—it's a dollar for dollar match.

Jeff Lehfeldt said the college built the Child Development Center with State funds. Dr. Jensen said it was constructed with categorical funding. Shirley Lewis said two years ago a proposal by the former interim VP of Business to obtain a loan never transpired and is this something we can still pursue? The Chair said yes.

Dr. Jensen emphasized the importance of getting to the real numbers and everyone on the same page because we need to save as much money as we can for 2008-09 so we increase the cash carryover for 2009-10 beginning balance, then we balance the budget.

The District has a Board-mandated 5% restricted reserve that fluctuates as the general fund ending balance fluctuates with one-time expense variables. Ms. Rinne said that a common error is the 5% restricted reserve and the unrestricted ending balance be added together and there's a misconception that there's a higher balance left on unspent money. We can use that money during the year for emergency purposes only and it must be restored each year.

For the current \$1.7 million deficit, if we take away those one-time only expenses and whatever remains is the "structural" or ongoing deficit. The District spent more in 2008-09 than revenue allowed—that over-expenditure "rolls over" to 2009-10. Dr. Jensen said the solution to the District's short and long-term problem is on the revenue side. The 2008-09 deficit of \$1.75 million assumes we'll have no additional savings, meaning we're not able to stop or lessen any more expenditures. And we probably won't since it's too late in the fiscal year.

He gave an explanation of one-time versus ongoing expenses. For example, we won't have the one-time costs of the Interim S/P and S/P search that totals \$178,000 for 2009-10 so that figure may be used for another one-time cost only. If the cost stays in the budget, it becomes ongoing and the money is gone permanently.

Susan Rinne distributed a handout on descriptions of what makes up revenue and expenditures. We need to get to 9182 FTES this year, we've borrowed from summer, have three years to make this number, the revenue gets distributed to other districts and we don't get it back. Even if we grow back to 9182, the State no longer has the money, and we've lost our base. Dr. Jensen said he can't stress the importance enough of making the enrollment number because it's that critical—we cannot cut our way out of the problem.

The Vallejo Center does not have center status so it won't get its \$1 million apportionment. The Vacaville Center is deemed a center.

3. Board Policy No. 4005 Revisions

A revised Board Policy #4005 was distributed whereby some minor revisions were made to titles, etc.

4. Review of Vision, Mission & Strategic Goals

VP Robin Steinback distributed a handout on definition of a vision, mission statement, and goals. It's typical during an Accreditation cycle to periodically review and update its mission statement. ACCJC defines a mission statement as containing: broad educational purpose, who is the target student population, and a commitment to student learning.

Ms. Luttrell-Williams suggested that the college's mission statement and goals be posted around campus once again. They used to be posted in every single building. As the college has gone through new construction and renovation, the posters came down.

Dr. Jensen and Dr. Steinback said we are formally begin the conversation to look at the statement; however, we are unable to finish this spring. We should complete it by the next Accreditation Self-Study in 2011. Discussion ensued on doing a charrette, climate survey, etc. to assess the community's educational needs. Jeff Leheldt said maybe the college should do a survey or report card first to prepare for revisiting our mission and core values.

Dr. Jensen advised the group that we really need to receive community feedback because we're too internal—the outside community needs to tell us how we're doing and how to improve. And we can do this with a blend of all the groups. Shirley Lewis noted the college paid the MIG Group in 2006 to conduct a very comprehensive study for our Educational Master Plan. She said it's a good platform to build on. The committee felt an internal survey (a report card) be completed first so we determine whether what we do still apply—to reaffirm our mission and goals.

The feedback to Dr. Steinback and Dr. Lamb is to not undertake a survey & reviewing the mission statement this spring but build off of what's contained in the Educational Master Plan. We'll do a charrette in the fall as part of our self-study, and kicking off the integrated strategic planning cycle.

Dr. Steinback announced two Accreditation summits in the next few weeks. She handed out a timeline: the first report is this Friday, March 20 and Monday, March 23.

5. Adoption of Board Procedures and Development

Dr. Jensen reported that the District will be returning to its schedule of reviewing and updating District Board policies. He reminded members this was one of the Accreditation findings.

He distributed a new timeline for board policies to cycle through and be updated. We're going to begin with Series 5000-Student Services and 6000-Academic Affairs. Series 3000-Business Services and 4000-Human Resources will include only the policies where the District may not be in compliance with federal and/or state updates.

Academic Affairs (Series 6000) is ready to go now. Student Services (Series 5000) will be next. Mr. Lamb said the policies should be given to the group addressing Recommendation #2. And Dr. Jensen emphasized that this review will include procedures also. Shared Governance will look at procedures, but the Board will be provided procedures for review only.

Ms. Luttrell-Williams suggested that we resurrect the big blue binders with hard copies of the policies, in order to show any procedures directly behind each policy, because the website does not contain procedures—only policies. It's also suggested for everybody to use the same format to indicate revisions, for consistency.

Shared Governance recommends that at least one complete hard-copy set of board policies and procedures get placed in each division—not only going to the website—what if there's a power outage?

6. Review of Governing Board Agenda:

The draft board agenda for its March 18 meeting was distributed.

7. College Area Reports/Announcements:

Superintendent/President: none

ASSC: Lillian Nelson: ASSC is aware that there have been committees on campus that should have had student representation and have not. ASSC acknowledges that, especially with so many new employees, there is a “lack of awareness about the procedures by which students are formally appointed to participatory/shared governance committees.” The procedure is simple: the committee needs to email the information to Dr. Shirley Lewis, the ASSC advisor. She will inform ASSC and they will designate a representative. Committees cannot simply select a student representative from the SCC student population. Constituent groups select their representatives; therefore, ASSC selects its representative. To aid in the dissemination the information about the process, ASSC proposes that it will have an email sent \$ALL with this information.

Academic Affairs: none

CCA/CTA: none

CSEA: none

Local 39: none

Management: none

Minority Coalition: none

Student Services: none

Human Resources: none

Academic Senate: none

Technology & Learning Resources: none

Workforce & Community Development/Foundation: none

Administrative & Business Services/FABPAC: none

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

RB/ja