EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MINUTES  
Sacramento City College  
March 1, 2010  ► RN 273  ◄  1:00PM– 3:00PM 

Note: Executive Council Members, please bring your agenda & attachments to the meeting.


Resource Ex Officio Staff: M. Buechner, A. Hamilton, G. Hayman, M. Poindexter, M. Turner

I. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Academic Senate Update ................................................................. C. Zuercher  
   • At the next meeting the following items will be discussed: election updates (Angela Dee-Alforque); feedback from senators on priority registration (Thomas Greene); Student Learning Outcomes (Marybeth Buechner and Alan Keys); Title IV updates (Catherine Fites); ‘censorware’ product for computers to prevent inappropriate internet use which has been discussed at the District level (Jeff Carlson).
   • SCC Academic Senate resolution 4: Folsom Lake College has shared the resolution regarding course reductions, and supports it.

B. Classified Senate Update .............................................................................. P. Geary  
   • The next meeting will be held at the West Sacramento Center. Given the time constraints, the meeting may not be a regular meeting and will be mostly for the purpose of touring and seeing the new facility.
   • The Classified Senate Retreat is scheduled for March 31, 2010.

C. Associated Student Government Update .................................................. T. Lang  
   • Student Government is preparing for a ‘walk-out’ event on March 4, which has been rather controversial among students and faculty. The event is in direct response to state budget issues.
   • The annual ‘March in March’ is an upcoming District-wide event the senate is promoting to garner participation from faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Funding in the amount of $2,000 has been allocated for t-shirts for those who participate.
   • Both events are sponsored by the statewide community college student senate.
   • K. Jeffery inquired about safety precautions being taken for transportation of students from the college to the capital and noted that there are risks present when traveling from one point to another and that some kind of consideration should be made for this issue.
   • C. Zuercher inquired about how faculty can handle attendance issues or other issues that may arise from student participation in the event. T. Lang responded that the senate does not anticipate significant participation event.

D. Senior Leadership Team Update ................................................................. T. Greene  
   • The group met February 8 and discussed the following items: second quarter budget metrics; budget committee process (moving forward Deans will go to the budget committee); paper budget; textbook loan program; reviewed new information about student discipline and crisis intervention; Chancellor’s update including the WARN
system and a new District-wide director of financial aid systems; accreditation (K. Jeffery).

- C. Zuercher inquired about the paper budget and if there were any anticipated changes. B. Martinelli responded that there were no changes planned for policies about white paper use.

E. President’s Cabinet ................................................................. K. Jeffery

- Dr. Byron McClenney was at the last board meeting to discuss individual districts in California that are participating in CLASS in looking at data regarding students who have not traditionally done well academically in basic skills areas. Dr. McClenney gave much anecdotal information about what is going on at colleges outside of California and discussed ways in which they are directing their efforts in intervention and strategies to help students and improve persistence and success rates. The Board was interested and committed to the district’s continued participation. Right now the data indicates Los Rios is looking good in most areas with regards to persistence.
- The board gave kudos to the colleges for reaffirmation of accreditation and thanking the colleges for work that was done to make the process one we can be proud of in the end.

F. Executive Staff Update .............................................................................................................. K. Jeffery

- See Chancellor’s Cabinet update.

G. Chancellor’s Cabinet ............................................................................................................. K. Jeffery

- Did not meet last week.
- Continuous discussion about enrollment management activities, which continues to be an area of great concern for the colleges. An individual college approach to managing course offerings is the strategy SCC is pursuing.
- An MOU for articulation agreements with Caplan University has come through the State Chancellor’s office. The articulation officers and other faculty statewide are concerned that the state chancellor’s office is negotiation an MOU without discussing it with the personnel of the system. The process in which this MOU was established is of concern among the colleges. No word yet on how the district plans to respond to the MOU on behalf of our colleges.
- C. Zuercher mentioned the bill that is out right now regarding parameters of what a degree should look like. This is of great concern to faculty.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Logo and Rebrand feedback .......................................................................................... A. Hamilton

- Academic senate: only 3 or 4 senators responded to choose various options (if we must); questions of why came up; overall the sentiment was that they did not choose any options; didn’t support the idea of changing the logo; none of the options resonated with the senate; like what we have; wanted to use the seal as the logo; some comments made on “S” logo regarding our distinction as a non-river Los Rios college.
- Classified Senate: if they HAD to choose one; various responses but logo 3 (Stonehenge) was most popular; some clarification was needed on difference between logo and seal. Logo 1 (S) was runner up; some education may be needed regarding the difference between logo and seal and how they are used.
• Associated Student Government: voted and logo 3 (Stonehenge) won; logo 1(S) looked too much like Nike symbol.
• Senior Leadership was in more support of the idea of changing the logo, and feedback was sent to A. Hamilton.
• Overall rejection of panther suggestion.
• K. Jeffery noted that the current logo is not consistently used and it is not necessarily a ‘stand out’ piece, as discussed by the Marketing Team, also. SCC needs an identifying logo and brand with visual impact and repeated use. Also pointed out a rollover date would be identified for usage of current logo pieces (stop using). Also, other institutions have not had as thorough a process to decide upon a logo. Need to get people to use one ‘look’ or logo on all items and have it look nicely.
• M. Poindexter pointed out at some of the logo samples are in galleries around the city and are being exhibited and are quite striking and do stand out.

B. Open Campus Issues

• Feedback on two campus issues – committee charge changes and smoking issues.
• Regarding committee charge changes: Academic senate approved by consensus; SLT approves by consensus; Classified Senate approved by consensus; Associated Student Government did not express concern. MB will recommend a response for the president to finalize the decision.
• Regarding smoking on campus: VPA’s discussed District policy and found that District colleges must abide by 30 foot rule, however information was provided to the District regarding other colleges that have more restricted policies and the district is considering going to more restricted policy District-wide, current policy of 30ft will be enforced with strengthened effort and will include ticketing for smoking in non-smoking areas. District approved of a survey to be conducted to get a broader sense of the sentiment on the issue of heightened smoking restrictions. Our nursing office is currently charged with an educational campaign about smoking and will conduct a survey on smoking to the SCC campus. Jeff Christian and MB discussed a quad booth for random sample, and to survey ASG and clubs. T. Lang inquired about a more broad survey through Imail. K. Jeffery concurs that it is a good possibility to avoid pushback. Clarification was made that the survey is not to vote on smoking versus a non-smoking campus, rather the survey is to determine the direction the campus will take on health education regarding smoking. Suggestions for the education campaign include cost implications.

C. Self Study Agenda Items (Process for feedback on governance structure; Evaluating the effectiveness of academic support services)

• No feedback to date from Academic and Classified Senate, and SLT.
• Constituencies ask to have information resent.
• Classified senate may need more detailed information.
• ASG noted there is no option for tutors on the survey.

III. NEW BUSINESS

Faculty workload committee has been convened based on request from lrcft and academic senate (being done at all colleges and district) and will hold its first meeting on Thursday
this week at noon to discuss issues around scheduling. The intent is to have more discussion from faculty about what the schedule of classes will be.

IV. OTHER
A. Minutes from February 1, 2010 Executive Council Meeting…………………A. Hamilton (attachment-1)
   • Edits from MB will be sent to A. Hamilton. No other changes were requested.
   • K. Jeffery – clarification (with reference to the mission statement) that when issues are discussed, though there is not opposition, the decision should be specifically noted so that the decision will stand out in the minutes. MB noted that details of agenda items will be listed on the agenda from now on.

B. Standing Committee Minutes (attachments)……………………………………………………………………………..All
   ▪ Council reviewed.

C. Announcements
The dedication of Fine Arts building likely for summer. There has been discussion regarding the name of the building (whether to be called Fine Arts Building or to keep the name of Fischbacher – the only building on college named for a woman). A Foundation policy was approved by board of trustees that states that when an existing building is taken out and a new one is constructed in its place, the new building doesn’t have to bear the same name as the old one and if a new person wants their name on the building they can pay for it.

April 26th tentative date for Davis Center groundbreaking.

V. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
2 PLANNING AGENDA ITEMS WILL BE ON THE AGENDA AGAIN (EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES AND PROCESS OF FEEDBACK ON GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE)

Adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Next Meeting: March 15, 2010

cc: K. Beyrer; L. Weathers-Miguel
    D. Styer