Governing Council Meeting   **Aug. 26, 2008 minutes**

Members Present

Diana Bennett	President	Teresa Morris	Library
Lloyd Davis	Secretary	Madeleine Murphy	Language Arts
Jeremy Ball	Past President	Jim Robertson	Creative Arts/Social Science
Bernard Gershenson	Language Arts	Huy Tran	Math/Science
Joe Mangan	PE/Athletics	Lilya Vorobey	Technology/Business

Others Attending

Sandra Stefani Comerford	Dean, Language Arts	Teeka James	Language Arts
Gary Dilley	former Dean, PE/Athletics	Dan Kaplan	AFT

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:22 pm. MSU to approve the agenda and the minutes of April 8, April 22, and May 13, 2008. Attendees introduced themselves.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT – Diana reported an enormous amount of good work was done by the summer workgroups. Participants earned a total of $60,000 in stipends: $2000 per person for forty hours of work and the production of final draft documents. Those documents will be circulated and their approval sought through a shared governance process.

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS – The Budget Subcommittee is considering the **Dental Hygiene Director** position. The district hasn't specified how long its funding for the program will continue. Advocacy groups funneled money for it into the district so we want to be sure it is used. CSM's deficit is $1.5 million per year, and it is a big liability for us to take on a money-losing program, unless the district is willing to take it on to meet a community need. Skyline said no to it because it cost too much.

Faculty have four representatives on **College Council**: Academic Senate president and vice president, and two others. Jeremy Ball will serve this semester, but we need another representative. College Council makes recommendations to President Claire on all matters except those under the 10+1, on which the Senate has primacy. It meets first and third Wednesdays, 2:15-4:15, and members serve for two years.

Teresa Morris reminded us the library encourages faculty to place texts on reserve. Joe Mangan said faculty parking is a big issue during construction. In lot 2 behind the theater, the rows near the perimeter road that faculty used a few years ago are now for visitors. The next two rows in are now for faculty.

A face lift is planned for buildings 15 and 17. During Fall '09, occupants of one of those buildings will move into buildings 10 and 11, including classrooms retrofit with cubicles. Occupants of the other will do the same the following semester. After that, 10 and 11 will be demolished to make room for 10N. We expect locked areas and locked file cabinets for security, and we hope for places for confidential conversations with students. Telephone extensions and computer access will be maintained. Professional movers will do the actual moving.   A similar move of the music department went well. Like the

modernization of buildings 16 and 18, the face lift for 15 and 17 will include asbestos abatement, functioning heating and cooling, new interior paint, and furniture upgrades.

Jeremy reported Dean of Business Services Virgil Stanford worked with contractors and SamTrans on parking and bus issues and determined that a parking shuttle is too expensive. We asked for and got temporary spaces in Lot 6 for 20 minute loading and unloading. Teeka and Ann suggested and got stairs (but so far no railing) up from lot 7.   Dan said the 20 minute areas are underutilized. Teeka, who uses them regularly, suggested allowing longer parking in those spaces later in the day. Jeremy suggested reducing the number of such spaces to perhaps one for each building if they remain underutilized. If longer parking is allowed, the spaces could be occupied all day by cars with disabled persons placards.

NEW BUSINESS – PROGRAM REVIEW A purpose of today's meeting is to get drafts of the Program Review and Planning document to faculty for review and comment. The senate executive committee will meet Sept. 2 to approve the drafts. Governing Council will address changes at its Sept. 9 meeting. The Board of Trustees needs the documents by Sept. 24. The final version must be ready Oct. 9 to meet the Oct. 15 accreditation deadline.

Teeka James, Jeremy Ball, Sandra Stefani Comerford, who worked over the summer on the program review document Governing Council looked at in May, took part in today's discussion. They have met with Marsha Ramezane, who is working independently on Student Services program review. As recently as yesterday they made changes for the sixth draft of the document, to eliminate redundancy, clarify instructions about what goes where, and be sure it would all be useful and doable.   The document is in part modeled after Foothill's. The process is very logical and won't be as difficult as it looks.

Jeremy said he was guided from the start (Spring 2008) by the rubric that ACCJC uses for evaluating program review processes, to be sure to hit all the points. We are responding to the outside agency that has us on warning.

Teeka described changes to the tables in section VII, Summary of resources needed to reach program action steps. At present there are three columns in the table for faculty positions, headed Full-time positions requested, Expected outcomes if granted, and Expected impact if not granted. The third column will be relabeled Identify the current or prior SLOs or SLO assessments which support this resource request. Sandra Stefani Comerford, Susan Estes, Jennifer Hughes, John Sewart, and Milla McConnell-Tuite have looked at the program review draft, and have emphasized the need for clear links of personnel and resources requests to SLOs. As for resource requests, we used to classify equipment as costing under $500 or over $500. That affects funding sources, but not program needs. We will now list all resources together, connected to SLOs, and let the deans figure out funding. The program review group will meet tomorrow morning to work on Section VIII, Course outlines. The result might be a list of which course outlines are current and when the rest will be updated.

Jeremy reported we have recommended CurricuNET to DAS. Canada also likes it. Skyline prefers a different tool. The district is committed to getting some curriculum management system for, e.g., building and archiving program review and SLO assessments. The choice of software is being determined. The program review template was written with that in mind. "Input text here" is for fields in an electronic system. Once entered, the system would populate every place the field is needed.

Teeka noted each section of the document lists data resources for faculty. Also, John Sewart and Milla McConnell-Tuite will give each program a one page sheet with the data needed for program review, e.g., LOAD/WSCH, ethnicity/age/gender, and core program and student success indicators. Teresa observed some programs have SLOs that can be tied to resources but not to people. Jeremy said they want us to tie

SLOs to planning in general. Sandra said the library needs people for what it does, and program review can show it is doing a good job with what it has.

Madeleine said as we look at how well students have mastered SLOs for a given course, a massive discrepancy in achievement might be tied to lack of personnel. Learning outcomes have become the center point from which everything radiates. Our need for more faculty must be related to outcomes, including outcomes not being taught.

Sandra said the library may be doing a good job with what it has. Program review looks at SLOs and data. For the library, that might include hours open, or number of tutors. In program reviews, SLOs should not be the only or even the primary consideration. Madeleine warned a program can tailor its SLOs to what the program can deliver. Jeremy added most institutional forces affecting faculty act to have us lessen academic standards. Keep more students? Make classes each easier. Get more students? Go for better reviews on RateMyProfessors. These undermine rigor. This might be a counterforce. We need this kind of rigor, and we need more people to get this, to demonstrate it affects student learning.

Madeleine said maybe a program needs another full-timer because there are things it could do if there were someone to do them. Tweak the wording to include SLOs you could posit, e.g. have every student able to use the library. Jeremy suggested information competency as such an SLO. Bernard suggested asking for new faculty to reduce the number of part-time faculty. There are various ways to show full-timers are better at what they do for our students, and we could indicate that in SLOs. But would we be undermining ourselves by unfairly castigating adjuncts? Jeremy said demonstrate it's not their competency, but their access to institutional resources, e.g. training in the use of student services, and professional development. Adjuncts don't have printers but are asked to print out first day materials. Remediating these things would have costs, but identifying them would not affect our accreditation. ACCJC is looking at how we do things, not at what we do. They don't criticize our SLOs. Gary suggested we identify the prior or current SLOs or program goals that support this request. Teeka suggested modifying the form to invite people to bring in other points.

Jeremy suggested we tie in General Education level SLOs by asserting we need resources to better address institutional goals. Huy Tran said last year's biology program review started with departmental and program goals. Jeremy said we have had course objectives for a long time, but we haven't said what it would look like if students achieved them, and we haven't demonstrated that students are achieving them.

Jeremy said after we did assessment on ISLOs and on departmental and course SLOs, we were told we were looking at the wrong things. Now we are to look at entities students see in a course of study, such as an AA degree, IGETC requirements, or a certificate. A separate set of SLOs is required for each certificate. Lilya pointed out some programs, such as real estate and building inspection, have no full-timers to work on SLOs.

Teeka said in May, a major concern was the workload involved in doing program reviews. It's a much better document now, but workload is still a concern. Jeremy said there is no way around that. Initial implementation will be a lot of work. Subsequent years will not be as bad. Reviews are done every three years, so each year about one-third of programs will prepare reviews. Who goes when has yet to be determined.

The PIV group wants reviews done early. It takes time to set up a PIV committee after the need for it has been identified through program review. The VPI and the Senate president must meet and a PIV committee selected and approved. Governing Council should consider faster ways to approve faculty appointments to time-sensitive committees. Jeremy suggested a due date right before or right after mid-

terms, perhaps March 25. Spring break is usually just before Easter. Between now and 2022 Easter is in March only twice, and it can be as late as April 21, so a due date tied to spring break is too late. Gary suggested something like the last Friday in March rather than a numerical date. Jeremy said fall semester is packed with tenure review and peer review. He hoped spring would be more manageable, allowing time for PIV and peer review. Gary said we could change the due date after a year if necessary. Pick a date, assess how it worked out, and feed that back into updating the process.

Jeremy suggested discussing with your dean where your program ought to be in terms of a productivity target (load.) A lot will ride on whether or not you hit that target.   In English, it is not rational to achieve the college load target of 525. Find a reasonable target, keeping enrollment caps in mind. Compare your program's load with its target. Achieving 335 with a target of 325 is better than achieving 550 with a target of 600. Marsha Ramezane is working on how to measure load in student services, and load in such areas as the writing center is being addressed. Load will also tie into the PIV process.

Dan said a productivity number is determined by each department. If the college wants 525, drill down to find how we can get there. Mike Claire wants to leave how to judge individual programs a bit open so CSM's Budget Planning Committee can consider what we can expect in the way of resources as a function of load. Teeka pointed out some programs can't get to 525 because of contractual class size limits. For example, the college must accept the cost of the English program. Gary stated the 525 number is somewhere in Title 5 funding regulations. Dan said it's also in the STRS law. Gary said each department can discuss how to increase load and serve students better at the same time. Labs are great ways to generate more hours for apportionment. Get more to do more.

Madeleine pointed out the annual review won't be that much shorter than it is now. There must be a better way to manage distinct duties of faculty in doing administrative tasks. We do more and more such tasks. It is empowering, but we do have classes. She would welcome a future discussion of administrative duties. With reassigned time, every department will have to lose a class or so. Jeremy called for reassigned time for program chairs as more administrative duties are placed on faculty.

Gary said administrators used to observe faculty.   AB 1725, which ASCCC favored, changed everything. Faculty wanted more say, and got it. It didn't reduce work for administrators.   If two people do one person's job you need a third person to keep track of the communication between the first two. Teeka suggested the college entertain having bigger departments, or clusters of departments, with faculty department chairs who are given time to do scheduling, SLO, and program review tasks.

Jeremy asked whether there should be a resolution accompanying our approval of the program review template, stating we get why we need to do program review and here's how to address workload concerns. Jeremy is considering clustering some smaller programs (for example, history, philosophy, and sociology) and doing program reviews for the clusters. Lilya wrote reviews for three programs and gets 0.7 unit/semester to oversee them. The multimedia lab has the same situation. P.E. does one program review for its entire division. The Writing Center has coordinators with reassigned time. We are entitled to fifteen flex days, but we take only five. When flex came in we decided not to take too many days out of the classroom. We could add a week of nonteaching flex time for these tasks. The work is not evenly divided. Maybe people in large departments could be assigned to work with smaller departments which lack full-time faculty, reading about the program and helping write reviews.

Jeremy identified two approaches. One is a resolution supporting reassigned time for faculty. The other is a request to DAS for better utilization of flex day activities for these added tasks, with a new block of flex days or a few flex days here and there.

Diana asked members to talk to faculty before the next meeting. She has received no comments from faculty so far in response to her August 21 email with drafts of the PIV and program review documents. The senate executive committee will meet Sept. 2 to approve those documents. Jeremy suggested we task someone to come up with a resolution to bring to the executive committee. The resolution would accompany adoption of the program review template, and would recommend we get reassigned time for the work. We can recommend flex to DAS, but that is not a college decision. Flex days are district-wide. Gary pointed out flex has a legal definition involving workshops, training, and developmental activities, but not institutional work. There is lots of variety among districts in the implementation of flex.

Another way to address workload is to adopt a compressed academic calendar. It would have a M-Th teaching schedule, with Fridays for labs and institutional work. A few years ago Canada and CSM favored it, but Skyline did not, and in the face of that division the Chancellor dropped the idea. Cabrillo and San Jose City College have such a calendar. It is still a front-burner issue at the District level. Dan noted the academic calendar is negotiated by AFT and the District. Jeremy asked is it OK for the executive committee to field comments, and deal with the documents next week. Diana thanked people for their work on program review.

NEW BUSINESS – PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND VIABILITY – Gary Dilley, retired Dean of P.E./Athletics, chairs the committee working on the Program Improvement and Viability policy. Other members include Diana Bennett, Marilyn Lawrence, Jim Robinson, and Laura Demsetz. All have been on PIV committees or in programs that underwent PIV review. It was clear the PIV process had no step-by-step structure. The committee wanted a predictable, step-by-step structure laid out in advance. It was clear the process had no such structure. Different programs may require different kinds of data, but forms and processes ought to be the same. PIV uses the data required for program review – student success indicators and program indicators from the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness.

There are three PIV documents: regulations on program viability for instructional programs, a program viability form to be completed by a program's PIV committee, and an appendix with a checklist of tasks. Non-instructional services , e.g. student services and the library, are not addressed here, but VPSS Jennifer Hughes is working on them. Her hypothetical example was a student services office to which no one ever came. Some districts refer to PIV as a policy on discontinuance, a title with a bad aura. The committee preparing the new policyused our PIV process as a starting point but also looked at various other colleges. Long Beach CC had a very logical, well written program. Our proposed PIV process can be initiated by either faculty or administration. Discussion between the senate President and VPI is triggered if for two consecutive years a program is below 70% of its target load. Such discussion could also result if there is concern about low enrollment, few students remaining at the end of the semester, or students not continuing into the next semester or not completing the program. The senate president and the VPI review student success and program indicators, and have its program review as an updated information source. If they feel a need to review the program through the PIV process, they discuss who they would like on the committee and forward those names to shared governance constituencies for discussion and approval. The PIV committee then does its work.

A PIV committee includes a member of the program's faculty, faculty outside the program and members of the program's advisory committee, if one exists. The committee discusses the program with the faculty in the program, and holds an open forum for faculty, students, community members and potential employers to talk about the need for the program and ways to improve it. There are three possible results:

1) The program needs some help, but not reorganization or major changes. It keeps its major goals and objectives. If the changes are implemented in the next year, the committee then reviews qualitative and quantitative data to see the impact of those changes, and the review process continues.

2) The program needs major changes requiring action by the Board of Trustees and certification by the State Chancellor's Office. The evaluation process would continue the next year to assess the changes that were made. Jim added the ACCJC needs to be informed about substantive changes.

3) The committee may see the program as no longer viable and recommend its discontinuance. The VPI must make a plan of discontinuance, taking faculty, staff, and students into account. Identify options for students and make students aware of those options. The recommendation goes to President's Council, then to the Board of Trustees for approval and notification of the state. We have a form to enter data, make comments, and record qualitative and quantitative observations and recommendations and how and when will we assess those recommendations. The committee can see what it has to do, and when.

Jeremy said in the past, PIV has been kicked off by a budget crisis. We need a way to do it regularly, when things are good. Gary said the process should not be applied negatively or punitively. We don't want to treat every program as if it is up for discontinuance. Diana noted PIV is for at-risk programs. We don't want every program review to flag PIV. The hope is to review or change programs, not discontinue them. PIV, like program review, identifies strengths, weaknesses, and big opportunities for a program, and an advisory and consultation team from outside the program to make recommendations. Depending on the program, the team could include employers or people from four year institutions. Lilya suggested making external inputs more evident in the program review document.

Four PIV committees are working now, and worked over the summer, but there were recent years with none. Jeremy has heard we can expect more. Dan noted the impact of construction on the welding program. Gary observed one could say that program is not at risk, as there are extenuating circumstances. By contrast, there was no way to reconfigure aeronautics after its key employer pulled out. In response to a question from Dan, Gary said he had no data beyond our district on what proportion of PIVed programs have been discontinued. All four CSM PIV reports are due in December. Dan told Gary the PIV document showed a lot of work, has set a different tone from the previous document, and looks good.

NEW BUSINESS – EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN – The draft is due Sept. 3.

Members described problems with both the printed and online catalog. A TTh class was listed as MW so its enrollment suffered, and three different courses were listed for the same room at the same time. Jeremy said there have been problems in the **Instruction Office**. The administrative assistant position, which was two levels below its counterparts at the other two colleges, has been upgraded and will be rehired at the new level. Other changes are taking place in the office. We need a more manageable electronic system. The schedule of classes has to be keyed in manually twice, once for Banner and once for the printed schedule, because neither can feed the other.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 4:16 p.m. The next meeting will be Sept. 9, 2008.