



Governing Council Meeting

Sept. 9, 2008 minutes

Members Present

Diana Bennett	President
Eileen O'Brien	Vice President
Lloyd Davis	Secretary
Rosemary Nurre	Treasurer
Jeremy Ball	Past President
Bernard Gershenson	Language Arts

Joe Mangan	PE/Athletics
Teresa Morris	Library
Madeleine Murphy	Language Arts
Linda Phipps	Math/Science
Jim Robertson	Creative Arts/Social Science
Huy Tran	Math/Science
Ruth Turner	Student Services

Others Attending

Susan Estes	VPI
-------------	-----

Jennifer Hughes	VPSS
Dan Kaplan	AFT

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:22 pm. The agenda was approved, with the addition of approval of the Sept. 2 Executive Committee minutes. The minutes of the August 26 Governing Council meeting and the Sept. 2 Executive Committee meeting were approved.

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS Tenure Review committees have begun their work, having been approved by the Executive Committee or by the Senate president and vice-president. The usual approval methods been to provide Governing Council with a list at the beginning of the meeting and consider it approved at the end of the meeting if there have been no objections.

NEW BUSINESS – ACCREDITATION FOLLOW-UP REPORT VPI Susan Estes introduced the accreditation follow-up report. VPSS Jennifer Hughes joined in with other documentation. On Jan 31, 2008 ACCJC put us on warning status. ACCJC made several recommendations based on the site visit, but the warning came from ACCJC, not from the site visit team. As the college accreditation liaison officer, Susan is responsible for preparing and submitting the report. The report must go to the Board of Trustees early next week, for approval at the Board's Sept. 24 meeting. ACCJC must have it by Oct. 15.

Susan distributed copies of the report, which is also posted on line. She asked members to read it, share it with our divisions, and get substantive responses (not proofreading) to her or Diana by Sept. 11. Diana's name is on the certification page.

The report is based on evidence, and as soon as the content is completed Susan will add references. ACCJC requires a report preparation statement signed by the college president as part of the follow-up report. The follow-up report used to be called a progress report. That was changed because of the two year rule. Progress is no longer enough. The college must have addressed the recommendations.

In February President Claire formed the Accreditation Oversight Committee, which has met every two weeks since February. Its web site has agendas and summaries of its meetings. We hired Maas Companies as consultant. Maas helped with several pieces of the educational master plan, including lots of information and analysis on facilities, and an external environmental scan. They met with oversight committee representatives and others on campus and gave an overarching framework of what an educational master plan should look like. We did the final development and production of the plan. In

the end it must be our plan. We know ourselves best. The office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness has given us lots of data. We as a college need to prepare our educational master plan.

We are at a disadvantage getting the ACCJC letter in January. Those who get a warning in the fall have the whole academic year to work. We had to have summer workgroups. They had broad participation, with classified, faculty, managers, and students. From these groups and other committees Susan gathered information – facts, including data reports from leads and chairs of committees. The report's section on college-wide updates gives key dates in the writing and reviewing of the follow-up report.

ACCJC wants answers in several categories about each of its recommendations. Headings in the follow-up report are derived from those categories, to assure all required content is included. Susan compared the approach to completing a job application, and said the writing is factual but not fascinating. Responses to four recommendations are needed for October: planning, SLOs, distance education, and student demographics. For each, the report includes resolution of the recommendation, analysis of results achieved to date, evidence of the results, and additional plans.

We have done a huge amount on the first recommendation, integrated planning. Jennifer will go through it. We are mandated to turn in a completed educational master plan on 10/15. That is done and ready. The second recommendation, SLOs and assessment, was addressed by a very active summer workgroup, who set up two workshops for Friday of opening days. 55 people came to the morning session and about as many in the afternoon. Jeremy distributes bar graphs showing the percent of courses listed in the catalog which have completed each of the five stages of the assessment cycle. 1. Articulate SLOs; 2. Develop a strategy to assess SLOs; 3. Assess SLOs; 4. Analyze what was learned; 5. Tie the results into future planning. Every April ACCJC requires us to submit a progress report. The graphs are for 2006-07, 2007-08, and September 2008.

Susan said that would have been in our self-study report. Currently 77% of courses have articulated SLOs. That figure is misleading since a large number of courses without SLOs are in areas like real estate and apprenticeship which have no full-timers managing the programs. We cannot exclude those courses. Jeremy has a spreadsheet including every division, department, program, and course. Banked courses do not count. Susan asked faculty with courses to bank to send a memo to the Committee on Instruction for its October meeting, to be sure their banking is on the October agenda.

Jeremy reported huge progress on stage 2, rising from 2% to 71% completion from '06-'07 to '07-'08. ACCJC site visits now expect competency at stage 3, and they will hold us accountable for stage 3. We have course SLO sheets with target dates, and lots of people committed to having assessments done by the end of fall semester. We do not know how CSM's compliance compares to that of other colleges.

We may always be a semester behind in completing the stages. Madeleine pointed out Stage 3 is doable only twice a year. Independent study courses like 690s with variable content have no course SLOs, but can be assessed in general for what does and does not work. We do need SLOs on all the syllabi. Susan thanked Jeremy and the other summer workgroup members, including Eileen O'Brien, Theresa Martin, Kevin Stacy, Merle Cutler, and Colleen Kirby-Banas.

Bernard got the impression on flex day ACCJC is fairly flexible. Will they understand there is no way we can achieve stage 3 in greater numbers. Jeremy will make that argument, but can't predict what they will do. ACCJC might want to make the schools going through the process now an example to schools that will go through the process. They may make an example of us.

Jeremy wants to be sure we're really solid in October '09. Our grade then is what matters. Bernard said they will want us at stage 5 next year. They will want concrete examples of stage 5 being articulated in

program review, and specific cases of referencing equipment and new faculty requests to stage 5 findings. We are on our way, but are likely to stay on warning this year, and probation is possible. Our focus now is on mid-October, but we are in a two-year process.

Recommendation 3 is on distance education. When 50% of a program's requirements are delivered by distance ed we must submit a substance change proposal. Susan stated we haven't submitted such a proposal though some of our programs exceed 50%. Martha Tilmann is working on it. We must also evaluate the effectiveness of courses delivered electronically, including looking at SLOs, student retention, and student and faculty satisfaction. The report states surveys have gone to students and faculty, and we have looked at retention data. When distance ed course outlines go to the Committee on Instruction, COI assumes the courses are as rigorous as on-campus courses, with the same SLOs. Madeleine expressed concern that the requirement for significant progress in evaluating distance learning courses is nebulous. Susan will develop a college distance education committee at CSM. We have made significant progress on other recommendations, and those are included in the progress report. Faculty are asked to send comments, recommendations, and suggestions to Susan.

It is a two year process. ACCJC will be looking for implementation as well as documentation. We have lots of documentation, and we are implementing a lot this fall. It is uncertain what their judgment will be in January. They may want to see where we stand next year.

Dan asserted he and the AFT Executive Committee were taken aback at District Recommendation 6 linking SLOs and faculty evaluation. Never before did the district suggest this as an agenda item for the reconstituted trust committee. The document outlines clearly what the trust committee would be working on, such as the adjunct evaluation form. Dan said he understands the district's reasoning and will not battle over this right now. The Executive Committee and negotiating team sees no progress on this area.

Dan stated the district has about 700 part-timers and 300 full-timers. Pressure is on full-timers to do SLO work. Adjuncts are paid only for classroom and office hour time, and we can't demand SLO work from them unless compensation is devised. Money for that is not about to appear. It is time-consuming. People need to learn how to do it, and to attend committee meetings. The numbers won't get beyond a certain point with 700 part-timers with no contractual obligation to attend the meetings necessary to do the work, or to do the work itself.

Susan said the recommendation came from ACCJC, who will hold to the standards. Jeremy reported some colleges have said they will not judge faculty on the basis of SLO assessment, but will make it explicit that work on SLOs and assessment is among "other duties as defined." Cabrillo does this and met with ACCJC approval, but it has problems. Everyone in the state is grappling with the new standards. We can't show we disagree by not doing it. We can do what is required, but fight it tooth and nail. Dan said he also was not advising noncompliance. Susan asked Council members to take the plan back to our divisions by Sept. 11 for review and comments, in particular on SLOs and distance education. Diana needs to sign off on the report, to confirm it is factual, not necessarily that we endorse its content.

NEW BUSINESS – EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN At a recent meeting Governing Council reviewed the revised strategic plan and the institutional planning calendar, two of three new documents prepared to respond to the ACCJC recommendation we improve and formalize institutional planning efforts. Jennifer Hughes reported the first draft of the educational master plan was posted on line last Thursday, with a timeline for its review. At 150 pages, it is very comprehensive. It needs to be submitted with the follow-up report. We want initial feedback by Sept 12. Rosemary asked what management practices CSM has been using to guide decision making.

Jennifer said for years CSM has had a strategic plan which provided for institutional goals and related activities and action items. We have had a number of plans, including the student equity plan and enrollment management plan. A plethora of institutional research fed into various reports that helped guide us. However, we never had a comprehensive educational master plan. Now we do. It is the central guiding document for planning and looking at resources. Jennifer reviewed how the plan was pulled together. Before we were put on warning, Jeremy and Andreas Wolf were the co-chairs of the new committee to form the educational master plan. They began by reviewing all the documents, the stacks of plans, the tables of information. When we got the warning, it seemed advantageous to employ people with expertise, so we engaged the Maas Companies. Maas is strong in facilities planning, and provided a very good framework for what goes into an educational master plan as well as important environmental scan data. It asked probing questions to help us distill down the plan. Jeremy and Andreas looked at educational master plans from other colleges. Skyline had hired consultants and was reaffirmed. We looked at what they did and identified what of theirs needed to be in our plan. We got a lot of help from John Sewart's Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness, which pulls together in one central place lots of key data we need to look at as an institution. The committee developed a series of broad initial draft planning assumptions.

The plan includes analysis of internal and external data, broad planning assumptions, and broad observations, impacts and/or recommendations for the institution to look at. The plan must be submitted as complete, but we really want to engage the college this year in a rich robust dialog about the plan and the planning assumptions. Are we on the right track based on the data, and are the assumptions correct and sufficient? The plan was presented at College Council last week and to an all-college forum last Thursday. It is very important to prioritize the recommendations the plan will produce, given our limited resources. Without an educational master plan, we still have lots of great ideas for strengthening the institution, but we need the plan. We need to pull together to formulate recommendations to head us in the same direction.

We know we need to move more into decision making based on data. We don't ignore hunches and anecdotal information, but we need greater balance and to rely much more on looking at data to help us make decisions. This plan provides a beginning foundation for more data-driven decisions.

The educational master plan and the accreditation follow-up report are drafts for internal discussion and review only, not for public release. Parts of the educational master plan are still under construction, and more information is being collected for inclusion in the plan.

The most important message is this is our first opportunity as a college community to look at the direction of the institution based on recommendations resulting from analysis of data. At the end of the first year we will review and modify it as needed. We hope for lots of opportunity for dialog. At the Sept. 4 all-college forum lots of time was spent soliciting ideas on how to get feedback, to be sure everyone at the college can review it. Several ideas came from that meeting and from yesterday's Budget Committee meeting: expand electronic communications, focus on one part of the plan at a time, provide opportunity for dialog, and plan a series of workshops through the coming year. Two will focus on the educational master plan. The plan is online, and there is an online survey for feedback. For the October deadline, feedback is needed by Friday. Jennifer will prepare documents for the library and division offices.

Dan asked whether the planning assumptions in our last comprehensive educational master plan, from 1955, are significantly different from those in the current plan. Jennifer has not seen the 1955 document, but imagines the answer is yes. For example, the student population profile has changed, and with it a lot of planning assumptions related to the activities and interests of our students. Other changes include new programs, emerging technologies, different instructional delivery, county needs, and economic trends.

Rosemary said documentation is important and we want to do a good job, but expressed concern that we are all busy. Susan acknowledged getting feedback for immediate response is a concern, but we also want robust discussion of the educational master plan all year long, not just for the next two days. How do we involve everyone in an integrated planning process and in looking at the educational master plan? Jeremy said the planning assumptions should be synopses of the data. Here's the past, here's what we think the future looks like. Pay attention to the planning assumptions. Dig down if you find an iffy one.

NEW BUSINESS – STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES Recommendations are found toward the end of the document. Spend time on the four or five pages of planning assumptions. Hit data points relevant to you, then go on to the recommendations. Remember the planning assumptions are drawn from the data. For example, because of the migration of San Mateo high school graduates to other community colleges we will evaluate our outreach and recruitment efforts. Eileen called the demographic information very interesting and asked how our college can accommodate community needs. Jennifer called the document very important for the institution. We must find ways to keep our energy up to focus attention on it. Look for anything really off, or really missing. These are dynamic, constantly changing documents. They never become static. We have a deadline, but after that we open it up for a year of dialog. This is a change of culture for us. If more planning and management work result, we have to figure that out. The observation that 10% of people do 90% of the work came up last week at the forum, which was attended by "the usual suspects." Finding ways to engage more people to spread the workload is key. Jennifer asked us to find ways to make that culture shift, and make the work doable. The strategic plan we saw at our last meeting will be posted very soon, with new introductory pages.

NEW BUSINESS – PROGRAM REVIEW Diana reported the Academic Senate Executive Committee approved a resolution on workload as well as the **program review** and **program improvement and viability** drafts. The committee wanted a resolution, but not one that came across as strong-arming. Instructional deans share our concerns and will work with faculty and AFT to address them. The deans will also coordinate the three program review cycles, starting March 25 in '09, '10, and '11 respectively. We need an annual review in October from each program for equipment and new faculty for '08-'09. Deans will be responsible for obtaining data from the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness, and getting it to each program. John Sewart has FLC, FLE, full-time/part-time ratios, load, and enrollment data. Clustering of programs, e.g. philosophy, humanities and political science, and the five in the media group, is under discussion.

Jeremy asked that this fall's program reviews be realistic and practical, and that we focus on the March reviews. Diana said a form for fall reviews is not yet ready. We may edit the old one down to bare bones. The annual reviews will refer to the three year comprehensive reviews. Updating will be required only if a program is short of its target numbers. Jeremy reported Social Science has done informal prioritization of equipment needs, and Huy said Math/Science lists requests and division faculty pick those for which the need is greatest. He said having two forms seems redundant. Jeremy said the three-year review is qualitatively different from past reviews. Many schools do it every six years, but our faculty calls that too infrequent. Diana noted these are working documents, so we can change them.

NEW BUSINESS – MUSEUM OF TOLERANCE (MOT) Diana said we must decide on two faculty members for this semester. Madeleine asked if this is where we want to spend our money. Nothing monitors whether the program has actual impact. Will there be follow-up a year later asking what participants have done to justify the money?

Diana has last year's waiting list, and names of this year's new applicants. There are both full- and part-timers. Some have been waiting for several years, including Heidi Eggert, who is now at the University of Montana, Erin Scholnick, and Tania Beliz. Rosemary asked do we still want to do MOT when there are other development opportunities. Maybe it has served its purpose. Eileen said getting to know the

people who went was great, but the program seemed more appropriate for grade-schoolers. Madeleine said it was great as a district-wide retreat for participants, but it is funded by diversity money and didn't do anything for that purpose. Members suggested alternative uses of the \$50,000 annual MOT cost: hire a consultant for hands-on diversity training (Eileen) or open more class sections (Madeleine), and alternatives to MOT: diversity activities addressing collegial relations and students (Madeleine), for example the fight on campus last spring and the accompanying false and misleading rumors (Bernard.) Ask what students are getting out of our diversity activities. Dan asked whether we are close to a resolution asking the MOT program be terminated and money reallocated to better activities. Jeremy pointed out it is funded through the district, and some Skyline administrators are strong proponents. Eileen suggested having each college decide. Diana will make it a future agenda item.

On workload, Dan reported AFT's Executive Committee will discuss the **academic calendar** for '09-'10 tomorrow at 2:15. There will be a full discussion of the idea of additional flex days. We are not close to the 15 per year we can use. Mondays and Fridays are at legal per semester minimums, but we have midweek options. AFT's final vote will be in October. The results of AFT's discussion will be emailed to the faculty. District Academic Senate (DAS) is discussing the 15 week calendar. It has data from CSM and Canada, but not Skyline, on the impact on classes. DAS president Patty Dilko will send an email update. At the end of last year DAS approved taking **plus/minus grading** to the Board of Trustees. Patty met with the student senates, where the idea got mixed reviews. In a survey of Skyline faculty, a substantial majority wanted it. Diana said research showed it has no significant effect on GPA.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m. The next meeting will be Sept. 23, 2008.