



**Governing Council Meeting**

**April 14, 2009 minutes**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

**President** Diana Bennett  
**Vice President** Eileen O'Brien  
**Secretary** Lloyd Davis  
**Treasurer** Rosemary Nurre  
**Business/Technology** Suzanne Russell  
**Creative Arts/  
 Social Science** Jim Robertson

**Language Arts** Bernard Gershenson  
 Madeleine Murphy  
**Library** Teresa Morris  
**Math/Science** Tania Beliz  
 Huy Tran  
**Student Services** Kevin Sinarle  
 Ruth Turner

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**P.E./Athletics** Joe Mangan

**OTHERS ATTENDING**

**AFT** Dan Kaplan

**ASCSM** Alexa Hemken  
**Math/Science** Laura Demsetz

**SUMMARY**

- Governing Council accepted the **Welding/Machine Tool Technology PIV recommendations**, (Welding: minor programmatic changes, and have administration address facilities; Machine Tool Technology: include that course or its content in the Welding program) and resolved to urge administration to develop a timeline for their implementation.
- Governing Council accepted the **Drafting/Manufacturing and Industrial Technology (MANU) PIV recommendations**: continue Drafting with programmatic changes, bank two MANU courses, incorporate course material into Drafting, and offer Blacksmithing to Community Ed.
- Diana will ask BPC to table any PIV proposals until '09-'10, and will ask the VPI to report to us then on the prospects of PIV programs.
- **Lab and Lab Center Program Review** Governing Council supports stipends for faculty working on these over the summer, at the special rate. Student surveys will be conducted in May.
- **Chapter 6 District Rules and Regs:** Governing Council approved several sections, and discussed others, including qualifications for Community Ed instructors (6.90), and conditions for studying controversial issues (6.35).
- **Vice-presidential nominee Huy Tran** and incumbents Diana Bennett (president), Lloyd Davis (secretary), and Rosemary Nurre (treasurer) are the candidates in the 2009-10 Senate election.
- The **Library Committee** plans to continue, and will clarify its status at our April 28 meeting.
- Diana and Eileen will attend **ASCCC Spring Plenary** April 16-18.

**CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 2:23 p.m. The agenda, and the minutes of March 24, 2009, were approved.

**PIV REVIEW** Laura Demsetz distributed a summary of the Drafting, Manufacturing and Industrial Technology, Machine Tool Technology, and Welding PIV recommendations. Of the four Manufacturing and Industrial Technology courses, two are banked (MANU 100, Science for Technology, and MANU 120, Industrial Materials and Processes), a recommendation approved by a subset of the PIV committee. MANU 130, Beginning Blacksmithing and Industrial Forging, should be offered to Community Ed, but it needs facilities off-campus. MANU 680, Arts of Industry, was never made permanent. The committee recommends considering offering it standalone, or including its content in a revised drafting program.

**WELDING AND MACHINE TOOL TECHNOLOGY PIV** Machine Tool Technology is a single course, MTT 200, required for the welding certificate, and the PIV Welding recommendations apply to it. As we discussed in November, the welding recommendation recognizes welding as a valuable program which prepares people for high paying jobs, but it cannot continue without facilities.

Points in discussion of the PIV process:

Governing Council makes recommendations based on the work of the PIV committees, but then things sometimes seem to stop. We are not seeing resources to implement PIV recommendations. This happened with Digital Media, and Engineering still depends on Laura Demsetz and part-timers. Administration should have a reporting timeline, just as PIV programs do, and should be more upfront about resource availability. There is no point to faculty spending months looking at the educational value of a program if all that matters is cost per student and whether money is available. The new version of the PIV process, not yet in place, gives the VPI responsibility for responding to PIV committee recommendations. Let us ask the VPI for a status report and explanation of how the administration intends to respond to PIV recommendations, perhaps at our first meeting in the fall.

Public Relations ought to work with deans or faculty on promoting programs, but promotion should not be the job of faculty members. Our marketing and PR people are doing a good job, but we need communication so faculty aren't duplicating things marketing does, and marketing knows what it is writing about. Perhaps funding streams could be redirected to publicity, but the major need is for coordination, rather than for additional resources. Laura volunteered to help with coordination, e.g. by asking marketing to meet with drafting faculty.

We are a recommending body. The administration has the right to make final decisions. We have made ourselves heard in programs where hard caps weren't the issue, like library and architecture. German had a nice resolution. The drafting program has great ideas, but do we have the resources and the people to carry them out? Some programs got PIVved because of dollars, and we were not told that. Perhaps the administration could give us dollar constraints and ask what we could do within them. We could ask the college what revenue and staff support it could provide, for example in PR and technology. We should know up front, so we don't spin our wheels on PIV committees for months. Diana suggested having the PIV committee reconvene to revisit the process and note the issues that arose.

Decisions to put programs on PIV will come from BPC. Members considered asking Diana to vote against forming new PIV committees this semester, but noted PIV programs would prefer to have their committees named informally now to give their members time to gather information. The formal process would not start for nine months.

Diana will ask PIV proposals in BPC be tabled, since there is too little time this school year. She will ask Susan to report to us in the fall on the process and the status of programs. There will be no hard budget numbers until at least June 1. Programs do know the costs of equipment and software; which are on program reviews every year.

MSU to postpone the formal start of new PIV committees from '08-'09 to '09-'10. MSU to approve the summary of recommendations, to urge administration to develop a timeline for their implementation, and to give special recognition and thanks to the PIV committee for its extensive long-term work and development in the proposal. Laura said all committees did their work well, and should be thanked. Diana suggested acknowledging the work of each PIV group as we accept it.

**LAB AND LAB CENTER PROGRAM REVIEW** Diana reported students using labs and lab centers will be surveyed during the last three weeks of May, so the survey data can be processed for reports due

to the VPI and PRIE offices Aug. 30, as part of the timeline for the Oct. 15 ACCJC accreditation report. Faculty involved will be briefed on what needs to be done.

Members discussed a stipend for faculty working over the summer to meet the Aug. 30 deadline. Some members have been told there would be stipends. Dan recommended we get an agreement in writing, and that participating faculty be paid at the special rate, so stipends are linked to the negotiated faculty salary schedule. Governing Council arrived at the following consensus: We are strongly in favor of stipends for faculty members having to complete lab and lab center program reviews. We recommend they be paid at special rate, and the agreement on stipends be in writing and signed off.

**CHAPTER 6 DISTRICT RULES & REGS** Our discussion continued on proposals to revise them. Skyline and Canada have approved some but not others. Governing Council approved the following sections with no changes: 6.21, Grading and Academic Record Symbols; 6.26, which addresses transfer issues within the district; 6.45, Field trips and excursions; and 6.60, Nursing Program. Others:

6.22, Academic Renewal: The first paragraph says previous low grades can be disregarded if “not reflective of a student’s demonstrated ability.” Members discussed whether to insert “subsequently” or “current” before “demonstrated ability.” “Subsequently” makes clear the policy is not seen as overruling a previously assigned grade. “Current” suggests “right now” but is easier to explain to students. Skyline added “current.” Diana will take this section to DAS as neither approved nor rejected, and note that we discussed the use of “current” or “subsequently.”

6.24, Articulation: members asked “ensure” replace “insure” in “In order to insure students the opportunity ... .” Members questioned the inclusion of high schools in the section. Jim noted the first accrediting body was set up to articulate exclusive prep schools like Groton and St. Paul’s with Ivy League schools like Harvard and Yale. Points in discussion: Articulation means course equivalence, and our academic courses do not articulate with high school courses. However, the 2+2 program, which we started and took to the high schools, links the last two years of high school with two years of community college microcomputer classes, for example in Word and PowerPoint. Students get both high school and college credit for such courses. High school students also get CSM credit for tech-prep courses. For example, high school drafting courses get CSM credit. We might use a word like coordination, rather than articulation, for our work with high schools. However tech-prep type agreements are articulation agreements, or at least serve the same purpose, to promote seamless transitions between institutions. Members agreed to approve 6.24 with “ensure” replacing “insure” and with our discussion about including high schools forwarded to DAS.

6.32, Educational Materials, is an AFT issue removed from Senate consideration. Dan reported AFT has sent a demand letter to the District that this be negotiated, and that the District has backed off on a change of policy it had proposed for spring semester.

6.35, Academic Freedom (formerly “Study of Controversial Issues”) was approved with paragraph 2a deleted. 2a said issues for study should “contribute to a specific program and the general education program of the Colleges.” Members felt it was unnecessary and the “specific program” requirement didn’t make sense. ASCSM representative Alexa Hemken asked doesn’t everyone who comes on campus have the right to talk about anything. Members said this section was more about organized events than individual speech, and may be intended to handle objections, or give grounds for saying no to an event. Jim was concerned that paragraph 2c, “the issue should provide opportunity for critical thinking, tolerance, and understanding of conflicting points of view,” would preclude discussions of polarizing issues such as the Israeli-Palestinian dispute, in which participants might be unlikely to be tolerant. Madeleine pointed out “provide opportunity” does not require participants to take the opportunity. Decisions on events will be case by case.

6.90, Community Education Classes, combines three sections from earlier Rules and Regs. Discussion centered on paragraph 5a, “The instructor of record is not required to meet minimum qualifications.” That language sounds demeaning, and Skyline tabled 6.90 because of it. Dan noted Community Ed faculty are not covered by the AFT contract, and Community Ed develops its own criteria for hiring faculty. Points in discussion: We want to be sure the instructor of record is adequately prepared to teach the course. The instructor of record should be required to demonstrate expertise (not just knowledge) in the subjects taught, as determined by the Community Ed director. The latter may be too specific. Diana will suggest to DAS changing 5a to “The Community Ed program shall determine that the instructor of record has demonstrated expertise in the subject matter.”

**INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS** This item was postponed because of its complexity. Dan pointed out AFT’s Article 13 was proposed for the contract but not accepted by the district, and remarked he would be happy to see its language in Rules and Regs or the faculty handbook.

**LEGAL OPINION ON CHEATING** Members stated their divisions know about the policy. The VPSS can drop a student, and with division deans can know about prior offenses. Instructors can do neither.

**2009-10 SENATE ELECTION** Jim Robertson nominated three incumbents who have agreed to continue: Diana Bennett (president), Lloyd Davis (secretary), and Rosemary Nurre (treasurer.) Tania Beliz nominated Huy Tran for vice president.

**LIBRARY COMMITTEE** Teresa Morris reported the Library Committee wants to continue. She will bring its statement of purpose, and membership list, to our next meeting. Its chair is English instructor Joyce Heyman. The Library Committee and Committee on Instruction are both Senate committees which are represented on the Instructional Planning Committee (IPC.) As such, each is writing up its missions and tasks, and each has a chair and a recorder. Chairs attend IPC meetings, and agendas and meeting summaries are posted on the PRIE site.

Jim asked whether the Library Committee Chair will continue to report to Governing Council on an occasional basis. Teresa said the committee used to report to both COI and Governing Council. It has functioned as a subcommittee of COI, and in that arrangement would not participate in IPC. It used to serve as an advisory committee to the library, and report to COI on what the library was doing. It may need to be re-envisioned. Laura said a purpose of the IPC is to coordinate the work of other committees, to see that they are talking to each other and their work plans are on the same path. Committees do not report to the IPC. The Library Committee will clarify its status. Teresa will report any structural changes to Governing Council at our April 28 meeting, so we can vote on them May 12.

**FACULTY RETIREMENT RECEPTION** Eileen reported it will be held in the Faculty Center, 18-206, on either May 5 or May 19. Eileen is looking for someone to share the responsibility and train for next year. Eileen will put together a standard operating procedure document for the event, to make it easy in the future. Diana agreed to assist. One task is to contact our vendor, from whom we have a \$500 coupon. Eileen does not have a list of retirees, but expects eight or nine faculty retirees.

**PRESIDENT’S REPORT** ASCCC Spring Plenary is April 16-18. Diana and Eileen will attend. Diana attended an Area B meeting at which resolutions were discussed. Resolution 10.02, would eliminate eminence (professional reputation) as a way of meeting minimum quals. It is supported by vocational education people who want their instructors to have at least associate degrees. Another resolution would require accreditation site visits to include a classroom visit. The resolutions are on the ASCCC web site. Patty Dilko may run for Area B or at-large representative to the ASCCC Executive Committee.

**ADJOURNMENT** The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 pm. The next meeting will be April 28, 2009.