Governing Council Meeting **Sept. 8, 2009 minutes**

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	Diana Bennett	**Language Arts**	Kate Motoyama
Vice President	Huy Tran		Daniel Keller
Secretary	Lloyd Davis	**Math/Science**	Tania Beliz
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre		Carlene Tonini
Business/Technology	Suzanne Russell	**P.E./Athletics**	Joe Mangan
Creative Arts/	Jim Robertson	**Student Services**	Ruth Turner
Social Science		**Library**	Teresa Morris

MEMBERS ABSENT

Business/Technology	Lilya Vorobey	**Student Services**	Kevin Sinarle
Creative Arts/	Benedict Lim		
Social Science			

OTHERS ATTENDING

Library Studies PIV	Stacey Grasso	**SLO/Assessment**	Jeremy Ball
Library	Michele Alaniz		

SUMMARY

- An **information competency graduation requirement** is planned for next year.
- November flex workshops will link **SLO assessment, program review, and planning**.
- Faculty are reminded to pay $20 annual **Senate dues**.
- **TracDat** will be ready this spring, **CurricUNET** next fall.
- Feedback is needed on how to improve **program review, labs and centers review and PIV processes**.
- Advancing the **last day to withdraw** to early mid-semester is being discussed.
- Bring ideas for 2009-10 **Senate goals**.
- The **plus/minus grading** pilot begins this fall.
- Faculty input is sought on proposed **building names**.
- The ASCCC **Area B** meeting will be at CSM Friday, Oct. 30.

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:16 p.m. Members and guests introduced themselves. The agenda was approved, amended to make approval of tenure review committees an action item, and the minutes of May 12, 2009 were approved. Diana reported things may happen quickly this year, and the administration will work closely with the Senate.

LIBRARY STUDIES PIV The Library Studies PIV committee recommended to Governing Council on Dec. 16, 2008 that the library studies program continue and that the library work with COI on addressing information competency at CSM. Information competency and computer literacy are the only skills listed in WASC standard II.A.3.b which CSM does not explicitly address. Chair Stacey Grasso reported a subcommittee convened last spring, working with data from earlier polls of students on information competency and research skills. Only 20% of students could pass a simple information competency exam. The subcommittee studied the four models currently in use around the state to address Information

Competency: 1) a stand-alone Library Studies course; 2) courses in other departments linked to a Library Studies course; 3) subject area courses infused with research skills, 4) online tutorials. The subcommittee considered how these might work at CSM, and examined existing tutorials. Based on this research, the subcommittee determined that an Information Competency A.S. graduation requirement would be appropriate at CSM to comply with WASC standards, to begin in Fall 2010. Students may satisfy this requirement by 1) testing out via existing standardized tests, or 2) taking a standalone library course or 3) taking integrated courses in other departments. Integrated courses would be required to satisfy a common set of SLO's, ensuring consistency between such courses. COI wholeheartedly approved the recommendation in May. The Fall 2010 date for the addition of the requirement provides time for departments to create integrated courses. Existing courses, some already having students do research, can be updated to include content and SLOs specific to information competency. Stacey distributed a draft of the SLOs that would need to be included in such courses.

Points in discussion: Information competency is a WASC accreditation requirement for CSU schools. Some make special courses a graduation requirement, others infuse the content into existing courses. Some area community colleges have implemented an information competency requirement. CSM does not have an extra course, but information competency is needed in some majors and for GE requirements. Integrated courses might undermine enrollment in library studies courses. On the other hand, the requirement might overwhelm the library. We do not know how many students would pass an information competency test. Stacey reported Canada has a GE SLO around this, and is considering a graduation requirement, and she suggested CSM consider a GE SLO for information competency.

COI determined the need for an information competency requirement, and the Fall 2010 change in degree requirements has been approved by COI and recommended to the VPI. Governing Council will discuss how this will affect the PIV decision on Sept. 22.

SLOs AND ASSESSMENT Jeremy Ball reported the district secured CurricUNET and TracDat to track SLOs and assessment. TracDat, which Skyline wanted, is considered better than CurricUNET at tracking SLOs, but not necessarily as well integrated. We will tie SLO tracking into program review, so program reviews and assessment updates will be together. TracDat will be used for General Education SLOs (formerly ISLOs.) There is no good way to assess them. An integrated system may help us look at them at both the course level and the institutional level. The Senate lately has updated program review every year, and will have to do so again to streamline the processes. We will tie existing grids into program review. SLOAC committee work is posted at the PRIE website, to make it clear to outsiders how assessment and planning tie in together.

We are moving forward on certificate level SLOs. 50% are done. We have a trove of data from last semester using the new program review model, which asks us to integrate assessment with planning. ACCJC wants requests for funding (including of faculty hiring) tied into assessment. We need to identify gaps between what we would like to do and what we are able to do, and show how adding resources would fill those gaps.

CSM will administer the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) to a sample of students this fall, and use its national benchmarks to look at our strengths and weaknesses compared to those of institutions similar in size and location. Student engagement is a measure of student learning. Bev Madden and Milla McConnell-Tuite's Students Speak focus group initiative provides similar data, but without the national norms. We want to use CCSSE and Students Speak data moving forward, not just to assess but also to plan. We now have planning infrastructure. How do we want to change the institution?

The **Nov. 11 and 12 flex days** arose from a Senate/AFT discussion of increasing faculty workload. Midsemester fall and spring flex days give faculty more time to work on assessment, program review, and similar endeavors. Workshops will be offered about different stages of the assessment cycle.

The SLO cycle has five stages: 1) define SLOs; 2) define how to assess; 3) assess; 4) analyze assessments; 5) plan and implement appropriate changes. Jeremy distributed a chart showing what percent of courses have completed each stage in recent semesters. ACCJC wants us to be at stage 5 and include it in program reviews. As of May, 2009, 92% of courses had SLOs, and how to assess had been defined for 85%, but only 18 or 19% of courses were at stages 3, 4, or 5. We have 892 courses, some taught only occasionally. If a course has not been taught for four consecutive semesters, it should be banked.

We need to get to stage 5 ASAP. There will be a flex workshop on how to assess and how to tie assessment into program review. Assess SLOs this semester, and in our Spring 2010 program reviews, tie assessment data into planning. ACCJC will look for this in our program review documents.

All SLOs should be assessed on a 3 year cycle. We should look for and share ways to measure commonly occurring SLOs. We have not had a good tool for archiving existing work. SharePoint didn't work so well. CurricUNET is good for course outlines, but is not really ready for SLOs. We're working with TracDat. Our focus is on narratives: what did you look at, what did you find, what did you do about it. A reflective look is good. The other tools are less intuitive, with more number crunching.

Jeremy continued: ACCJC and the U. S. Department of Education want to see resource allocation tied into assessing student learning. They want us to demonstrate our teaching makes a difference. Factions in Sacramento and Washington continue to say prove to us you are worth the money we give you. People at the state level don't judge the cost of having a student in a class. They look at completion and retention rates, and in those we don't stack up well. Our cost to get people to a certain level is higher than that of CSU and UC. Our funding sources require us to demonstrate what we can do for students.

Kate Motoyama reported the Speech Department decided to wait until Spring 2010 to assess SLOs, in the expectation TracDat or CurricUNET would be available by then as an easy way to enter and process assessment data. We need to know what these tools can and cannot do. Jeremy said the current program review was crafted with CurricUNET in mind. It will be in the form of a word document we can post and access, not a rigid matrix. This lets each department do what it thinks is meaningful. Different departments have very different assessments. We should choose the right technology, but technology should not drive curriculum. Diana will take these concerns to DAS on Sept. 14.

Jeremy said planning at the department level should be tied into assessing. Our assessment should look for gaps, not show how good we are. We are supposed to assess individual courses, degrees, and certificates, but we no longer need departmental SLOs. Students complete courses of study. They do not complete departments. We also need SLOs for labs and some student services functions. It is not clear how these fit in with General Education or certificate level SLOs. Members suggested a two hour informational meeting during November flex days, and a briefing sheet. Lots of things have changed.

TREASURER'S REPORT Treasurer Rosemary Nurre reported the Senate has about $1400 in its cash account. The $1000 a year we get from dues no longer seems adequate. We help fund the holiday and retirement parties, and send members to ASCCC plenary sessions. Dues at CSM have been $20/yr since at least the 1970s. Dues at Skyline and Canada are $100/yr, and they have no problem collecting the money. Payroll deduction, in which annual dues are automatically withdrawn from the first paycheck of the academic year, is available here but has few participants. If enough members paid Senate dues, maybe we wouldn't have to consider raising them. Rosemary will email her annual reminder to faculty.

PROGRAM REVIEW AND PIV PROCESSES Last March, as part of the three-year rotation cycle, one third of our departments did comprehensive program reviews. The rest did annual reviews. We need to review problem areas and update the process to make it easier. For this we need faculty input. We can work with Milla and PRIE on a survey, and other ideas are welcome. After we gather information, we will reconvene the original committee to edit the forms as needed. Similarly, we can review and update the PIV process and program reviews of labs and centers. Lab and center reviews are synchronized with

comprehensive program reviews. PIV committee members have input on the PIV process. Points in discussion: surveys are useful. A lot of work is involved in both PIV and program review, and it always seems to fall on the same faculty members. We want it fairly distributed across the faculty. Perhaps division deans can help assure that. We would like more feedback on program reviews.

Diana said at present all committees reporting to the IPC need to read program reviews. Reviews are used in forming institutional plans as well as division work plans. We base resource choices, including where to hire new faculty, on program reviews, and follow up to see whether the needs stated in the reviews were met.

Asked whether Title 5 requires program reviews every three years or every six, Diana said six years is too far apart for us. Kate, who has worked on program reviews for courses and labs, said in the past, executive summaries went to deans, College Council and the Board. There should be feedback from peers. Program review gives departments a better idea where they need to go, but they may lack the time and resources to move the department in that direction. Reviews are valuable to help departments come up with plans and recognize crises. Diana said reviews are available on the PRIE website. Proposed program review guidelines there are part of a Senate-approved pilot. Reviews should align with the educational master plan and strategic goals, and with individual plans from IPC.

Jim reported in his division, three departments wrote their reviews together, and he and another member of the History department reviewed them. Jim wrote a critique, which was included but not used to change the reviews. All this took time, and History has to do its own program review. Jim called for major deletions of work that doesn't contribute to improving programs.

Diana said it is important that faculty members who have done reviews complete the online program review survey. CurricUNET will be available to us in Fall 2010. The District bought it and TracDat at 50% off this summer. Curriculum chairs and VPIs are meeting to train themselves and to discuss types of forms and what information to gather. Then they will look at individual college needs.

Points in discussion: Program reviews are important planning documents. They are useful within departments, but is anyone else paying attention? We want people to say I did this because of what you said. Requests for external funding reference program reviews. In cosmetology, program reviews showed productivity is much higher at CSM than at Skyline, so actions were taken at Skyline. The Senate president, the VPI, and the IPC committees are required to read program reviews. This helps them with institutional planning and accreditation.

ADVANCING LAST DAY TO WITHDRAW Students can withdraw with a W as late as a month before finals. Jim Robertson reported members of the Creative Arts/Social Science Division think if that date is moved up to the fifth or sixth week of the semester, students will commit early, driving up performance. Most students will have an idea where they stand by that time. Most schools have a very late date, so comparison data is lacking and we would be a trendsetter. Students will think they had better get to work after the first six weeks, and instructors won't be spending time on future dropouts.

Points in discussion: Stanford allows students to drop up to the last day of classes. Perhaps drop dates are so late because of leniency in the late 60's. Some of our students drop late to maintain their student status for financial aid, car insurance, and athletics. Some students even plan their drop date well in advance. For lab classes the fifth week is too soon. Instructors can encourage students who are not building skills to drop, and those who are building skills to stay. Discipline problems can be handled in other ways, including sending students out of the classroom. Students can behave well, but not do enough work.

Suzanne asserted the fifth week is too soon in cosmetology. Its licensing course meets eight hours a day, five days a week. A student who could not withdraw, say due to illness, would have to get a bad grade. Carlene said for lab-intensive, hands-on classes, five weeks is too few. She has a bimodal distribution of

performance in her lab-intensive classes, and with time and energy she can move students from the low end of the U to the high end. Students need more weeks to see we're serious, to learn study skills, and to attend weekend study sessions. Carlene uses HBA time to help her students succeed, and said she can reduce her W rate to 15% if she shows up on weekends. Jim said a drop date six or seven weeks in would be acceptable. He understood from Henry Villareal the decision was up to us.

Jim pointed out we don't get paid for weekends, and noted UC and CSU give students just days to decide to withdraw. Diana will seek more information from PRIE and other sources on who set the withdrawal date and whether there is state regulation. Members should ask for the opinions of their constituents. A change would have to be district-wide and the decision would have to involve students. Kate Motoyama suggested an FW (withdraw failing) option as an alternative to making the drop date earlier. Huy Tran noted some institutions see Ws as negative.

Carlene suggested we get student input about why students drop. It's hard for us to follow up after they drop. Diana asked Jim to research the matter further, and for members to talk to their faculty.

ASGC GOAL SETTING FOR 2009/10 Do we want to update or change Senate goals? They are posted at http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/academicsenate/goals.asp

PLUS/MINUS GRADING PILOT   Start of the pilot was postponed from Summer '09 to Fall '09. After three semesters PRIE will collate data and we will decide how to proceed. Research elsewhere shows GPAs computed with and without plus/minus grades are within 0.02 of each other. During the pilot faculty may give plus/minus grades, but will not be required to do so. Pluses and minuses during the pilot will not affect GPA and students will see only full letter grades.

CSM BUILDING NAMES Suggestions to College Council from a building names committee include Allied Health and Wellness (5N), College Center (10N), East Hall (12) and Bortolazzo Hall (1). Visitors to the college have asked why buildings don't have names. Carlene noted there are three different naming systems here: geography, function, and people. Several members expressed preference for function-based names.   Board of Trustees approval is required for any changes.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS – Governing Council received lists of committee members from several divisions, including
  Business/Technology: COI: Patricia Brannock, Patti Appel, Stacey Grasso (alternate);
    Library: Sam Sanchez
  Creative Arts/Social Science: COI: Mike Galisatus, Janet Black;   Art: Lilya Vorobey;
    Assessment: Stacey Grasso, Michelle Brown;
    Budget and Planning: Rick Ambrose (CSM Chair);
    District Committee on Budget and Finance: Rick Ambrose
Language Arts: COI: James Carranza, George Kramm, Kate Motoyama (alternate);
    Library: Joyce Heyman; Student Development: Roberta Reynolds, Allison Miller

AREA B MEETING The ASCCC Area B Fall meeting will be at CSM this year, on Friday, Oct. 30. Area B includes more than 20 area community colleges. Senate presidents, vice presidents, and others meet to discuss resolutions and the upcoming plenary session. A lot gets done at these meetings.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT District Academic Senate meets Sept. 14. Last week's President's Council meeting was canceled. College Council went over building names and got an accreditation update. Two reports due Oct. 10 are on track: the accreditation follow-up report, and the substantive change report on distance education. These can be submitted a month in advance for review. The accreditation committee meets every two weeks to see that everything is going correctly. There is an accreditation website. College Council heard an IPC update. IPC co-chairs are Jennifer Hughes and Diana Bennett. IPC is at the implementation stage, working on how to prepare planning documents and on making sure all plans are

integrated into the Strategic Master Plan. Each committee under IPC has faculty, staff, student, and administration representation. Information is on the PRIE website, and we can track what happens to the various proposals. Recommendations move from IPC to College Council to the college president.

The Human Relations Committee (HRC) will finalize its meeting hour after it finds another faculty representative. Substitutes will be provided if HRC meetings coincide with a faculty member's classes. The Budget Planning Committee (BPC) meets Sept 14. President Claire will hear its plans for this year's 10% cut. Its work is being kept quiet to protect the privacy of programs and people. It will look at programs, classified staff, and administrators. Any 10+1 proposals will go through the Senate. CSM faces a 30% cut over three years: 10% already, 10% this year, and 10% next year. Bond funding cannot be comingled with the college operating budget. The two must be absolutely separate.

INFORMATION/ANNOUNCEMENTS Tania Beliz announced regular flu shots will be available on campus next week, 10-1, $5 for students, $10 for faculty. H1N1 vaccine will be ready in October or November. The state will not provide flu shots for K-12 students because of the budget crisis.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS VPI Susan Estes will present follow-up on our PIV recommendations and explain the administration's process. We will consider updating minimum qualifications.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 pm. The next meeting will be Sept. 22, 2009.