



**Governing Council Meeting**

**Apr. 27, 2010 minutes (May 6, 2010 draft)**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

**President** Diana Bennett  
**Vice President** Huy Tran  
**Secretary** Lloyd Davis  
**Treasurer** Rosemary Nurre  
**Creative Arts/  
 Social Science** Jim Robertson  
 Benedict Lim

**Business/Technology** Ed Seubert  
**Language Arts** Daniel Keller  
**Math/Science** Tania Beliz  
 David Locke  
**P.E./Athletics** Joe Mangan  
**Student Services** Kevin Sinarle  
 Ruth Turner

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**Language Arts** Kate Motoyama

**Library** Michele Alaniz

**OTHERS ATTENDING**

**AFT** Dan Kaplan  
**COI** Laura Demsetz

**Math/Science** Charlene Frontiera  
***San Matean*** Alex Farr  
**SLOAC Coordinator** Chandra Vanajakshi

**SUMMARY**

- Work on DGME curriculum will continue over the summer. Ed Seubert criticized the PIV process.
- The Edison Project is on hold, as relocation of horticulture facilities to near B12 is not feasible.
- Online election of 2010-11 Senate officers will take place May 3-9
- Senate by-law revisions on reporting relationships of committees will be considered on May 11
- New min quals and FSA policies and procedures will be on the May 11 agenda
- The 2010-12 SLO Coordinator will be selected on May 11
- The Faculty Retirement and Tenure Reception will be May 4 at 2 pm in the Office of Student Life

**CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 2:18 p.m. in 36-109. The agenda, and the minutes of April 13, 2010, were approved.

**PLUS/MINUS GRADING** is in the second semester of a three semester pilot. Using plus/minus lowered GPAs an average of 0.02 points. A decision to switch to plus/minus grading would be made through DAS.

**MEDIA PIV** Huy Tran gave an information update. The PIV committee is reconstituting the advisory committee, with experts from the areas of all programs to be consolidated. DGME Faculty proposed names of people to contact about serving on the committee. VPI Susan Estes says the curriculum must be approved by regional deans and the State Chancellor's Office, which will take until December. We hope to do it over summer. It will be addressed at the first Senate and COI meetings in fall. Huy has asked for regular progress reports from the PIV committee, and he will report back to the Senate. Speaking as a DGME faculty member, Diana said she wanted follow-through on the reporting. Huy said March 15 layoff notices are possible if there is no program by then.

Ed Seubert called the PIV process deeply flawed. It seems as if certain outcomes have been predetermined. One reason we are going back to curriculum experts is the PIV committee did not follow the recommendations it had from previous advisory committee members. Graphics alone has two full-timers and one adjunct, with over 100 years of accumulated experience. The three-person PIV committee has no curriculum expert but was writing our curriculum, though it was not charged with doing so. We knew we had numbers and articulation problems, and were willing to work on them.

Tania Beliz, who served on the committee, said programs go into PIV because things aren't working. Numbers in some DGME courses were really low. For several years some classes ran with less than 20 students. If we had had money, that would have continued. In other areas, we have seen huge waiting lists and sent home hundreds of students because we could not open more sections, and this program is running classes with ten or twelve students. Which do we support? PIV committee members looked at transfer curriculum at other institutions with similar programs and made their recommendations accordingly. Members of the Media Group gave the committee names of outside people to talk to, and those people told us students would not be ready to take positions in their organizations. The committee recommended restructuring programs. Susan was willing to give professional development to prepare people to teach new curricula. The curriculum came from transfer institutions, and was based on employer statements of needs.

Ed Seubert said the PIV committee was painting with a very broad brush and had a hidden agenda. When he asked its chair at the very first PIV meeting how it would end up, she said all five media group programs would be consolidated into one, which is exactly what the committee ended up recommending. Other points: in Graphics, no advisory person said students were not well prepared. Lumping the programs together is a disservice. The committee claimed to have surveyed transfer schools. Ed found ~~more~~ data from UC Davis, UC Santa Cruz, and every local CSU, in one day with little effort. The committee claimed they followed the advice of curriculum experts not to teach software, but that was the advice of only three of about 30 experts. Verbatim transcripts showed two of those three quotes were taken out of context and the third was invalid, yet the committee advised to stop teaching software – another hidden agenda. Tania said faculty on the committee had no hidden agenda, but said teach in the context of the concepts.

Ed researched 103 community colleges, found every remotely similar program, and condensed a thick stack of research into a 2 ft by 3 ft table of courses in those programs, creating a gold mine of what other colleges are doing. He said it was completely ignored. Tania said the committee met for several months, and did not see Ed's table until its last meeting. Ed said Marilyn did not share it. When given the opportunity to accept or reject the committee's recommendations, Ed said he was given five minutes to present his case to reject the committee's recommendations, then was told that they were out of time and had to move on but since no one was recommending elimination of the programs, the committee's recommendations would be accepted.

Huy reported the committee will work over summer. He has asked to be kept updated, and there will be a report on the fall. Diana, speaking as Senate President, suggested a report to Governing Council on May 11. PIV is our purview. We need to know how things are going and learn from this. There will be other PIVs in the future, but none this year. Points in discussion: Kathy Ross and Marilyn Lawrence are arranging an advisory committee meeting. Contractually, faculty need 15 units. Might this lead to running classes below the 20 student minimum? That would be hard to justify to faculty who agreed last fall to cutting healthy courses in 2010-11.

DSPC asked at its 4/26 meeting when there will be collaboration, but did not get an answer. Neither the Chancellor nor any Board members were present, and Tom Mohr was the only college president at the meeting. DAS President Patty Dilko said we can't do district visioning without knowing the thinking of the leadership.

Ed gave an example of the consequences of not communicating. After Canada opened a program duplicating much Media Group curriculum, CSM Media Group enrollment took a nose dive and they ended up in PIV. The district didn't manage its curriculum, so we are competing with a sister college. The district has a chance to consolidate, but will it?

**EDISON PROJECT** Tania Beliz gave a report. Our April 13 minutes have information on the proposals the Edison Group made to cabinet on March 26, including replacing the 6000 sq ft greenhouse with a 2000 sq ft greenhouse, with nearby lath house, storage area, and integrated lab for horticulture, floristry, and biology. Since March 26, there have been two very difficult meetings on facilities. Working with Karen Powell of CPD, the task force first recommended the horticulture/floristry facility move between B12 and B10. Karen decided to get bids on an 800 sq ft facility. The space between B10 and B12 is too small for the facilities we need. On

April 26 Susan, Jennifer and Mike went back to the original recommendation that horticulture facilities stay in a refurbished B20 and the gardens remain. A greenhouse on the main quad was seen as unattractive relative to the new buildings. A 2000 sq ft greenhouse between B20 and B36 would be visible but not ugly. Mike Claire will take cabinet's recommendation to the Chancellor, but made no promises as to the outcome. Charlene Frontiera reported demolition of B20 was officially on hold. Tania said the task force recognizes the need for parking space. There is no need to raise the level of the parking area.

Tania noted horticulture was not a PIV program, and was not on the original course reduction list last fall. It voluntarily traded with floristry, which was on the list. Since moving to night classes, its numbers have been very good. The program is very well integrated into the sciences. Its students get jobs, and some transfer, for example into landscape architecture programs. Diana noted last fall faculty changed the language of the cuts from discontinuance to hiatus. Tania said the senate has been very supportive.

**NOMINATIONS OF OFFICERS** Diana announced the following nominations: President: Huy Tran, Diana Bennett. Vice President: Huy Tran; Secretary: Lloyd Davis; Treasurer: Rosemary Nurre. MSP (Bennett abstaining) to accept the nominations. Rick Ambrose will oversee the election process. Online balloting will take place next week, and results will be announced May 11.

**SENATE BY-LAWS** Action was postponed because there is a lot to be worked on. Diana identified items to address before the end of the semester, principally updating reporting relationships of committees, including the SLOAC and Library Committees and COI, which now reports to the Board of Trustees and the VPI. At Skyline and Canada, the curriculum committees report to the Senate, and their chairs are voting Governing Council members. Maybe we should do that here too. COI needs to act on some things at the end of May, after the last ASGC meeting, so there are timing issues. Neither COI nor the Skyline or Canada Curriculum Committees has its own by-laws. Other suggestions include having something like a Student Equity Committee. Perhaps wording for by-laws changes could be suggested before the May 11 meeting.

Committees report to Governing Council to keep us informed about what they are doing. We need to maintain dialog with COI, especially during revisioning. COI can use us as a support system.

**DRAFT OF DISTRICT MIN QUALS/FSA PROCEDURES** DAS is gathering ideas from the colleges and incorporating changes for final review. Diana will send us the current versions. Reporting structures need to be refined and assure the faculty is included in the process. These decisions are not for HR or the deans. Some deans are reported to have been making the decisions, rather than faculty. Points in discussion: The procedure seems fine but you don't really know without going through it. Could people who have gone through it comment on its appropriateness? There has been some finger pointing about people being hired who are thought not to have min quals. Min quals language is vague, and the process has been contentious, so the committee must be careful. What of instructors who transfer from a sister college which has quite different standards?

In the past, district HR screened applicants for min quals and screening committees never saw applications HR rejected. Why should HR perform a function within faculty purview, and requiring faculty understanding of min quals? In the future, screening committee chairs will sign a form saying they applicants have met min quals. Some confuse min quals with FSAs. Faculty meet min quals when they are hired. FSAs are used during layoffs to put faculty on seniority lists within their disciplines. For adjuncts, deans do the paperwork. For emergency hires, deans process the paper but there is no checking by faculty for min quals. Some faculty members in the district are said to lack min quals.

The equivalency form for min quals in an FSA is submitted to a committee of three faculty members, one from each college, and one dean. The committee reviews the applicant's academic and professional qualifications. After a year of consideration, at spring plenary ASCCC decided not to allow equivalency for an associate degree. Faculty should have gone through the educational process their students are in. This primarily affects CTE (vocational) areas.

Points in discussion: In recent years we have needed expertise in evaluating transcripts from foreign universities. We have assumed it to exist in HR. Some programs, like nursing, are subject to state and federal regulations. Where are such requirements in writing? We can bring such questions to the Senate president or the min quals committee, and work with the ASCCC min quals committee to research them. Does our new process align with those of other districts in the state? Our process is being shared at the state level, which is helping us in coming to a final decision.

The committee added a rationale for rejection, and an appeals process. Appeals go to the college Senate president, who will work with ASCCC and/or go to outside experts. For example, when there were questions about an FSA decision, Diana and Susan reviewed the decision, and Diana contacted the Senate Executive Committee and went to an outside expert in the FSA. Some appeals are pending.

**SLO COORDINATOR** Interim SLO Coordinator Chandra Vanajakshi and David Locke have both volunteered to be SLO coordinator, who will serve a two year term starting in Fall 2010. Chandra and David could share the position and its reassigned time, but one of them would have to be designated as the main go to person. Points in discussion: To select one, it would be helpful to have statements from each. The previous SLO coordinator was unclear as to what we are supposed to be doing and what the accreditation team needs. The coordinator works with TracDat, the district, faculty, the VPI, and the accreditation team. We will get dinged if we don't get the SLO job done. Diana will get documents to the nominees and see to it they understand what the position entails. We have lots to do on SLOs, and lack the guidance of policies and procedures. It will be a good thing for us to make it more solid. Selection was postponed to May 11.

**ACCREDITATION EDITORS** The deadline for applying was last week. Huy and Diana have discussed questions for applicants. If two faculty members are chosen, each will get 6 units reassigned time per semester. There is a three year commitment. Qualifications include strong writing skills, facility with Microsoft Word, and the ability to get people to do things. The Accreditation Oversight Committee is paper screening the applicants. The Accreditation Oversight Committee will make the final decision.

**ASCCC SPRING PLENARY** Issues addressed included min quals and transfer AA degrees. AB 1400 and AB493, on transfer degrees, are both good but it would be best to make a new bill using the good parts of both. Diana will send out information about resolutions that were approved or deferred. AB 2400 authorizes a multi-year pilot program offering four year degrees, primarily in CTE areas, at community colleges. Three districts were identified: Grossmont, San Diego, and SMCCCD. Chancellor Galatolo, Jing Luan, and Barbara Christenson supported it at a recent DAS meeting. It would bring us more apportionment dollars. Canada hosts an SFSU nursing program.

**FACULTY RETIREMENT AND TENURE RECEPTION** will be May 4 at 2 pm in the Office of Student Life (formerly the Student Activities Center). RSVP to Diana or Kate Motoyama. There are seven confirmed retirements. There is speculation the retirements may free up money for a few new faculty positions. If it does, a request would go from instructional deans to cabinet for those positions. Departments wanting a new hire should be sure their program reviews are in. Decisions about what positions to request are made by deans in consultation with division faculty, who prioritize the requests from their divisions. Instructional administrators (including division deans) prioritize requests from the college. Cabinet makes the final decision.

**ABCs Accreditation:** we are moving forward toward the Oct. 15 visit. The only red flags are SLOs, a funding mechanism for technology, and distance ed. The college is working hard to resolve those. **Budget:** Mike will share information at an all college meeting the first week in May. **Construction:** The Edison Project is on hold. The completion date for B10 has been moved up a year to Dec. 2011, but no opening date has been set.

**COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.** MSU to approve the following SLO leads for the **SLO Assessment Committee:** Nicole Borg, Michelle Warner (PE/Athletics); Colleen Kirby-Banas (Math/Science); Richard Castillo (Language Arts); Patricia Brannock (Business/Technology); Frederick Gaines (Creative Arts/Social Sciences); Eileen O'Brien (Student Services). The work of **FSA committees** is in progress. Diana apologized for delays in the work of some of the committees.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS** Tania Beliz reported **DEAC** meets April 28. David Locke reported **College Council** decided the **POW/MIA flag** will be flown under the American flag, but only at certain times, including the weeks of Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Veterans Day. From Fall 2010, **smoking** will be allowed only in parking lots. Facilities will measure how close faculty offices in B15, B17, and B36 are to parking lots, to be sure smoking areas are at least 20 feet away. Student senators will hand out citations requiring violators to put in a few hours of community service work on campus, such as picking up cigarette butts. Signage will go up this summer. Shelters for rainy days are being considered. A decision was delayed on the **Art on Campus** policy, because information on it has been available for only a short time. The Art on Campus Committee has been in place for 8 or 9 years, with members primarily from the Art Department. It decides how money is spent for art works on campus. College Council members asked how the composition of that committee was determined, and whether it is appropriate to spend big money on art in these times. Some on the Art on Campus Committee see such spending as an investment, and that the present committee has the background to make such decisions. The committee also has a say on student and faculty art being shown on campus, and on donated art. The committee needs to be brought into the IPC model, with appropriate representation across campus. Shared governance applies, so committee policies and procedures must go out to the campus before College Council makes any decisions. This will also be a Governing Council action item.

**OFFICERS REPORTS** **President's Council** heard KCSM is now a district entity, and that employee benefits, which had been part of the district budget, will now be in the budget of each college. **DAS** and **AFT** leaders had a good ninety minute meeting on April 14. They talked about roles and responsibilities, what they have in common, and how to work together, for example on a faculty evaluation process. They will write a joint statement for the Board on the importance of moving forward on negotiations. There will be an article in the *Advocate* at the end of this week. Dan said the collaboration should have happened much earlier. The date for the next meeting is the start of fall semester, and they will meet twice a year. Senate and AFT Presidents will communicate monthly, work together to set goals, and put the results on their organization's agendas.

**IPC** (Institutional Planning Committee) has received all required plans from its committees. What was missing was connection with the district on the Distance Education plan. Tania is on both the college and district distance ed committees, so can communicate both ways between them. She reported the district distance ed committee is working on assessment, new courses, and policies related to the district's master plan for distance ed. Patty Dilko and college representatives are on the district committee. CSM has a distance ed committee, but Canada does not. At Skyline, distance ed is addressed within another committee. One pressing issue is evaluation of faculty teaching distance ed courses. We need to look at the number of online courses, student and faculty readiness, and faculty training and evaluation. A distance ed portal for all distance ed courses is under construction, listing instructional fees and with links to educational services. The accreditation agency wants to see that. A subcommittee is looking at other institutions. VPs and A&R people are involved in the district committee. It is a working committee, with homework.

**DSPC** (District Strategic Planning Committee) is comprised of leaders at each campus – college presidents, Senate and AFT presidents, classified representatives – working on a vision for the district. Have we had, or are we going to have, the conversations we need for this process? What is the district to each college? Is it just a provider of information and resources? Is it actively involved in the colleges? Members felt the chancellor and someone from the Board should be there. There will be a special meeting in May. DSPC brought in a facilitator on writing up vision statements.

**INFORMATION/ANNOUNCEMENTS** Diana will send surveys to everyone who participated in the PIV work that began in 2008, and to those who did program reviews or reviews of labs and centers. Those who did program reviews should complete the survey for the type of review (comprehensive or annual) they did this year. PRIE will tabulate the information and bring it back. We will see where changes need to be made. The online program review survey will be available for one week.

The meeting adjourned at 4:01 p.m. The next meeting will be May 11, 2010 in 36-109.