



Governing Council Meeting

Mar. 8, 2011 minutes (Mar. 18, 2011 draft)

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	Diana Bennett	Language Arts	Teeka James,
Vice President	Huy Tran		Daniel Keller
Secretary	Lloyd Davis	Math/Science; SLOAC	David Locke
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre	P.E./Athletics	Larry Owens
Creative Arts/ Social Science	Benedict Lim	Student Services	Kevin Sinarle
	Jim Robertson		

MEMBERS ABSENT

Business/Technology	Ed Seubert	Library	Teresa Morris
	Lilya Vorobey	Math/Science	Tania Beliz
		Student Services	Jackie Gamelin

OTHERS ATTENDING

AFT	Dan Kaplan	Math/Science	Charlene Frontiera
P.E./Athletics	Andreas Wolf		Cheryl Gregory

SUMMARY

- Governing Council approved policies and procedures on **min quals** for new hires and **additional FSAs** for current instructors.
- **ASGC by-laws** revisions, mostly related to committees, were approved after some tweaking.
- Andreas Wolf and Cheryl Gregory reported on **Math Boost**, a program to prepare students to retake the math placement test to place into higher courses.
- A committee was approved to prepare a modified PIV report to document the efforts and needs of the **horticulture/floristry** program.
- The DAS/AFT statement on forming a **trust committee** on faculty evaluation will be presented to the Board this month.
- Diana will meet with Cabinet and others to discuss criteria used for the Fall 09 load reduction list.
- Governing Council discussed rejecting the practice of disenrolling students behind on fees, as proposed in District Rules and Regs §8.70.

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:20 p.m. in the SoTL Center, 12-170, by Vice President Huy Tran. The agenda, and the minutes of Feb. 22, 2011, were approved.

OLD BUSINESS

MINIMUM QUALS/FSA POLICY AND PROCEDURE In discussion before the vote on a draft of policies and procedures for establishing min quals in new hires, and for granting additional FSAs to current employees, Daniel Keller asked whether there is policy about faculty members with more than one FSA asking to be evaluated in one but not in another. What if an instructor gets positive evaluations in one FSA but repeated negative evaluations in another? Does it result in loss of FSA, or loss of job? Points in discussion: there seems to be nothing in policy or in the contract about this question. On the other hand, how is getting a good evaluation in one FSA and a bad evaluation in another different from getting a good evaluation in one class and a bad one in another class? Evaluation is partly negotiated. This question needs to be looked at, but it is different from granting FSAs in the first place, which is what the proposed policy addresses.

The policy we are voting on today includes the procedure for determining a new hire meets minimum quals, and the ability to contest an FSA committee's decision not to approve, for example if the FSA committee was not properly formed. The role of the dean on an FSA committee is to assure process is followed. The proposed policy aims to get rid of ambiguity in the process. MSP (Robertson/Lim, James abstaining) to approve the policy.

ASGC BY-LAWS Most discussion was about the role of committees. There is a distance education committee at the district level (DEAC, the Distance Education Advisory Committee) and at CSM (DEC, the Distance Education Committee, which reports to IPC.) There is only one library committee, the Library Advisory Committee (LAC.) It is a senate committee, not an IPC committee. Whether chairs of COI, SLOAC, and LAC should be voting members of Governing Council is an issue for future discussion. Discussion of proposed revisions produced additional changes, suggested by Teeka, Jim, and others:

In Article II, line 32, change "and full participation in shared governance" to
"to fully participate in all other aspects of shared governance"

In lines 27-28 on COI, change "may establish subcommittees on library, distance education, and other instructional matters" to "may establish committees as needed on other instructional matters"

In line 25 on LAC, change "accreditation standards" to "accreditation requirements"

In line 10 on SLOAC, change "advise(s)" to "advise"

In line 23 on SLOAC, change "Carries" to "Carry" and "SLO's" to "SLOs"

In line 16 on SLOAC, change "student-learning" to "student learning"

In line 28 on SLOAC, change "one additional representative" to "one representative"

MSU to approve proposed by-laws amendments with the above changes.

MATH BOOST Andreas Wolf and Cheryl Gregory spoke on Math Boost . In Summer 09 and Fall 10, Bret Pollack and Cheryl each ran a Math Boost project, offering 20 contact hours of intensive math review designed to prepare students who took our math placement test to retest and place higher. The results were similar in both programs. Some students did not advance, some placed two or three courses higher. Last spring, one-third of participants advanced one level.

Andreas gave an overview of its history. Interest generated by the programs is interdisciplinary, including Student Services, Math, and PE. The Enrollment Management Committee, which Andreas chairs, and DEAC, which Henry Villareal chairs, are both involved. They created a proposal tying in the institutional priorities programs and services, enrollment management, and diversity. They asked BPC for, and were granted, funding for two years to gather data and assess results. The numbers so far are too small for definitive results on how participants do in the courses into which they place. Some tested out of having to take any course. Some students who placed below their expectations took no math as high school seniors. The math department is comfortable with the placement test.

After the BPC approval, a group met in January to plan for this year. It coordinated with Public Relations, Marsha Ramezane, and Chris Rico. Students get a Math Boost flier with their placement test results. Orientation

and course selection workshop leaders have copies. After students take the placement test they get an email advertising this program. Emails are also used to survey people who drop online courses. In the future other events will generate automatic email.

A counselor will track through Fall semester those who complete Math Boost. In some math classes five seats will be set aside for summer workshop students who place higher, and will be made available to them during a 48 hour window. Faculty and rooms have been identified, and the programs are ready. We need to get enrollment procedures working in Banner. Math Boost can accommodate up to 32 students this spring. At lunch breaks, the focus will be on math study skills. Skyline has a similar program online but has no results yet. They have several intensive programs. Pat Deamer made a presentation about this to the Board. As an Hispanic Serving Institution, Canada has a similar program that is federally funded. CSM does not qualify. Our program will have a high cost per student unless it gets lots of students.

The summer program runs for one week in August. Last year it had a session in June. It meets in two-hour blocks, which are needed for skills. Teeka suggested an eight-hour brush-up version for students who just need review. Cheryl said 20 hours are required for ½ unit of credit. Having students work in the MRC without staff contact has not worked. Andreas said we may modify the program as we go along. We are thinking of running a similar program for the English placement test. It too would free up resources and give students a faster path. Diana noted Math Boost is a pilot program.

HORTICULTURE/FLORISTRY Huy reported the Chancellor supports horticulture undergoing a modified PIV process to determine its needs. A PIV document would provide alternatives, which the Board wants, as well as reasons for funding requests for a greenhouse, lab and classroom, and why they must be close together. In the past, the PIV process has not addressed facilities. Ordinary PIVs are for programs which have too few students, or are too expensive. Horticulture is not on the chopping block. Teeka asserted we should say faculty have decided to use PIV as a tool to explain the needs of this program, rather than just use the word ‘modified’. Huy said he does not want use of ‘PIV’ to create the misconception that the program is in danger. In the recent past horticulture voluntarily pulled back courses to help protect other programs.

Points in discussion: The horticulture/Edison group has met several times. What are the positive options? Edison parking is a non-issue. We can live with fewer parking spaces. Parking is also scarce for B15 and B17. There is a push to convert a physics lab into a horticulture lab. Reducing horticulture would kill it, but the same is true for physics. It is expensive to alter B36. Some have said the greenhouse will cost over \$1 million. We made clear it will not.

Enrollment is not an issue. Horticulture has made changes to raise its enrollment, such as moving to evening. Diana said there is load issue with horticulture/floristry, and with physics, but not with biology. Huy said a benefit of the PIV document is it will make people aware of the changes horticulture has been making to modify and improve its programs. Having more and larger evening courses has strengthened the program.

Math/Science Dean Charlene Frontiera said when Math/Science inherited horticulture in the division realignment a few years ago, horticulture had a load of only 300. The first year was spent raising its load. It was offering courses both at night and during the day. Charlene said pick one. They did, and it worked. Horticulture on the transfer side is very good. Floristry is CTE. In our division, every area brought things to the table. Horticulture chose to cut its transfer program. People think horticulture must have been weak or it would not have done that.

Huy said there is lots of community involvement in horticulture/floristry. We can put that in the clear, official PIV report. Educate the Board and Chancellor on why gardens and plants need to be there. Diana said there is not consensus with all stakeholders – district, construction, and cabinet. Horticulture has done a lot, but nowhere is it recorded. Modified PIV is to get the hard work documented. PIV and program review documents speak louder than informal papers. We are talking about facilities and equipment – normal PIV does not. There is also a cost issue, and coordination with other construction. We have lots of factors which were never officially reported or presented. Present to Mike, Cabinet, Chancellor, and the Board – everything with options. The modified PIV will take 90 days, to June 8. Usually a PIV takes a year. Nothing will be demolished in that time.

MSU to approve the committee.

DAS/AFT TRUST COMMITTEE STATEMENT The statement will be presented to the Board on March 23, since the March 9 Board meeting is a study session. DAS will work on selection criteria, should the statement be approved. Dan Kaplan said it was not presented at the last Board meeting, by AFT request, because of a possible conflict of interest if Ray Hernandez presented it as DAS President, since Ray recently became Skyline's interim dean of Math/Science/Technology. Ray agreed to the postponement.

FALL BUDGET REDUCTIONS – “THE LIST” On March 15, Diana will meet with cabinet, the COI chair, and others to look at the criteria and indicators used for the Fall 09 load reduction list. Such criteria and indicators will be used in program review and PIV in the future to classify courses and programs as green, yellow, or red as we discussed at our Feb. 22 meeting. Teeka, who was on the emergency steering committee in Fall 2009, reported Cabinet had access to data through Hyperion that faculty did not have. She asked Diana to take forward that faculty, or at least the Executive Committee, should have access to Hyperion data so we can participate fully in shared governance, with the same information Cabinet has to apply the criteria and indicators.

DISTRICT RULES AND REGS DSGC is updating a large number of District Rules and Regs. On 3/7, DSGC moved everything in the current batch forward by consensus except for §8.70, Fees and Charges. Consensus of Governing Council was to support the rest of the batch. DSGC pulled §8.70 and will take it up next month for clarification and rewrite. In discussion of §8.70, Governing Council focused on ¶6 requiring students be disenrolled if they have unpaid fees and have not enrolled in a payment plan.

Teeka supported pulling §8.70 at DSGC for AFT, and Donna Bestock did so for Skyline managers. Skyline students and classified also supported the action. All are concerned about unintended consequences for low income students. Students stated the key points. Canada's Senate wanted to change “shall be dropped” to “may be dropped” in ¶6. That was turned down by consensus. It would add confusion. Diana convinced DSGC to backtrack. She recommends taking “Students whose fees are not paid and who have not enrolled in a payment plan shall be dropped from classes prior to the start of the term.” out of ¶6, then let §8.70 go forward. People like the payment plan idea. A student who has a balance, or gets financial aid, would be automatically put on a payment plan. Canada students favored that. CSM students were absent. Speaking as a Governing Council rep, Teeka asked Governing Council to hold off on dropping students. See how well the payment plans work. Skyline people also said let's get information.

Points in discussion: The payment plan is automatic. We have policies and procedures that are out of sync. DSGC does policy. Our job is to ask our constituents about policy language. What suggestions do we have for §8.70 beyond Diana's? Slow down on dropping students. Most of Skyline (but not faculty) oppose dropping at this time. The concern is the procedures are not fine-tuned enough to minimize erroneous dropping. Diana asked for a temperature check of CSM faculty. We have one more meeting before §8.70 goes to DSGC.

ANNOUNCEMENTS Flex day is this Friday, March 11, an opportunity for work on program review. Nominations of officers for two year terms will be made at the next meeting. Be sure to check with nominees that they will agree to serve. Lloyd will not be a candidate for secretary. Hiring policy and the new CSM logo are among items deferred to the next agenda.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting adjourned at 4:14 pm. The next meeting will be March 22, 2011 in 12-170.