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Co-Chair Don Norton called the meeting to order at 1:47 p.m.

Approval of minutes from September 15, 2009

The minutes from the September 15th Shared Governance Council meeting were approved as amended in item IV, i: being amended to begin.

AGENDA ITEM I: PROPOSAL TO CREATE A TASK FORCE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE

a. Cathleen Greiner introduced this item by stating that at its May 12, 2009 meeting, the Shared Governance Council reached consensus to begin a discussion regarding its name, composition, function, and scope of authority. At the same meeting, the council conducted a self-assessment. The results of the self-assessment were compiled for review and action. It is now proposed that a task force be formed. The task force will work on reviewing the council’s name, composition, function, and scope of authority, as well as the assessment results, with the purpose of drafting a proposal for modification of the council. The proposal for modification would focus on improving the efficacy of the Shared Governance Council and contributing to institutional effectiveness and better planning.

b. Steve Leone requested that the Academic Senate President or a designee be added to the composition.

c. Jay Chalfant requested that a classified manager be added to the composition.

d. Kathy Jimison stated that the Shared Governance Council deals primarily with instructional issues; as a result, the task force should have more faculty members on it. However, if the SGC were to add more members to the task force, then that decision might not make the task force as effective as it could be. She suggested reviewing the composition and coming up with a more focused group.

e. Allison Merzon stated that she would support one manager, one classified member, and two faculty members. The task force is only going to make a recommendation to the Shared Governance, not a decision on its behalf.

f. Kathy Jimison supported Allison Merzon’s recommendation with the addition of one more faculty member.

g. Sandee McLaughlin added that when Mark Wade Lieu and Scott Lay visited, they suggested revisiting the “mutually agreed upon” and “primarily rely upon” items. In order to achieve this, SGC needs to make sure that one of the faculty members on the task force is a representative of the Academic Senate.

h. Steve Leone stated that he would support four members on the task force, as long as one of them is Academic Senate-appointed.
i. Linda Fontanilla requested that at least one member be a representative from Student Services.

j. Jay Chalfant clarified that the reason he requested a Management Senate representative is because that group, at times, is asked to review proposals from the Shared Governance Council. If having too many managers on the task force were to become an issue, he would support appointing the Academic Manager as Management Senate representative.

k. Beth-Ann Dumas expressed her concern with having too large of a task force. She said she would support four task force members, maximum five. She reminded the SGC that the task force will bring a proposal for SGC’s review—they will not be making any decisions.

l. Steve Leone agreed with Beth-Ann Dumas and supported four members on the task force.

As a result, the Shared Governance Council reached consensus unanimously to approve appointing a task force to work on the Shared Governance Council’s name, composition, function, and scope of authority. The task force will be composed of four (4) members, as follows: (members are to come from the Shared Governance Council’s permanent membership): one manager, one classified member, and two faculty members (one must be appointed by the Academic Senate).

AGENDA ITEM II (EXCHANGED): PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE PROCESS (ITEM III ON AGENDA)

a. Deborah Wulff reminded the Shared Governance Council that a discontinuance process was conducted in spring 2009 with the Dental Hygiene program. The SGC appointed a task force to assess the discontinuance of Dental Hygiene. Steve Leone, Beth-Ann Dumas, Kevin Bontenbal, and Deborah Wulff worked as a task force to fine tune the process. She added that it is an accreditation requirement to have a program discontinuance process, and it also is mandated by Title 5. The college does not have a choice to implement a process, so the focus is to adopt the best process. The task force thought the past discontinuance process had a lot of positive characteristics, so many of them were carried over.

b. Beth-Ann Dumas added that the task force reviewed other college’s processes. The process was not created in a vacuum or in isolation; best practices were reviewed and followed.

c. Steve Leone added that the main reason why the Academic Senate supports having a discontinuance process is so that appropriate due process is given to programs that might be on the line for discontinuance. Ultimately, the goal is to save programs, so this process helps in determining what can be done to save and improve a program, instead of discontinuing it. He also complimented Deborah Wulff for her hard work on the document and research of the process as it is done by other community colleges in the State.

d. Allison Merzon pointed out that the initiation of the process did not include participation from either bargaining unit member. Also, she stated that the program discontinuance report seemed that it should be completed before the discontinuance process starts—it is helpful to have data prior to beginning the discontinuance process. She asked what is it that triggers recognition of a program to go on a discontinuance process.

e. Deborah Wulff answered Allison Merzon’s question by stating that instruction does track data and when a red flag is seen on an indicator, the responsible manager addresses it. Addressing it, then, could mean jumpstarting the discontinuance process. She added that the APPW also triggers observation and analysis.

f. Kathy Jimison asked if the Academic Senate had finalized the definition of a program. She stated that it is crucial to first understand what a program is and then explore the details of the process for discontinuing it.

g. Steve Leone explained that as he understood it, this was the first read of the discontinuance process, so it should not conflict once the Senate finalizes defining a program. Feedback can be gathered as the Senate works on refining the definition. Addressing Allison Merzon’s concern and question, he clarified that the task force is exploring the creation of some sort of template or document that is filled out on the front end of the discontinuance process.

h. John Fetcho stated that CCCUE needs to be represented on the discontinuance task force because a discontinuance process does affect classified employees. He also asked if it would not be prudent to establish a sunset clause on the suspension of the program, instead of having an open window of time.

i. Deborah Wulff stressed that the main idea and purpose of this process is to avoid discontinuing a program. The process encourages careful review of report and adoption of suggestions to move forward in a way that is best for the people in the program and the students in the program.
j. Kevin Bontenbal requested that SGC members e-mail the task force with suggestions and input to be incorporated into the discontinuance process and document.

k. Cathleen Greiner asked if a reference could be made to the IPPR and the APPW.

l. Jane Morgan commended the committee that worked on the discontinuance process and complimented their work. She expressed her concern with specific items in the document: 1) Page 7, “lack of available qualified personnel.” This statement could be potentially misused and it could create issues with diversity. 2) “Poor retention within courses.” She expressed concern with the wording of the statement and the possible routes that people could take to manipulate results. 3) Page 12: fill rates must be looked at simultaneously with course caps because do not accurately represent the whole picture.

m. Karen Reyes stated that it is imperative to have a classified member on the discontinuance task force. Classified members in divisions have expertise on, for example, equipment, resources, and regulations that pertain to the program on the discontinuance process.

n. Beth-Ann Dumas reminded the SGC that the discontinuance task force will not be making a decision on whether or not a program is to be discontinued; the task force will only make a recommendation and bring it before the Shared Governance Council.

o. Kathy Jimison commented that multiple measures should be looked at when evaluating the possibility of discontinuing a program. Budgetary reasons should not be the sole reason for discontinuing a program. She also expressed her concern with budget being the backdoor through which a program can be easily discontinued and not given due, methodical process. For this reason, she suggested that the emergency discontinuance process be tied to the overall process.

p. Bret Clark asked if there is a vision on how the Shared Governance Council will review the process.

q. Steve Leone also requested that SGC members forward their feedback and input on the discontinuance process to the task force members.

The Discontinuance Process will be revisited by the Shared Governance Council at its next meeting. The task force will work on incorporating the feedback received at this meeting and any other feedback received by e-mail.

AGENDA ITEM III (EXCHANGED): STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE—PROPOSAL FOR MODIFICATION (ITEM II ON AGENDA)

a. Steve Leone reminded SGC members that this agenda item was tabled at the September 15 meeting. The reason for the item was to modify the reporting nature of the Strategic Planning Committee. The modification would extract the committee from Planning and Budget and make it a college-wide, standalone committee.

b. Cathleen Greiner clarified that it has always been the plan to have the Strategic Planning Committee be composed of liaisons from the other main college committees to ensure that there is communication and continuity in planning.

c. Dave Pelham explained that the Strategic Planning Committee would produce strategic directions based on the input from the community and the other main college committees—that has always been the intent. There would not be disconnection or planning conflicts because liaisons would ensure that there is continuity.

d. After hearing the explanation from Steve Leone and Dave Pelham, Dennis Baeyen proceeded to call for consensus on the proposal.

e. Allison Merzon raised an ORANGE CARD and expressed that it is not clear to her how this would function organizationally. In other words, the mechanics are not clear. Planning and Budget has also been struggling with the mechanics of planning. This seems to be starting at a place where the mechanics are not defined or clear.

f. Sandee McLaughlin agreed with Allison Merzon, but she expressed that whether the Strategic Planning is a subcommittee or a standalone committee does not address the mechanics.

g. Allison Merzon agreed with Sandee McLaughlin, but she stated that since the vote is on the whole package, her concern stands. She added that she was not blocking consensus, just expressing her concern. She would, however, ask that the Strategic Planning Committee take as its first task to produce a flowchart/organizational chart to explain the mechanics of strategic planning.

h. Dennis Baeyen proceeded to call for consensus.
As a result, the Shared Governance Council reached consensus to approve the modification to the Strategic Planning Committee and make it a college-wide, standalone committee, effective immediately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM IV: ANNOUNCEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>Dave Pelham</strong> informed the Shared Governance Council that the visiting team from ACCJC will come to Cuesta College on October 27, 2009. They will have received and reviewed our Follow-Up Report by then. The visiting team consists of College of Marin Superintendent Dr. Fran White and Santa Barbara City College Superintendent Andreea Serban.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>Bret Clark</strong> requested that the Faculty Prioritization process be reviewed and assessed some time in the near future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEXT MEETING:** The next meeting of the Shared Governance Council will be held on October 13, 2009, from 1:45 p.m. to 3:45 p.m., in room 5402.