Approval of minutes from March 9, 2010

The minutes from the March 9, 2010 Shared Governance Council meeting were approved as written and presented.

AGENDA ITEM I: FEEDBACK ON PROGRAM REVITALIZATION, SUSPENSION, DISCONTINUANCE POLICY

a. Steve Leone introduced this item. An explanation was provided regarding the process: The Academic Senate approved the Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance Policy on March 12, 2010 with the following proposal: “The Academic Senate Council approves the Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance Policy for submission to the Shared Governance Council for final feedback, after which it will be resubmitted to the Senate Council for final approval.” The Academic Senate welcomes final feedback from the members of the Shared Governance Council. The changes that the Academic Senate did on the document were indicated in highlight. One of the main revisions that the senate did to the policy was clarifying that the policy for revitalization, suspension, and/or discontinuance is driven by the content of a CPPR. Also, that the President/Superintendent has the ultimate authority to implement a recommendation from the College Council regarding revitalization, suspension, and/or discontinuance of a program.

b. Deborah Wulff expressed her concern with the process being driven solely by the content of a CPPR. She requested clarification on how the policy would be applied to, for example, a program that has not undergone a CPPR process in three years and has yet two more to go through it.

c. Steve Leone stated that the content of the latest CPPR would be considered in order to apply the policy to a program. This means that it would not be necessary to wait two years until the next CPPR if the previous CPPR showed a clear need for revitalization, suspension, and/or discontinuance. The Academic Senate’s main concern in making this an explicit requirement was that the policy would be applied based on hard, comprehensive evidence, which is found in a program’s comprehensive review.

d. Deborah Wulff then requested that the wording be clarified to show that the CPPR to be considered is to be the most current CPPR.

e. Linda Fontanilla requested clarification on the definitions of student services programs and administrative services programs and how the policy applies to those programs. It seems that the policy is only for instructional programs.

f. Sandee McLaughlin stated that she had a concern with some of the current language in the policy being interpreted erroneously in the future: since it’s not clear
that the content that triggers the policy comes from the latest CPPR, an individual could interpret that it would be necessary to wait until the next cycle of CPPR. She requested that the language be clarified and that it includes the content of the APPW.

g. Allison Merzon requested that the documents from the program plan and review documents be linked to the policy document in order to refer both processes.

h. Don Norton expressed his concern with a seemingly negative incline against vocational educational programs, which conduct their CPPR process every two years.

i. To address Deborah Wulff’s concern of the CPPR language, Marie Larsen suggested adding the APPW as the trigger.

j. Pamela Ralston suggested finding and replacing all occurrences of CPPR with the overarching process, the IPPR. Doing that would include the CPPR, the APPW, etc. she also suggested changing language from “driven by the CPPR” to “informed by the IPPR.”

k. Steve Leone stated that the idea is that the process is, in fact, driven by the CPPR process. More weight to the content is given by stating it in such way.

l. Ray Hobson asked if the discontinuance process allows for some sort of external review.

m. Steve Leone referred to the driver of the process: data in the CPPR and the APPW. These documents make sure that the policy is triggered by a comprehensive review and not just by one set of data.

n. Pamela Ralston suggested rephrasing a sentence in page 4 (“This policy will prevent programs from being cut [...]”) to reflect more positive language: “Following due process and using appropriate data, this policy will assure that all programs under consideration for revitalization, suspension, and/or discontinuance must be proposed for such consideration using the policy guidelines...” This places a positive focus on the policy. She also expressed concern with a phrase in the definition of instructional programs: “[...] the acquisition of selected knowledge or skills [...]” This phrase is incredibly broad.

o. Steve Leone responded to Pamela Ralston regarding her concern with the language in the definition of instructional programs. He stated that the language came directly from Title 5 language and it is the only element there that does not have a degree or certificate attached to it. for example, that language would apply to areas like philosophy, economics, or speech.

p. Sandee McLaughlin stated that the current policy and form do not speak to administrative or student services. If the college is thinking on institutionalizing the policy, then the form needs to reflect specific language and guidelines that apply to those programs. As it is, the form and policy only take into consideration instructional programs.

q. Steve Leone suggesting revising the form and policy next year so that it speaks to administrative and student services programs as well. However, for this year, the Academic Senate expects to approve the form and policy for instructional programs.

RESULTS/FOLLOW UPS:

1. Steve Leone will take SGC’s feedback on the policy and the form back to the Academic Senate for final approval. The policy, for now, will be applicable to instructional programs only. Next year, it may be revised to be applicable to student services and administrative services programs. The goal will be to have an integrated document that applies to all programs in the college by the end of 2010-2011.

2. VPs will update the master lists of program-review cycles to make sure they reflect the current definitions of programs.

AGENDA ITEM II: REVISED PROPOSAL FROM TASK FORCE ON SGC NAME, FUNCTION, COMPOSITION, AND SCOPE OF AUTHORITY

a. Cathleen Greiner introduced this item: At its March 9, 2010 meeting, the SGC reviewed a revised proposal from the task force working on SGC’s name, function, composition, and scope of authority. SGC members requested that the task force amend the composition of the proposed College Council and bring back a composition that better reflects the functions of that council. The task force met on March 23 to discuss and complete SGC’s request. The proposal now reflects the changes to the composition.
b. Beth-Ann Dumas stated that the new college council did not seem to address issues that go beyond college committees. There is a concern with the college council being a much narrowed down council.

c. Gil Stork stated that he has a keen interest in the modification of the Shared Governance Council. He added that while the proposed college council may not be the best answer, it is definitely a commendable step towards improvement. The way he envisions the ultimate college council is as a group that works as a clearing house for any college-wide issues. The bifurcated, not integrated system of planning and decision-making currently executed by SGC and Planning and Budget needs to be corrected; the proposed council is a step towards correcting that deficiency. The college needs to be aware, however, that assessment of the new college council will be necessary at the end of next year and the college council might be modified yet again to continue striving towards continuous quality improvement. He concluded his comment by adding that he firmly believes in the model of a college council and is looking forward to the council evolving to a very effective, focused council.

d. To address Beth-Ann’s concern, Marie Larsen suggested modifying the proposal by striking out the sentence “by college-wide committees” to make the statement broader.

e. Kathy Jimison asked clarification on items four and five. Number four seems to address instructional programs only and number five seems to address all programs (instructional, administrative, and student services). She added that the matrix needed to be defined to clarify who has the responsibility for developing a policy to approve and revitalize programs that are not instructional.

f. Beth-Ann Dumas responded to Kathy Jimison’s request for clarification by stating that the Academic Senate is only responsible for instructional matters, hence only responsible for developing policy on new instructional programs or the discontinuance of instructional programs. For any other type of programs, the college will need to form a group or task force that will propose policy and procedure for approval and discontinuance.

g. Sandee McLaughlin requested that the matrix be modified to follow the same pattern of the roles, one through five.

h. Linda Fontanilla stated that it is important that as we evaluate the effectiveness of the new college council, that we focus on staffing the council based on functions and roles and not on numbers.

i. Cande Muñoz expressed concern with the composition of the new college council leaving out student services directors. The current Shared Governance Council has three student services directors and he is uncomfortable that the new council has no representative from that group.

j. Regarding item four, Gil Stork asked if there was a discussion about the interfacing of the new college council with the Planning and Budget Committee, especially regarding financial viability.

k. Steve Leone answered Gil Stork’s question and stated that it was the idea that the college council will make integrated decisions with the P&B committee. It is also understood that the college needs to look at all of its committees and make modifications so that they all fall under the integrated planning model.

l. To address the issue with instructional program approval and discontinuance and any other type of program approval and discontinuance, Marie Larsen suggested taking the word “instructional” out of item four so that the document reflects that the council covers all programs (instructional and non-instructional).

m. Steve Leone addressed Marie Larsen’s suggestion: the SGC has only looked at instructional program development and discontinuance. If the proposal is changed to reflect that the college council would cover all programs, then the college needs to make sure that the appropriate constituents meet and develop policy and procedure for programs that are not instructional.

n. Deborah Wulff supported Marie Larsen’s suggestion. Any approval or discontinuance of any program affects the institution as a whole. Everything should be brought to and through the college council.

o. Gil Stork agreed with Deborah Wulff. However, the decision has to be consistent and there needs to be follow through by the appropriate constituents.

p. Linda Fontanilla supported Gil Stork’s comment and added that there needs to be a process for programs that not instructional. Furthermore, there needs to be a college-wide body that looks at those proposals. The college council would be the appropriate body to do that.
q. Cathleen Greiner encouraged the group to remember that this is a starting point for the college council. We will focus on assessing and changing what needs to be changed in order to improve.

r. Beth-Ann Dumas supported Linda Fontanilla’s comment. She added that it makes sense for the college council to look at all college-wide issues, including non-instructional program approval, discontinuance, etc. Even though cabinet and the president might have the final answer on approving or discontinuing a program, it is important for the college to be aware of the plans that the institution has adopted.

s. Deborah Wulff suggested modifying the proposal so that it reflects that the college council covers all programs (modify number four and number five to address all programs). Then, a task force can be formed to develop policy and procedure for approving and discontinuing non-instructional programs. If SGC decides to leave non-instructional programs out of the college council, then it will be a whole year before the college can address the issue.

t. Cande Muñoz stated once more his distress with the current proposal of the college council leaving out student services directors completely. At least one student services director needs to be included in the composition.

u. Linda Fontanilla seconded Cande Muñoz and added that Student Services is a department that is large enough, important enough, and active enough to demand inclusion in the new college council.

v. Steve Leone supported Linda Fontanilla and Cande Muñoz and suggested modifying the composition of the new college council by subtracting one CCCUE member and adding one student services representative, an SS director.

w. Jay Chalfant clarified that Management Senate cannot be compelled to have its appointment to the college council be a student services representative. For that reason, he supported Steve Leone’s suggestion to modify the composition.

x. John Fetcho shared with SGC that it has been suggested by CCBT consultants that because of the size of the SGC, CCCUE should have at least two representatives.

y. Dennis Baeyen stated that the job of the representatives that sit at the table of the SGC is to voice the concerns of the groups and people they represent, not just their personal concerns. Representatives should be actively speaking with their groups, sharing information on what is being carried out at SGC, and then bring the group’s feedback to the table so that the voice of the group is heard. He added that it should not be a matter of numbers but of communication between the representative and the individuals that make up the constituent group. The new college council should also consider having open seats for the college community to simply show up and hear about what is going on at the college council. While a large group is valuable in richness of opinions, it is true that it may not be as effective as a smaller, more focused group.

z. Karen Reyes supported Dennis Baeyen’s comment in that the people at the table are responsible for going back to their constituencies, sharing the information, and bringing back their concerns, ideas, or feedback. If we look at proportions, she added, the Management Senate group is much smaller than CCCUE, yet has more representatives on SGC. The proportionality argument would be one to support the addition of a CCCUE member to the composition. She strongly suggested keeping the composition with two representatives from CCCUE.

aa. Matthew Green stated that if the council is going to be focusing mainly on instructional matters, then the current composition suits the role. However, if the proposal to expand the council’s coverage over all programs is passed, then the composition needs to be amended.

bb. Gil Stork encouraged all SGC members to remember that the spirit should be that we are all part of one college, Cuesta College. The commitment is to the college, even though the representation varies. He proceeded to commend the group for a robust discussion on the modification of SGC.

c. Pamela Ralston promoted Deborah Wulff’s idea to focus on assessment. She added that the council is not to stay stagnant but to continue improving; that may mean adjusting the composition, revising the roles, etc.

dd. Cathleen Greiner proceeded to call for consensus on the following amended proposal:
The Task Force determined that the term “Shared Governance” for the Council is a misnomer. This Council does not determine issues of shared governance, such as what areas are in the Academic Senate’s purview, the President’s purview, the purview of CCFT, the purview of CCCUE, or the areas of concern for Management Senate. No, the role and functions of this Council are limited to the following:

Role/Functions of the College Council (formerly the Shared Governance Council)

1. College-wide issues
   a. College-wide issues will be reported by college-wide committees as needed or as requested.
   b. College-wide committees will prepare proposals for the council to address, when needed or requested.

2. College-wide committee reporting council
   a. New college-wide committees are approved at College Council
   b. Revisions to existing college-wide committees are approved at College Council

3. Faculty Hiring Prioritization
   Specifics: Annually, all ranking for possible new faculty positions is determined by a faculty hiring prioritization process whereby all disciplines identify and report quantitative and qualitative data to justify their new faculty position request and whereby ranking occurs after each discipline defends their request.

   New Proposal: Faculty Hiring Prioritization Subcommittee -- To conduct the faculty hiring prioritization process, the College Council will convene an annual subcommittee composed of all deans, all academic directors, all division chairs, the Academic Senate President or designate, and the CCFT President or designate. This subcommittee will meet twice, or three times if necessary, in the Fall semester and it is the primary decision-maker for the process and ranking of faculty hiring prioritization.

4. New Instructional Program Development
   Specifics: New instructional programs will be developed and approved at the College Council. The College Council recommends new instructional programs to Planning and Budget for financial viability and to the Superintendent/President.

   Note: the process (i.e., guidelines, criteria, documentation) of instructional program development is the purview and responsibility of the Academic Senate. The College Council should always utilize the Academic Senate-approved process for this activity.

5. Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance Policy
   Specifics: Proposals for Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance will be reviewed by the College Council for approval

   Note: the process (i.e., guidelines, criteria, documentation) for Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance is the purview and responsibility of the Academic Senate in consultation with the collective bargaining agent due to its focus on instructional programs. The College Council should always utilize the Academic Senate-approved process for this activity.
**Summary Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy and Procedure</th>
<th>Responsible for Policy and Procedure</th>
<th>Responsible for Implementation of Policy and Procedure</th>
<th>Responsible for Final Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College-wide issues, committee reports and proposals</td>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Superintendent/President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Hiring Prioritization</td>
<td>Academic Senate (Ed Code)</td>
<td>The Faculty Hiring Prioritization Subcommittee of the College Council</td>
<td>Superintendent/President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Instructional Program Development</td>
<td>Academic Senate (Title 5 and BP 2305: Mutual Agreement)</td>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Superintendent/President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance Policy for Instructional Programs</td>
<td>Academic Senate in consultation with CCFT (Title 5 and BP 2305: Mutual Agreement)</td>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Superintendent/President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Non-Instructional Program Development</td>
<td>Superintendent/President and Cabinet</td>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Superintendent/President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance Policy for Non-Instructional Programs</td>
<td>Superintendent/President and Cabinet</td>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Superintendent/President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composition of the College Council (formerly the Shared Governance Council)**
Superintendent/President, Ex-Officio, non-voting
Vice President of Administrative Services, Ex-Officio, non-voting
Vice President of Academic Affairs, Co-Chair
Vice President of Student Services
Executive Dean for NC and SC Centers
3 Deans of Academic Affairs
5 Academic Senate-appointed faculty members (one of which will serve as College Council Co-chair; three of whom are Division Chairs, one from each cluster; one of whom is a service faculty member; one of whom is a NC faculty member).
1 Academic Senate President or designate
1 CCFT President or designate
1 CCCUE-appointed Classified employees
1 ASCC Student Representative
1 Management Senate appointment
1 Student Services Director
Total: 17 voting members; 2 ex-officio, non-voting members

Due to the limited role and functions of the Council, the Task Force agreed that the College Council, as proposed, should be limited in numbers and be composed of the primary shareholders as recommended by the Lay/Lieu Recommendation Report on Participatory Governance.
CALL FOR CONSENSUS—SEQUENCE OF CALLS

CALL #1 on proposal (as written above)—CONSENSUS NOT REACHED

   Red cards: 1

   Reason/Concern: Composition of the new College Council: CCCUE should have at least two representatives. CCCUE is a large group. The notion that one representative will be able to touch base with all members is not feasible.

Moment of Reflection

CALL #2 on proposal (as written above)—CONSENSUS NOT REACHED

   Red cards: 1

   Reason/Concern: SAME AS ABOVE: Composition of the new College Council. CCCUE should have at least two representatives. CCCUE is a large group. The notion that one representative will be able to touch base with all members is not feasible.

Modified Proposal: 2 CCCUE representatives; slot for one service faculty is given to one Student Services Director

CALL #1 on modified proposal: 2 CCCUE representatives; slot for one service faculty is given to one Student Services Director—CONSENSUS NOT REACHED

   Red cards: 12

   Reason/Concern: The proportionality argument should not be considered here. The composition should be established based on function.

Moment of Reflection

CALL #2 on a modified proposal: 2 CCCUE representatives; slot for one service faculty is given to one Student Services Director—CONSENSUS NOT REACHED

   Red cards: 12

   Reason/Concern: The proportionality argument should not be considered here. The composition should be established based on function.

CONSENSUS NOT REACHED— CO-CHAIRS MOVED TO VOTE (ON ORIGINAL PROPOSAL, AS WRITTEN (ABOVE) IN THESE MINUTES).

Vote results:

   Yes: 24
   No: 3
   Abstained: 1

FINAL RESULT: PROPOSAL APPROVED BY MAJORITY VOTE AS WRITTEN (ABOVE) IN THESE MINUTES.

AGENDA ITEM III: SAFETY COMMITTEE PROPOSAL TO CHANGE DESCRIPTION AND COMPOSITION

a. Terry Reece introduced this agenda item: On March 9, 2010, the Safety Committee presented a proposal to change its description and composition. SGC members
tabled the proposal and requested that the committee come back with a more focused description and composition. The Safety Committee took SGC’s considerations and feedback into account and is bringing a new proposal for change in its description and composition.

b. Kathy Jimison shared with SGC that she, Terry Reece, Deborah Wulff, and Cathleen Greiner met to discuss the tasks and composition of the safety committee. Her main concern was that the committee tasks did not seem to address the safety rules and regulations for instructional employees at the college. At that meeting, there was lengthy discussion regarding the need for this committee’s tasks and composition to reflect that it addresses meeting federal and state legal requirements for safety training, hazardous materials training, etc. The tasks and composition that the Safety Committee is bringing once again to SGC for approval still do not reflect these changes. The changes that are being presented are only changes in wording that state that the committee will assist, not necessarily oversee or direct, safety trainings. Also, the changes in the composition do not reflect representation from instructional areas directly impacted by these issues. She requested clarification on whether the proposal was an interim fix or an assertion that the Safety Committee would be addressing all but instructional employees’ needs for safety training, etc. She concluded her comment stating that the current proposal does not address any of the concerns she expressed at the last SGC meeting (3-9-2010).

c. Terry Reece clarified that there is provision for the district to be fully involved in all employees’ need for training. This provision is given through the membership of the district’s safety officer in the Safety Committee. The safety officer is in charge of instructional safety and all other safety—this is the Director of Public Safety. This person should bring the concerns of the instructional units to the Safety Committee.

d. Cathleen Greiner stated that Terry Reece shared that our college is out of compliance with many safety regulations. This is very serious. She requested an explanation of what the plan of the Safety Committee is to address this issue.

e. Terry Reece responded that the lack of the Public Safety Director has been a shortfall. This needs to be addressed first. The Safety Committee is not responsible for doing the director’s job. They support him/her, but he/she have to initiative the activities to correct the safety deficiencies.

f. Steve Leone agreed with Kathy Jimison and supported her concerns. He recommended that the Safety Committee keep the old description language, which would work just fine to describe the Safety Committee’s scope of service.

g. Terry Reece stated that Steve Leone’s suggestion is viable. However, the committee needs to correct the composition so that it reflects who is actually serving on the committee at the moment. As far as the description goes, the committee also needs to make it more current.

h. Deborah Wulff would like see more faculty representation added to the committee; specifically, faculty from divisions with safety concerns (art, human development, etc., engineering, etc.).

i. Terry Reece shared that the committee is open to anyone who would like to participate in it; in fact, the committee expects people affected by safety issues to attend their meetings. The committee has done outreach to inform people of this expectation and tries to keep up with sending communications about safety to the campus community.

j. Kathy Jimison asked if the role of the Safety Committee is to supervise and oversee all of the safety on campus or is it primarily for the non-instructional areas.

k. Terry Reece answered Kathy Jimison’s question by clarifying that the committee addresses issues that are not directly related to human resources. However, the committee does encompass general safety but not program-specific safety (what happens in a chemistry lab, for example). Instructional-specific safety training is not the purview of the Safety Committee.

NO ACTION TAKEN—DISCUSSION ENDED DUE TO ADJOURNMENT—PROPOSAL TABLED

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting of the Shared Governance Council will be held on May 11, 2010, from 1:45 p.m. to 3:45 p.m., in room 5402.