

SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL – MINUTES

CO-CHAIRS: HARRY SCHADE & MICHELE MCAUSTIN

MARCH 13, 2007

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|---|-------------------------|---|----------------|---|-----------------------|
| X | Akelian, Chris | X | Gold, Randy | X | Morgan, Jane | X | Schwab, Patrick |
| X | Amyx, Guyla | X | Jimison, Kathy | X | Muñoz, Cande | X | Stone, George |
| X | Barclay, Judy | | Maduli, Ed | X | Norton, Don | X | Sutter, Ralph |
| | Bennie, Roanna | X | Mariucci, Bob | X | Parker, Mary | | |
| X | Chacón, Dan | X | McAustin, Michele | X | Peachey, Pam | | ASCC President – |
| X | Conklin, Ed | X | McLaughlin, Sandee | | Rehm, Walt | | ASCC Vice President – |
| X | Curiel, Franky | | Medina-Maloney, Delfina | X | Rossa, Marilyn | | ASCC Secretary – |
| X | Davies, Anna | X | Merzon, Allison | X | Ruppert, Ron | | Guests: |
| | Dowell, Dave | | Mifsud, Lise | X | Schade, Harry | | |

MINUTES – FEBRUARY 27, 2007

The minutes of the February 27, 2007 meeting were approved as written.

FACULTY PRIORITIZATION AND HIRING PROCESS –

- 1) First, it is hereby proposed that Shared Governance Council confirm its commitment to automatically replacing retirees and resignations during the ensuing hiring cycle, providing the programs in question are “viable” and budgets permit. (Please see SGC minutes from 2/26/02 and 2/25/03.) In the rare case that a discipline/program is no longer viable, the respective Cluster Dean, in consultation with the appropriate parties, will report the matter to SGC.
- 2) Second, it is hereby proposed that, under normal circumstances, we will have a two-tiered priority list for determining those positions to be hired in the next cycle. The first tier is retiree/resignations; the second is the list of new positions for which chairs and managers wish to advocate. When we believe an emergency situation requires us to 1) alter the order of first-tier priorities or 2) move a second-tier request to the first tier, the respective Chair/Manager and Cluster Dean will make that proposal to SGC at the appropriate time. Any such reordering of our priorities will be made only after SGC has reached consensus on that specific proposal.
- 3) Third, it is hereby proposed that when the backlog of retirees or resignations becomes too great in number for us to replace them all in the next hiring cycle, the positions vacated the longest will be highest on our first-tier priority list. Also, when the backlog is too large to fund the entire group, no discipline will receive more than one position until all others have received their first position. Those first-tier positions not funded in a given year will automatically be at the top of our first-tier priorities the following year. (Again, any desire to alter this first-tier priority list, at any time, must come to SGC as a proposal, and no change will be made unless we reach consensus on the matter.)

- E. Conklin reminded us that this is not a new idea; rather, it is a reaffirmation of decisions made by this group several years ago.
- The purpose for automatically replacing retirees and resignations was to provide a sense of equity and fairness among all divisions, both large and small.
 - Several years ago, we put together an ad hoc committee to decide how to prioritize second-tier positions so that everyone had an equal and fair opportunity to compete for their positions.
 - E. Conklin is proposing that we return to what we have already agreed to do.
 - Processes and decisions were overruled by the past president and her Personnel Committee, which has been disbanded.
 - Since authority rests with the deans, A. Davies requested a definition of the word “viable.”
 - Replacing retirees is budget positive. Budget should never be a reason not to replace a position unless we are in a deep budget crisis.

MARCH 13, 2007

- “Viability” means that the deans have the prerogative and responsibility to do the exploration, talk to people, collect information, etc., to decide whether the program is of value to the campus and needs the position, or is a sinking, declining program. In very rare instances, programs may no longer be appropriate or needed in today’s society, and students are not interested in enrolling in them.
- M. Parker opposed use of the word “automatic.” Nothing should be automatic in today’s ever-changing environment. The clusters are the people best suited to determine whether or not a specific position is really needed or whether a new and different position would be of greater value.
- The purpose of the proposal is to keep a program from going backwards. We should not have to fight for what we once had.
- The intention of the proposal was never to be inflexible. Perhaps the proposal should be amended to provide for greater flexibility.
- M. Rossa is opposed to running programs with ever-increasing numbers of part-time faculty. The full-time faculty in the divisions are overloaded because of administrative duties, evaluations, etc. The integrity of the programs is maintained through the full-time faculty.
- H. Schade noted that, since 2001, we have replaced 2/3 of the retirees and resignations. The other 1/3 have been new positions or converging of positions. That seems to be a good track record, plus it has allowed flexibility for new program development and expansion of programs that do not have enough faculty to service the growth.
- Developing a timeline and rethinking the prioritization criteria will also be the task of the SGC.
- P. Peachey noted that, besides worrying about retirement, the Nursing Department has grown so much that their program needs are huge now compared to what they were five years ago. She is very concerned about new programs with no full-time backup.
- H. Schade suggested a possible compromise. Perhaps a percentage of hires could be allocated to retirements and resignations, with a smaller percentage for new hires.
- M. Rossa pointed out that the overall faculty salary base has eroded over the years. For example, if ten faculty retire and only six are hired, the remaining funds are absorbed into the general fund.

Action:

E. Conklin withdrew the proposal. He encouraged everyone who has an idea or opinion on how the proposals should be rewritten to contact him. He will revise the proposals and present them at a future SGC meeting.

PROGRAM PLANNING AND REVIEW COMMITTEE

It is proposed that a Program Planning and Review Committee be formed as a sub-committee reporting to the Planning and Budget Committee. Membership would include faculty, staff, and administrators, and the primary purpose would be to oversee and assist in the Program Planning and Review reporting process. This committee would advise the Planning and Budget Committee on agenda items that address program needs. At a minimum, this committee will have as members: a dean, a student support manager, a part-time faculty member, a full-time faculty member, and a staff member. The Academic Senate President will serve as an ex officio member. The chair will be appointed once the committee is formed, and one member will serve as the representative to the Planning and Budget Committee.

A. Merzon introduced the proposal.

- This would be a permanent committee.
- This committee would provide assistance and oversight to the ongoing program planning process, as well as helping to align this process with the annual planning that we are asking the departments to do. Additionally, the committee would provide technical support to faculty who are working

MARCH 13, 2007

on their program reviews.

- This is an extension of the work that began 18 months ago as a result of the 2002 Accreditation Site Visit recommendation that we strengthen the tie between budget and program planning.
- The committee would also provide structure and oversight for Administrative Services and Student Support program reviews. Currently, the Academic Senate has been working on the instructional reviews; but a more broadly focused committee needs to be in place to assist the other two areas.
- M. Rossa stipulated that, if part-time faculty serve on this committee, they need to be paid to serve.
- The committee would provide constructive feedback and share ideas and information pertaining to other models that are being utilized.

Call for Consensus:

The proposal to appoint a Program Planning and Review Committee was approved.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Hiring Timeline – Need a proposal regarding late retirees and how we would evaluate those needs against the current prioritized faculty hiring list. Additionally, the SGC needs clarification on how many more faculty we can hire, if any.

Alternative Calendar – Allan Hancock College is delaying the implementation of a 16-week calendar with a 6-week January intersession until 2008-2009 because they also have an antiquated computer system. This gives us more time to explore the possible impact on Cuesta College.

Communication Regarding Grants – Some grants, which could impact multiple areas of the campus, are being written in a vacuum. How is this communicated to the appropriate departments?

NEXT MEETING

- The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.
- The next meeting of the Shared Governance Council will be held *Tuesday, March 27th, from 1:45-3:45 p.m. in Room 5402.* Agenda items and proposals are due ASAP!