

2008-2009 CUESTA COLLEGE SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2009 - ROOM 5402 - 1:45-3:45 P.M.

MINUTES

CO-CHAIRS: DR. CATHLEEN GREINER & DON NORTON

✓	Allison Merzon	✓	Dennis Baeyen	✓	Kathy Jimison	✓	Ralph Sutter
✗	ASCC President	✗	Don Norton	✓	Linda Fontanilla	✓	Randy Gold
✓	Beth-Ann Dumas	✗	Douglas Pillsbury	✓	Marcia Scott	✓	Robert Mariucci
✓	Bret Clark	✓	Franky Curiel	✓	Marie Larsen	✓	Ron Ruppert
✗	Cande Munoz	✓	Guyla Amyx	✓	Mark Stengel	✗	Sandee McLaughlin
✓	Cathleen Greiner	✓	Jennifer Martin	✓	Matthew Green	✓	Steve Leone
✓	Chris Akelian	✗	Joel Carlson	✓	Pam Peachy	✓	Virginia Findley
✓	Dave Pelham	✓	John Fetcho	✓	Pamela Ralston	✓	Walt Rehm
✓	Deborah Wulff	✓	Joy Chambers	✓	Patrick Schwab		

Co-Chair Cathleen Greiner called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m.

Approval of minutes from February 10, 2009

The minutes from the February 10, 2009, Shared Governance Council meeting were approved as amended in item III (1) – word change: ~~equal~~ adjusted

AGENDA ITEM I—FOURTH READING OF THE NEW PROGRAM APPROVAL TEMPLATE

- a. **Deborah Wulff** began the discussion by explaining that Shared Governance appointed a group to meet with the Vice President of Administrative Services in order to discuss possible strategies for securing funds for new programs. The group held its meeting on February 26 and modified the template. Also, a piece (worksheet) was added, which might address the issue of securing funds.
- b. **Steve Leone** requested clarification on steps I and II of the template and asked for clarification on why courses would be approved by the curriculum committee before the program itself was approved.
- c. **Deborah Wulff** clarified that that courses did not necessarily have to be approved prior to the program being approved. Courses could be approved simultaneously.
- d. **Kathy Jimison** shared that she thought the reason of the steps is because programs are usually based on existing courses. She expressed that it is important to maintain the ability to use existing coursework to build new programs.
- e. Regarding the Endorsement Worksheet, **Patrick Schwab** requested that all funding sources be included in the worksheet that goes to Planning and Budget.
- f. **Steve Leone** pointed the group’s attention to step I again. With the advice of Kevin Bontenbal, Curriculum Committee Chair, Steve asked that the template be amended so that the Curriculum Committee does not approve additional coursework (additional meaning coursework other than the existing coursework) before the program itself is at least pre-approved by the Shared Governance Council.
- g. **Bret Clark** suggested that in order to accommodate Steve’s request, step II be moved down to step IV, since it does not seem to be important to have curriculum approval before it goes to Planning and Budget. In step I, SGC will have already pre-approved the program, so moving step II to IV

would address the issue.

- h. **Allison Merzon** added that what is important is to have the cost analysis be the first piece of the process. People would still be able to use existing coursework. She also added that the review/viability piece should be linked to Cuesta's program review cycles. She requested that the template be amended to sync with the 2-year cycle for vocational programs or the 5-year cycle for comprehensive programs.
- i. Regarding the Endorsement Worksheet, **Marie Larsen** suggested that instead of listing all categorical programs, a line be added and the requester be prompted to fill in the blank with the respective categorical. The advantage with this is that if a new categorical fund is created, the template does not need to be amended.

As a result, consensus was reached unanimously on approving the New Program Approval Template as amended.

AGENDA ITEM II—STRATEGIC PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE

- a. **Dave Pelham** distributed copies of the final document produced by the college subcommittee that worked on Cuesta's Vision, Mission, and Values. He explained that the subcommittee began its work in the fall and has been working on this task since then. Several surveys were sent out to the college community so that everyone would have a chance to weigh in on the content and quality of the proposed mission, vision, and values. A final survey was sent and the feedback was incorporated into this final product. Scores of community approval were all above 4, which is quite good for this type of process. If SGC and the Board of Trustees approve this document, the next step will be to work with advancement so that these "drivers" are presented in a way that impact every corner of the college and the community that has contact with the college.
- b. **Marie Larsen** clarified that because of the incredible amount of feedback received from Cuesta's stakeholders regarding the line that reads, "Cuesta College is a community dedicated to...", the subcommittee decided to amend that sentence of the vision to read "Cuesta is dedicated to..."
- c. **Beth-Ann Dumas** asked what the next steps are for the completion of the strategic plan.
- d. **Dave Pelham** stated that if the mission, vision, and values are approved, then in the fall, focused groups will begin developing strategic goals that will guide the institution in pursuing these three components. The process will be very similar to what it was with the mission, vision, and values.

Consensus was reached unanimously on approving Cuesta's new vision, mission, and values.

AGENDA ITEM III—PROGRAM ELIMINATION PROCESS: DENTAL HYGIENE

- a. **Deborah Wulff** provided context to the committee by sharing that in 2002-2004, the Academic Senate developed a process for program elimination. In May 2004, the President/Superintendent approved the document, but it has never been implemented. In a meeting of Steve Leone and Deborah Wulff, the document was discussed in detailed and an agreement was reached to conduct a beta test of the document by using to eliminate the Dental Hygiene Program. Deborah provided evidence and data in support of the need to eliminate this program. She added that a taskforce from the Academic Senate has been appointed to assess the process after the elimination of the program has been approved.
- b. **Kathy Jimison** requested clarification on the task of the Shared Governance over this proposal. She asked two questions: 1) was the task of SGC to assess the process? 2) Or was the task of SGC to eliminate the Dental Hygiene program?
- c. **Deborah Wulff** clarified that the task of SGC was to approve the elimination of the Dental Hygiene Program. The assessment of the process is the purview of the Academic Senate and its appointed taskforce.
- d. **Allison Merzon** stated that the reason why the Program Discontinuance Policy was never implemented is because that policy is tied to layoffs of

faculty. Program elimination, however, is different. She expressed that there is a need to clarify what the process is that SGC is conducting. Also, she shared her concern with the current process not mentioning what happens to full-time or part-time faculty embedded in a program is going away—such piece should be linked to the Cuesta College Bargaining Agreement, Article 6.

- e. **Joy Chambers** stated that it might help to make a clear distinction between active and inactive programs.
- f. **Steve Leone** agreed with Allison Merzon in that there needs to be a distinction between discontinuance and elimination. This terminology can be clarified by the taskforce. However, for clarification, he added that the document that was approved by the Academic Senate clearly states its purpose: discontinuance.
- g. **Bret Clark** suggested that the Academic Senate taskforce that will work on assessing the process consider adding a column titled “Impact to current faculty.”
- h. **Deborah Wulff** requested that all suggestions be forwarded to Steve Leone so that the taskforce can take them into account. She proceeded to call for consensus on approving the discontinuance of the Dental Hygiene Program.
- i. **Allison Merzon** red-carded the proposal and blocked consensus. She expressed that rushing into the process only because we are trying to comply with a recommendation is not wise. Instead, she suggested that time be taken by the Academic Senate’s taskforce to revise the process, add the proposed changes, and have a good, comprehensive, viable process.
- j. **Deborah Wulff** clarified that the taskforce would initiate work immediately in order to achieve that purpose. Not approving the discontinuance of this program as soon as possible would continue to be a disservice to our students.
- k. **Allison Merzon** expressed that it was not made clear that the Academic Senate taskforce would begin to work immediately. It was her understanding that the Academic Senate taskforce would begin to work on this process in the fall, which is why she blocked consensus. However, having heard the clarification, she proceeded to retrieve her red card and moved to approve the proposal to discontinue the Dental Hygiene Program.

As a result, during a second call, consensus was reached to approve the discontinuance of the Dental Hygiene Program.

AGENDA ITEM IV—EXPAND YOUR HORIZONS COMMITTEE

- a. **Deborah Wulff** explained that Expand Your Horizons is a committee that does a great amount of work throughout the year. Their request is that their work be recognized as “official.”
- b. **Beth-Ann Dumas** asked is this committee would be recognized as a college-wide committee.
- c. **Kathy Jimison** stated that when Shared Governance Council approves a committee, generally a content page is attached. Since this is the process established by SGC, she recommended not approving this committee until the content page is brought to the group.
- d. **Steve Leone** agreed with Kathy Jimison and recommended that this request be tabled to the next meeting so that the members can bring a content page.
- e. **Allison Merzon** expressed that she was concerned with how SGC is imposing expectations on people without having been clear on what it wants. It is not fair to penalize a committee because SGC has not been able to formalize its processes. She requested that the committee not be held up because of a form and that SGC be flexible.
- f. **Beth-Ann Dumas** suggested that the Expand Your Horizons group be approved as a task force.

As a result, consensus was reached on recognizing Expand Your Horizons as a Task Force.

AGENDA ITEM V—CULTURAL DIVERSITY STUDENT EQUITY COMMITTEE

- a. **Catherine Cyr**, on behalf of Sandee McLaughlin, explained that the goal is to update the tasks of the committee and the committee composition, as presented in the attachment.
- b. **Steve Leone** added that the Academic Senate is in full support of these changes.

Consensus was reached to approve the changes to the Cultural Diversity Student Equity Committee

AGENDA ITEM VI—RESTRUCTURE PROPOSAL: COMPUTER AND NETWORK TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

- a. **Chris Akelian** explained that this proposal will work as a “merger.” The bottom line is that Alan Ross, full-time faculty member, would be reassigned from the Business Education Division to the Engineering and Technology Division. In the E&T Division, Alan would be part of the Computer and Network Technology Department. Chris Akelian would also be reassigned to this new department.
- b. **Kathy Jimison** requested clarification that this move would not entail the creation of a new program, just movement of courses.
- c. **Chris Akelian** clarified that this proposal was not for the creation of a new program, just the movement of courses.

As a result, consensus was reached to approve the reassignment of Alan Ross and Chris Akelian to the Department of Computer and Network Technology in the Engineering and Technology Division.

AGENDA ITEM VII—PLANNING AND BUDGET COMPOSITION

- a. **Kevin Bontenbal**, on behalf of Sandee McLaughlin, explained that this proposal came as a result of recommendation nine from the ACCJC. The commission recommended that the Board member be removed from the composition of the committee. This proposal, he clarified, would modify the composition of Planning and Budget by removing the Board member.
- b. **Allison Merzon** suggested that the proposal be amended to make the member ex-officio.
- c. **Pamela Ralston** asked if that change would satisfy the commission’s recommendation.
- d. **Dave Pelham** answered Pamela’s question and addressed Allison’s comment by stating that making the Board member ex-officio would not suffice. The Board of Trustees is supposed to appoint the Superintendent/President as the “implementer” of its policies. However, having a Board member in a committee under the purview of the Superintendent/President, though led by appointed co-chairs, contradicts what the Board is supposed to be doing.
- e. **Allison Merzon** stated that faculty members have concerns that Board members are not educated or informed enough about issues. The question is, then, how do we educate our Board members?
- f. **Dave Pelham** clarified that Board retreats are a good strategy to address that issue.
- g. **Allison Merzon** asked if the district would allow for faculty leaders to attend these retreats.
- h. **Dave Pelham** agreed and said that any retreats would be open to the campus to attend and talk to the Board.

- i. **Cathleen Greiner** called for consensus.

As a result, consensus was reached to approve the removal of a Board of Trustees member in the composition of Cuesta College's Planning and Budget Committee.

1 ORANGE CARD—NO BLOCK OF CONSENSUS—by Allison Merzon, who expressed her concern that retreats are not dialogues and, in her opinion, will not be as efficient in fostering communication between the faculty and the Board of Trustees.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL: NAME AND FUNCTION

Tabled to May 12, 2009 meeting.

AGENDA ITEM IX—ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

- a. **Steve Leone** explained that the Accreditation Steering Committee is seeking approval as a standing committee. This is a concept that has been kneaded throughout the self-study. It is also important for a college committee to be dedicated to assessing and tracking planning agendas completion, and gathering evidence.
- b. **Allison Merzon** requested that a faculty member be appointed by the CCFT, especially in light that some of the issues are evaluations and student learning outcomes.
- c. **Steve Leone** agreed to make the amendment to the composition by having 4 faculty members from the Academic Senate and 1 faculty member from CCFT.
- d. **Kathy Jimison** asked if the committee is made entirely of faculty.
- e. **Steve Leone** clarified that the committee would be made up of faculty and administrators. Ideally, the composition is half and half.
- f. **Cathleen Greiner** suggested amending the composition of the committee to reflect the following: Total of members: eight, including co-chairs (4 faculty; 4 administrators). Of the four faculty, one will be appointed by CCFT and three by the Academic Senate. The four administrators will include the Vice President of Student Learning and three more, appointed by the President and the Vice President of Student Learning.
- g. **Ralph Sutter** suggested that every four or six years, when building the self-study steering committee, the same members be considered as co-chairs for each standard. This will ensure that the expertise they acquire over the years of serving on the standing committee transfers over to the self-study.
- h. **Steve Leone** concurred.

Consensus was reached to approve the Accreditation Steering Committee as amended.

AGENDA ITEM X—COMMITTEE DEFINITIONS AND NOMENCLATURE

- a. **Steve Leone** explained that a group of Cathleen Greiner, Chris Castro, Beth-Ann Dumas, and himself worked on the wording and definition of the committees to better reflect their function. Allison and Peet Cocke had a chance to review the proposed language and provide input.
- b. **Beth-Ann Dumas** added that composition and function were the main drivers for determining the nomenclature.
- c. **Steve Leone** clarified that the new nomenclature does not imply that if a committee is, for example, an Academic Senate committee, it cannot

have members from other groups. In other words, the Sabbatical Leave Committee is an Academic Senate committee, but an administrator (VPSL) is an ex-officio member of that group.

As a result, consensus was reached unanimously to approve the new committee nomenclature as presented.

AGENDA ITEM XI—PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

Consensus was reached unanimously to approve the change to the appointment of faculty to the Planning and Budget Committee.

AGENDA ITEM XII—ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

- a. **Steve Leone** explained that after attending a Statewide Senate Plenary, he understood even more clearly that it is imperative to have faculty on the Enrollment Management Committee. His recommendation is to change the composition of the committee to include two faculty members, who are appointed by the Senate.
- b. **Linda Fontanilla** supported Steve Leone's proposal and agreed with the fact that it is important to have stakeholders that are affected by the decisions at the table; faculty are one of them.

As a result, consensus was reached to approve the addition of two faculty members to the composition of the Enrollment Management Committee.

AGENDA ITEM XIII—PROGRAM PLAN AND REVIEW COMMITTEE

Proposal **withdrawn** by Steve Leone.

AGENDA ITEM XIV—MAJOR GIFTS CAMPAIGN

Tabled to May 12, 2009 meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:52 p.m. by co-chair Cathleen Greiner

The next meeting of the Shared Governance council will be held in the fall (2009); meeting date TBD. 1:45 p.m. to 3:45 p.m., in room 5402.