College Council Meeting Minutes
February 27, 2012

Members Present:
Gari Browning
Tim Roberts
Alison Kuehner
Scott Thomason
Kathleen Schoenecker
Genie Gertz
Eddie West
Ralph DeUnamuno
Bruce Griffin
Shairon Zingsheim

Sally Scofield
Stephanie Pintello
Nandar Lin
Stephanie Ramos
Jason Trinidad
Leta Stagnaro*
Jim Wright*

Members Absent:
Joanne Schultz
Matt O’Donnell
Peggy Kauffman
Dave Schurtz
Ron Travenick
Tom Harchous

1. Approval of minutes
7th bullet point – listed as a CSEA question, came from Stephanie Ramos, and not Stephanie Pintello. 13th bullet - CSEA comment, unfortunately while that was true, it was Stephanie Pintello speaking on behalf of herself and not the rest of CSEA. Personal comment and not a reflection of the rest of CSEA.
Tim - we could approve the minutes with these changes?
Stephanie - We could list as Pintello instead of CSEA comment?
Tim - move approval of minutes as amended – moved by Kathleen, Sally seconded. Nandar Lin abstained.

2. CurricUNET Update
Steve Thyberg was here on Tuesday, February 21st. 19 people met with Steve. A lot of good discussion about how to work with the CNET program review module. There have been many glitches that we’re trying to deal with and resolve and as a result of this meeting, some of the things that haven’t been done have been done. There’s been losses of information, there’s several different causes – determined some of the issues and working to resolve it. Also, if you finish a page and it doesn’t finish for you and it goes back to the Home page, it will have a note “Do you want to save?” and it will allow you to save all the information you put in.
Description and scope page - There haven’t been many problems at all with this page. This is essentially the same as the last program reviews.
The college mission page is similar to what we’ve had in the past, although it’s a little more detailed. In this page is the college mission statement, the vision statement and the core values. People are supposed to select in each of the programs which core values their program supports and then write how they support them. The other is the college goals, and when you select a goal, all the college objectives come up and you select which objectives your program relates to. Then you have to write a separate area about how your program supports the college goals and another separate area about how your program supports the college objectives.
Program SLO and assessment page - This is instructional area, the non-instructional is student impacts. The main mission of the college is for student learning and student success. Each of the instructional programs, they write what they expect the students to get out of the program when they finish the program. For the other areas, like in
Administrative Services, they write “how does what we do in our area impact students?” They have student learning impacts. All of these need to be assessed.

**SLO matrix** - only in instructional area. There’s a matrix with each of the courses and how they relate to the program outcome. Course outlines are available

SLO assessment – Take each course and the SLOs related to that course and describe how to assess it. The course SLOs get aligned with the program SLOs through that SLO matrix, when you’re assessing courses, then you can also assess your program SLOs, and if they’re in GE you can assess those as well. The non-instructional areas don’t have the SLO matrix or SLO assessment pages.

The **student achievement area**, in program non-instructional areas it is called program achievement. These are the things related to Mike Bowman’s Ohlone website.

One of the issues is that it’s difficult to go to the website, get these (program reviews??), download and attach them. If we at Ohlone send these flat files from Datatel, it could be incorporated within the CurricUNET database. Then we won't need to be downloading and then uploading it again. We’re hoping to have that change and ready to go live in June 2012.

The **Program Analysis** area – Part of what this is about is when you’re doing, when instructional areas are assessing program and course student learning outcomes and student achievement, they’re going to say what’s working really well, what are the achievements and successes for that year, and what do we need to improve on? For non-instructional areas, what are the student impacts, what are the achievements, what do we want to improve on? From there it will go to the PIO.

The **PIO page** is a very, very long page. This is where we’ve had the most amount of loss of information. Part of it is the way the page is set up. When you want to add you'll press "add", and you want to edit you’ll just come back and hit the pencil edit. There will be a separate spreadsheet just related to the resources and one related to the PIO action plan, assessment plan, and college goals and objectives.

Question, Kathleen S. - PIO reporting tool is not part of CurricUNET, was there any discussion of that being built into CurricUNET? The formatting of the tool has been improved. When Bruce Griffin and I had a conference call with one of the programmers, the VP of technology over there, we talked about that. When S. Thyberg came we had further discussions, and that’s why we’re thinking of maybe pulling out the resources. Academic year shows up in the description and scope, but academic year does not show up when you’re sorting by search. Label not by the date that it’s copied over but the date that it’s actually reviewed, the academic year. And then the PIO reporting tool will be by academic year as well. If we pull out the resources and we reformat that a little bit, and they can be connected. PIOs will all be time-stamped. If I started in Spring 2009, and I’m also updating this year, how do you know if the PIO was written two years ago? We’re going to work on making changes in the development module, not the live module, and hopefully go live in June. The feedback that everyone gave was very cordial and professional. There’s a lot they need to do.

The **PIO assessment page**- if I have a PIO that I wrote from two years ago, I should be putting an assessment in.

When I look at my PIOs for this year, I’m going to look at what I wrote in that program analysis page, I’m also going to look at what I did for my PIO assessment.

**Outside Review Results page** - This has been on hold for a while now.

**Attach Files** – This has been an excellent vehicle to put assessments in. One could say "see attachment" or refer to a link.

We’re making a lot of progress, and I really appreciate the 19 people who participated last Tuesday, it was important for Steve Thyberg to see and hear what is going on on campus. It was a very productive meeting.
3. Council By-Laws Amendment
Tim - did we cover the points up to Article 4? Yes, these change were okay with everyone.
S. Pintello – If we could look at Article 3, Membership – there was a discussion among CSEA chapter that for classified staff members . . .
Kathleen – IT’s not pertaining to the by-law changes, but CSEA has had some concern at the number of classified representatives on college council. It’s not necessarily germane to today’s discussion, but we may want to reexamine the makeup of college council to better provide a voice for classified employees. Pertaining to the by-laws discussion, in Article 4 – there’s a great deal of concern from CSEA about limiting the co-chair position to just faculty, because regardless of the intent was, the changes perceived by CSEA as an attack on our ability to participate in shared governance and that by not allowing us to be a co-chair, that we would not have as equal a position on the council as other constituent groups. I know that the changes don’t just exclude classified. CSEA would object to limiting the co-chair position to just a faculty member.
Tim - Any discussion from other members?
S. Ramos – When talking with my peers, it was an interesting conversation - what does CC do? We Discuss all issues of the college, not just faculty issues. They felt like then maybe it shouldn’t be exclusionary, they didn’t have any questions for me to bring back though.
Tim – Any other feedback on Article 3 or Article 4?
A. Kuehner – I’d like to ask the Faculty Senate president’s opinion.
J. O’Connell – We do have faculty senate to deal with faculty issues. I do, without any disrespect intended, feel like as an academic institution, it makes sense that the co-chair of the college council is a faculty member. The fact that it is being interpreted as limiting or diminishing the role of any other member of the campus community, I don’t see that. I am definitely in favor of the co-chair being a faculty member. (That’s my two cents)
Tim- Does CSEA think that their voice hasn’t been heard on college council?
Kathleen - I think that CSEA has some concerns that we don’t have enough of a say on college council.
Stephanie P. - That there’s not equitable representation.
Tim – Equitable, meaning equal? Is it supposed to be equal?
Kathleen – CSEA believes that certain provisions of Ed Code, Section 70901 highlights the importance of classified staff in their role in shared governance, and that CSEA believes that classified staff should have an equal representation in shared governance to faculty.
Tim – That part of Ed Code, does that have a percentage?
Kathleen – It does not.
Tim – Does it say equal?
Stephanie P. read this section 70901 of Ed Code.
Kathleen – CSEA also had some concerns that most other colleges have college councils that are chaired by faculty members. There are also other colleges including those in the Bay 10 that also have classified representation. Foothill College has three chairs, the president, faculty senate president, and classified senate president. And so, the idea that, as Stephanie Ramos pointed, out while AB 1725 points to the importance of faculty, as it pertains to academic and professional matters, the discussions at college council are not always faculty-centric and curriculum-centric such that expertise of faculty is required. We also believe that classified would be just as qualified.
Mike B. – The classified representative at Foothill is also the president of classified senate.
Alison K - I do understand that we have the areas where faculty, staff and students are supposed to participate in shared governance, and the language for faculty is consult collegially, or mutually agreed. I understand and it even says in the bylaws that it’s the academic senate by which we tend to make those decisions. For instance, that’s why the Curriculum Committee chair is a faculty member. I also have questions about College Council, as it does seem to have a broader scope that maybe this is the appropriate place for other constituent groups to have more input in making decisions and more participation if that means allowing classified to be co-chair or not excluding them from being co-chair perhaps that is appropriate – there are areas where students and staff are given the opportunity to participate.
Gari – I believe it says any issue that has an impact on students or staff they’d be given an opportunity for input and that every consideration be given for that input. It doesn’t limit it to the “10+1”, those are academic.

Alison – In those areas we have vehicles for faculty to either mutually agree, curriculum committee, planning, program review. There are some areas where we have committees on campus that are dealing with specifics – budget, planning, curriculum.

Gari – Curriculum is a sub-committee of the faculty senate.

Jeff O’Connell listed the “10+1” from Title 5.

The language of mutually agreed primarily are negotiated district-by-district at the beginning of each college. At Ohlone, “rely primarily” are #1 and #3, those that administration is supposed to rely primarily on the judgment of the faculty, the other “8+1” are mutually agreed upon.

Alison - Those are specific issues of the faculty, but college council is a broader area. It seems like this is a place where everyone makes decisions together.

Tim – That is what we’ve been doing.

Deb - I agree that this is the place where everyone works together and everyone has their voices heard. When the list was read, there were three major areas - accreditation, program review, and planning. That’s what’s this committee is about, strategic planning. It's looking at the college role, mission, values, goals and objectives, and how the programs fit into it. The majority of the programs are instructional. Everyone has a say and everyone has a really important place, but when we look at the “10+1”, three of those areas are directly related to what happens at this college. Coming up with accreditation, the co-chair will help put the accreditation report together. Standard II is related to instruction, and programs review throughout it all. Everyone’s voice is important, and we need to hear everyone’s voice.

Jason - two questions. One on Article 3, and one whether the co-chair will be faculty or not. What's the role of the co-chair? Does being co-chair make that certain body, say a student, more represented than faculty, by virtue of being the co-chair? If that is not the case, we can go back to the membership question and address the issue of representation. If the answer to whether the co-chair gives faculty more weight in representation, or students more weight should they be co-chair, if that is yes, then I think there’s an argument. If the answer is no, there is no argument of advantage, then we should move to the question of membership and that’s where the issue of being equitable could be addressed. I think everyone here agrees that being a voice and talking, everyone is heard. We really have to examine what does it mean to be co-chair, and if there is in fact more weight for that body being co-chair. I think it’s no.

Kevin - Students have our “9+1”, There are some districts, like Contra Costa, where their district governance council is equal, they have eight administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The students have a chance to be a co-chair, the option is nice. If we are talking about equality, in terms of college council, students should also have a chance to be represented equally. If you look at the membership again, I think that all four groups should be equal in terms of representation.

Kathleen - CSEA does agree with that. There should be equal representation between all four constituent groups.

Tim - Any other comments?

Jackie Whitehouse - I did research over the weekend. Of 12 different colleges in the Bay Area, 4 have classified and faculty as co-chairs, 3 have faculty only, 3 have president, and a few say "within the group". In some of the colleges, they find that classified work as well as co-chairs as faculty do. In all these cases, except one, the apportionment is equal across the board. If we're looking at what happens in this area of California, it's fairly evenly distributed.

Mike B. – I came up with the same number of colleges that had classified co-chairs. I only found two colleges where the representation was equal, Los Medanos and Foothill. Otherwise, they vary – not by a lot. In 60% of the cases, the presidents were the chair, or one of the co-chairs. Faculty were chair or c-chair 30%, classified 20%, other administration 15%, and 10% had no chair, either facilitators or taking turns. Most of them, classified had representation from classified senate (3/4 of them).

Tim - Which we don't have. And let me clarify that classified is referring to both SEIU and CSEA.

Jason - It is my opinion that there should be equal representation. I like hearing about what other colleges are doing, but it doesn’t address our questions. Just because there’s equal representation doesn’t necessarily mean that there’s equal opportunity. We could look at what other colleges are doing, it will only get us so far. I think everyone here
has an opportunity to speak, that's just the culture of Ohlone. We have to have a dialogue now. What does it mean for Ohlone College?

Linda Evers - When the college council was started, I was on the original group and served for several years as president of CSEA and CSEA representative. I’ve watched for several years, although co-chair is a very visible role I don’t believe that it needs to be limited to a faculty position because the goal of this body is to allow all the constituency groups at the college to have some point of discussion. Although the classified staff do not have a delineated list of “10+1” items that they are to be consulted on - with the possible exception of two, all others are concerns that affect our working conditions and are opportunities for discussion. I believe the co-chair could come from any constituency group on campus.

Tim - Are there things we can approve? When we get to Article 3 and 4 we could approve line by line.

Alison - We’ve heard some alternative ideas, the membership numbers, having three chairs instead of two. We have one option that we do have to vote up or down, but some of these ideas have just come up today, do we want to think more about them? I would like to hear what other people have to say.

Kathleen - I would like to say that perhaps the recommendation is that CSEA would support approving all by-laws changes except the co-chair change in Article 4. Perhaps we can take up the discussion of the membership of the council at a later time, but for now, we could vote on all the by-laws except the part on Article 4 relating to the co-chair.

Jason – Would Article 3 be re-visited if everything else would be approved except Article 4?

Tim - If someone presented language, it certainly could be an agenda item. Ask – is this broken? Each of the colleges has their own choice in terms of how they put together their shared governance groups, to make sure everyone has a voice. I haven't heard that everybody doesn't have a voice.

Kathleen moved that we approve changes to articles 2, 3 and 5, leaving article 4 as it was before the revisions. Alison seconded. Opposed? No. Abstentions? No.

Mike B. - Was the motion that we're done talking about article 4?

Tim - We approved the changes to Articles 2, 3 and 5, but not the changes to #4. Clarification – we will leave Article #4 as is for now.

4. Board update

In the next few weeks, the board will be very busy. There will a workshop on the DFMP on Feb. 29th, it will be an opportunity for them to talk about the DFMP. The second part of the workshop will be on the frontage property.

We have a draft of an RFP that is ready to go to the business community.

March 7th - special meeting on the SSTF recommendations.

March 14th, regular meeting

March 28th - joint workshop with Newark USD, accreditation

April 11th - regular board meeting

April 18th - workshop on Measure G delivery methods, how we set up construction work in April, the board will do a 1st reading on the DFMP, for final approval in May.

5. Accreditation Process

Jim Wright has asked this item to be postponed until the next college council meeting. Two years from now we will be preparing for our site visit. We need to give the team our self-study report at the end of our fall 2013 semester, in order to have that ready to go, our board needs to approve it by then. We have to have the self study done before the fall of 2013. Thinking about it now is not too soon. All groups of the college need to be involved. The CC, last time, and we’re proposing this time, will serve as the steering committee for the self-study. The CC are the key players of the self-study process. Hopefully at the next CC meeting we will more of an in-depth view of the plan.

6. Future Topics

- Facilities about the DFMP
- Jim - accreditation

Adjourned at 4:13 pm.