

COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO

College Council Meeting Summary

College Council meetings are open to all members of the campus community

Meeting of Sept. 3, 2008

Members Present: Jeremy Ball, Diana Bennett, Mike Claire, Susan Estes, Maria Gershenovich, Fauzi Hamadeh, Jennifer Hughes, Kathy McEachron, Shawn McGriff, Roger Nishimoto, Eileen O'Brien, Robert Schwartz, Annie Theodos. Andreas Wolf, Richael Young

Review Meeting Agenda: Added two items: Community College Survey of Student Engagement (Ball) and Proposed Process for Evaluating Delineation of Functions (Wolf)

Review Meeting Summary of Aug. 20, 2008: No changes were made.

Orientation to College Council

Susan Estes provided background information about the history of shared governance in California community colleges and how CSM went about implementing the process in 1993. She explained that College Council works in an oversight capacity charged with ensuring that shared governance operates appropriately and that the recommendations that go to the college president have been subject to review and input from the four constituency groups. Jennifer Hughes described how College Council conducts its business, ground rules governing the meetings, the role of the facilitator and the participatory nature of the group. She explained that Council follows a consensus model, based on cooperation, inclusiveness and trust. Mike Claire discussed how President's Council, which includes President's Cabinet and a number of others that report to him, supports the college's decision making process. He delineated the roles of the two councils and reiterated that College Council has a well-defined role in shared governance.

Planning Documents

A draft of the Educational Master Plan (EMP) was distributed. Jennifer indicated that there would be opportunity for input; it would be posted on the internal website and there will be an all-college meeting on 9/4 to seek comment and input by the deadline of 9/12. Council members were encouraged to share the plan with constituency groups. She provided an overview of the contents of the plan and asked Council to pay close attention to the planning assumptions as they will form the basis for important future discussions. She reminded Council that one of the accreditation recommendations is to complete the EMP by the October 15 deadline. Although its development has been an accelerated process, the draft is open for discussion, and after revisions and additional information has been included and analyzed, a second version will be produced. An oral report of the EMP will be presented to the Board on 9/10 and submitted with the Accreditation Follow Up Report.

Regarding the division work plans, Andreas reported that they are not ready for review but would be brought to the 9/17 meeting. He reminded Council that division work plans are the outgrowth of the strategic plan and that each division will develop an annual plan and identify action items that address the strategic plan.

Susan presented a draft of the Accreditation Follow Up Report that addresses the accreditation recommendations due the commission by October 15. She encouraged council members to share this draft with their respective constituents but emphasized that it was not ready for public release. She reviewed key elements of the document and went over the timeline that was established in order to meet the Oct. 15 deadline. She requested that comments be sent directly to her. It was pointed out that the report not only includes how the college is addressing the four recommendations that need to be reported on in the 2008 follow up report but also reports on progress of two additional recommendations that are to be included in the October 2009 Follow Up Report.

Strategic Objectives, 06-08 – Final Report

Jennifer Hughes distributed copies of “Key Accomplishments, Strategic Objectives, 2006-08” which is the final report on the college’s former strategic plan. While there will continue to be annual report, she indicated that it would be the last time we would be using this model as we transition to the new planning process. Members were encouraged to share this document with their constituent groups.

Community College Survey of Student Engagement

Jeremy Ball presented information about Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), an organization that assists community colleges assess their educational practices so they can improve student outcomes. The Assessment Committee is recommending that the college become a member of CCSSE. CCSSE provides important benchmarks in a number of critical areas and the feedback we would receive from the survey would assist our assessment of GE SLOs and provide a window on how the college is faring in many areas. The data would also address accreditation needs in the area of SLOs and assessment.

Proposed Process for Evaluating Delineation of Functions

Andreas presented a document, “Proposed Process for Evaluating Delineation,” drafted by a district accreditation committee in response to an ACCJC policy directive. It recommends that the colleges and district review the Delineation of Functions Agreement every three years and that a committee be established to coordinate the districtwide delineation of function review efforts. It also recommends a process be adopted by College Council and District Shared Governance Council that includes a timeline for the process. College Council reviewed the draft and by consensus, gave its approval.

Submitted by V. Anderson