



**Governing Council Meeting**

**Oct. 14, 2008 minutes**

**Members Present**

Diana Bennett	President	Rosemary Nurre	Treasurer
Eileen O'Brien	Vice President	Joe Mangan	PE/Athletics
Lloyd Davis	Secretary	Jim Robertson	Creative Arts/Social Science
Bernard Gershenson	Language Arts	Huy Tran	Math/Science
Teresa Morris	Library	Ruth Turner	Student Services
Madeleine Murphy	Language Arts	Lilya Vorobey	Technology
Jeremy Ball	Past President	Kevin Sinarle	Counseling

**Others Attending**

Charlene Frontiera	Dean , Math/Science	Courtney Jamieson	<i>San Matean</i>
Matt Kaidor	ASCSM	Dan Kaplan	AFT
Stacey Grasso	Business/Technology	Lewis Kawahara	Social Science

**CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 2:22 pm. The agenda, and the minutes of Sept. 23, 2008, were approved.

**FACULTY APPOINTMENTS** – Math/Science Dean Charlene Frontiera discussed the **Dental Hygiene** position. Request for a dental hygiene program came to the district three years ago. A study done at the request of the Board of Trustees determined there was a significant need for dental hygienists in the district. After receiving a general impact analysis, the Board decided on a dental hygiene program in the Math/Science division at CSM. A consultant was hired to help develop an advisory group, put together curriculum, and take the program to the state chancellor’s office. When the consultant left last September, Charlene took over. The program got the approval of Bay Area deans, as required for voc ed programs. The State Chancellor’s Office approved the program in July. At the end of September Charlene delivered the program’s self-study to the American Dental Association, the professional accrediting agency for dental hygiene programs. Like most accreditation self-studies, it had many requirements, including on facilities, protecting students, and faculty-student ratio. Bond money will fund an on-campus clinic. By contrast, our nursing students go out to hospitals for clinical experience under CSM faculty and hospital floor nurses. We won’t hear back until early December to see whether we did a good enough job for an ADA site visit. Charlene prepared the self-study with the help of very talented dental hygiene people. We must hire a director (a faculty position) three months prior to the site visit, which will be in March or April. The director must be on board 90 days prior to the ADA site visit.

At a meeting with Charlene, VPI Susan Estes, and CSM President Mike Claire, Diana learned the program cost dropped from about \$877,000 to \$300,000 when we decided to have the facilities on campus rather than off, and she was assured the district would get the money from the five entities (CSM, Skyline, Canada, the District, and facilities,) not the CSM or CSM Math/Science budget. Students fulfilling prerequisites will increase our FTES. The facilities are covered by the bond issue. The position does not affect the number of other faculty hires this year. Local dental societies are pledging money. The San Mateo County Dental Society is pledging \$75,000/yr for ten years. The Mid-Peninsula and San Francisco Dental Societies have also made five to ten year commitments to the program. We must have a director hired by January 9 to meet ADA accreditation standards.

Dan said when the Board discussed this a few years ago the cost seemed prohibitive, but the community wanted it. Charlene said without the bond funds it probably wouldn’t happen. All CIP2 projects (new buildings) are going forward as planned but some cuts may be needed. The clinic will be open to the

public, with fees based on ability to pay. We need the diversity we get from the community. On the risk of hiring someone before the program is approved by an ADA site visit, Charlene said she has been assured that would result only in a delay. She took our program's self-study to Chicago, where she asked an ADA education consultant about the next steps and what the ADA looks for. Everything they brought up we had done, and done well. For example, we were expected to have a curriculum outline for the program's first year. We got COI approval last year for the full two year program. We were expected to calculate the need for adjuncts and the locations of classes. That has all been done, with a map and times.

Jeremy said typically deans and the Budget Planning Committee set priorities. This position came from a different direction. We will vote on it in two weeks. Charlene said we are confident we can find someone for the position because a good many people have contacted us about faculty positions, and Charlene's contact with other dental hygiene administrators indicates that finding applicants is not the challenge it is for nursing. We have been advertising for an open nursing position for the past three years. The program will take in 25 students per year and of those hopes to graduate at least 20. We have tried to put a sequence of remediation in place, with checks on incoming students.

Mid-Peninsula Dental Society gets a handful of hygienists from Foothill. The San Francisco Dental Society used to get UCSF grads, but that program was closed when UCSF switched to a master's program to produce educators. The San Mateo County Dental Society feels the biggest squeeze. With no direct access to graduates, it has stepped up to the plate on curriculum development and advising on building design. We have an active advisory committee. The District has made an ongoing commitment to the program, with no time limit. Charlene said what has worked with nursing is to continue to involve the community. We want to be sure we have an ongoing commitment from the outset. Charlene is available for questions any time. We will have further discussion and a vote at our Oct. 28 meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS – DISTRICT RULES AND REGULATIONS REVISION** –Discussion continued from our Sept. 23 meeting on revisions to section 6 of District Rules and Regs. Section 6.2 on grading and academic record symbols does not yet include plus/minus grading. No date has been set for its implementation, and it has not yet been agendized for Board of Trustees' approval. CSM and Canada's Governing Councils approved it first, followed by Skyline's. Getting student buy-in, which is desirable, has been a problem. Student senate positions on this change as their membership changes. In the past some have thought this would hurt students. One Skyline student senate felt betrayed when Skyline's Governing Council reversed its opposition after learning Skyline faculty favored +/- grades.

Members discussed how to proceed. A study at Foothill showed no significant difference in GPAs resulted from using +/- grading. If permissible, we could rely on that study. We could instead conduct a pilot study similar to Foothill's by assigning +/- grades for a year so GPAs could be calculated with and without them for comparison purposes, but not use +/- for official transcripts or GPA calculations that year. Perhaps we could do similar calculations using CSM records from the years we did use +/- grades. When we did use +/- grades they weren't counted in GPAs. We tried to change that twice but were held up by the student senate. A pilot study would likely show there are no problems and that +/- grading doesn't harm students, so the burden of proof would shift. This issue will be on our Oct. 28 agenda.

Dan reported a development on 6.32.8, on royalties paid to instructors who create their own educational materials. Only six faculty members are affected. Kathy Blackwood had said this would change in Spring '09, but that is rescinded through the end of that semester. Harry Joel and Kathy Blackwood have acknowledged this is a negotiable item, and would be negotiated prior to any implementation. MSU to approve the proposed revisions to Section 6 of District Rules and Regs.

**NEW BUSINESS – DELINEATION OF FUNCTIONS** The policy discussed at our last meeting has not been changed. MSU to approve the policy.

**NEW BUSINESS – DISTRICT RULES AND REGULATIONS 2.09 REVISION** Section 2.09 sets the rules for District Shared Governance Council. Jeremy identified a few changes since our last meeting. There are two paragraph 6's, so renumbering will be done. Proposed language in paragraph 5 on decision-making includes "A recommendation will be forward to the chancellor when a simple majority (50% plus 1) or 2/3 of members present is/are at any one level." (The levels are complete support, support with reservations, and cannot support.) The substantive issue is do we want DSGC to move from 100% agreement (consensus) to less – either a simple majority or a 2/3 supermajority? The technical issue is what does the language mean: were we asked to choose one or the other (50%+1 or 2/3), or does the rule mean, if either 50% + 1 of all members (present or not), or 2/3 of members present, agree, then the recommendation is forwarded, or does it mean something else?

Jeremy said consensus is valuable, if slow and painful. There is something to be said for trying to meet the needs of all constituents. 50% is not enough. Dan reported AFT discussed it at its last meeting. Desire for the consensus model came from Paula Anderson when she was co-chair of DSGC and the District had lost several battles using the consensus model. With the 50% + 1 standard, consensus is not just narrowed, it is out the window. Under consensus, disagreement opened up discussion, which could go on for months or years. This process led to the District abandoning the Mutual Respect Policy (MRP). At first only AFT opposed it, for legal reasons. AFT later convinced two Governing Councils. Since then, courts have ruled MRPs unconstitutional. Without AFT's vote, it would have been approved here. Not wanting a battle, AFT's Executive Committee agreed to the change to 50% + 1. Jeremy said given the makeup of our campuses, 2/3 of each constituency seems a reasonable standard. Governing Council asked Diana to take the language back for clarification.

**NEW BUSINESS – ALTERNATIVE CALENDAR** The District wants a task force on the alternative calendar. Charlene Frontiera and faculty members David Locke and Tania Beliz have volunteered. Math/Science has problems with a compressed calendar because of science lab facilities and scheduling problems. Consensus of Governing Council was to empower the Senate president to find people from other divisions to serve as well. Teresa said the library is interested. Bernard asked that the concerns of Language Arts about the impact on night classes be brought to the discussion.

Dan reported several Bay Ten districts are now on a compressed calendar. Most are very positive about it, but even the most enthusiastic say it will take us to a four day work week with a major negative impact on the shared governance process. Community colleges have been operating on the shared governance model since AB 1725 took effect in 1989. It is extremely difficult to involve faculty in the Senate or the union because they are working so intensively. Compressed calendar schools can't get quorums at shared governance meetings. Faculties are trying to figure out how to deal with it. It needs to be in our calendar discussion. DAS has proposed all meetings be on Fridays. Skyline's Governing Council already meets on Fridays.

**NEW BUSINESS – MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS** (min quals) - Lilya reported her students have noticed big differences among teachers, and have asked why people without min quals are teaching here. Should we do something about them? Most are in the technology department, but some are adjuncts in other departments. At one point, people in technology could be hired with no degree whatever, perhaps only a high school education and an uncertain amount of experience, but they had to take classes, e.g. through UC Berkeley extension, to get a teaching certificate. That last requirement has been dropped. Lilya came to CSM from industry, which has different ways of presenting things. She started with a BFA and went through a master's program in education.

Members asked how people could be hired without minimum quals. Hiring committees are thorough about that. There must have been a determination of equivalence. That can be a loophole if the screening committee isn't doing its job. Maybe min quals changed after they were hired. If it was just sloppy

administration of the hiring process, and we gave them tenure, we are stuck with them. In a handful of cases, instructors have created courses outside their area of qualification. This affects their departments.

There is a process for revising min quals at both the district and state levels. The state has min quals which local districts are allowed to adopt or exceed. Information is available at <http://www.ascsc.org/>. Governing Council can make a recommendation to DAS about reviewing the current (2005) District min quals policy. For example, some disciplines, such as multimedia and graphic design, now have master's degrees to consider. Courtney Jamieson of the *San Mateo* asked whether an instructor who has been here 30 years, about whom students are complaining, will stay on. Madeleine said people can be fired, usually for extreme offenses. Jeremy said the tenure process is very rigorous. After tenure there are regular peer reviews and student evaluations. Once tenured, we want to protect intellectual freedom. Sometimes we get a few people who aren't as on top of their jobs as they should be. We do have quality control. Madeleine noted it is very difficult to get a community college teaching job. Courtney complimented CSM teachers based on her experience at different schools. She started in a private college in the Midwest, where the teachers were not so qualified, then continued at SFSU. She said teachers at CSM are a lot kinder and more receptive to student questions, and can explain material in ways that are easy to understand.

Points in discussion: The retraining issue will come up in PIV programs. Displaced faculty meet with Harry Joel to see how they can fit in, but they must meet min quals in some area. We need to look at the equivalency process for people already tenured who are migrating into another area.

When students have complaints or issues with an instructor, they should first talk to the instructor, then go right to the dean. Deans are willing to talk with students. Input to deans may not be acted on right away, but feeds into the peer review process. Tenured faculty can be encouraged to work on areas of their performance, especially if a dean gets many sets of comments. Student input is not ignored or discarded.

Madeleine emphasized the importance of responsible hiring and tenure review decisions. Firing people is usually very difficult. We must live with risky tenure decisions for a long time. Sometimes it takes a while for new faculty to grasp the importance of tenure review and peer evaluations. Some instructors have not scrutinized others carefully and spoken up about unsatisfactory performance. If you are not satisfied, say so and why.

Screening committees determine whether an applicant has met min quals or equivalency. Administrators usually don't have the subject matter expertise. Disciplinary migration is different, and appears to be a 10+1 issue. As for people tenured in areas for which they lack min quals, we can't do much beyond hoping they have learned their job over the years. Hiring is based on ability to teach. Senate presidents sign off on adjunct equivalency. We can add faculty migrating to other disciplines to our agenda. That includes faculty displaced by the PIV process. Affected instructors should make sure the district's list of FSAs is up-to-date. If it does not include an area in which the instructor might have equivalency, petition for an adjustment to the list.

**NEW BUSINESS – ACADEMIC SENATE MISSIONS AND GOALS** We are updating Academic Senate mission and goals. The mission statement is OK, but the goals need work. Bring changes to the next meeting for an approval vote. Diana is working with Valerie Tyler on the Senate web site, and wants this ready before the accreditation team comes on Nov. 3. Our web site has '04-'05 goals, some of which we have met and can change. Senate goals should match college goals. There are nine goals in the strategic plan we can try to align with, in such areas as programs and services, enrollment management, diversity, staff recruitment, institutional planning and effectiveness, resources, communication, and facilities. One goal to implement is having an electronic system for curriculum and assessment. Email suggestions for goals for the next year or two to Diana.

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT** College Council has created a task force on committees. Eileen and Jeremy are members. It is working to streamline the number of committees and of committee members in hopes of getting more done. Eileen circulated a flowchart showing reporting relationships among committees. Most committees will have five members: two faculty, and one each from administrators, classified, and students. Rick Ambrose and Jackie Gamelin are on the BPC. Other committees will address such areas as diversity, human resources, distance education, and enrollment management. The Institutional Planning Committee will consist of the chairs of the other committees. We are identifying faculty on existing committees who want to continue. Committees dealing with 10+1 issues should report to Governing Council, those dealing with college issues to College Council. Members asked how Governing Council gets information from these committees. Streamlining without communication is for naught. Huy Tran, Mike Claire, Diana Bennett, Teeka James, and Yaping Li will meet to look at effective ways to communicate to the college.

The **Budget Planning Committee** (BPC) will meet the last Monday of October, after which we may know how many new faculty we can hire for '09-'10. The decision is late because of budget uncertainty. BPC approved a proposal from Susan and Jennifer for the BSI committee to have nine units released time, plus three units covered from our \$100,000 in state BSI funding, for a BSI coordinator. Jeremy said BPC needs to be able to prioritize, not to approve things in isolation. Nine units reassigned time means cutting three sections. Diana will get further clarifications from BPC on where funds are coming from within CSM.

Stacey asked if the position was created in anticipation of growth in basic skills due to Math 110 and English 838 and 848 potentially becoming basic skills courses in Fall 2009. Diana will find out who the basic skills coordinator will report to. Bernard warned the state budget shortfall may result in midyear cuts. Other points in discussion: Why have a BPC if it just rubber stamps decisions made elsewhere? The BPC should look at whether taking faculty tapped for a great project out of the classroom is worth it.

Diana, Jeremy, and Susan are meeting next week with the construction architect on how Building 12 will be used as office swing space while Building 15 and later Building 17 are being renovated. Occupants of Buildings 15 and 17 should discuss how to decide who will go into 10N faculty offices.

Eileen reported President's Council had a short meeting two weeks ago. They discussed a day of remembrance for Japanese-American CSM students interned during World War II. Eileen told them we think the committees with Academic Senate primacy should be represented on the Institutional Planning Committee. Jeremy said prior to the new committee structure SLOAC was never under Governing Council. The change was made last fall at Jeremy's suggestion.

Eileen reported last month Mike was within 15 minutes of closing the campus because of an overnight power outage still in effect at 7 am. Who should be allowed on campus in such an emergency, and by what procedures? Campus will be powered down for two weeks over winter break, so for security and safety reasons facilities wants almost no one here then. Only buildings 1 and 9 will have electricity. Even Building 36 will not be powered up, so things will have to be moved from it.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS** Stacey Grasso reported on the **Committee on Instruction**, which she chairs. In addition to approving courses and programs and banking courses, the COI began its year by determining its goals for the year. First on the list was new member training for StandAlone courses (courses not part of a program). The state has given final authority on courses of this type to the college, and every member has to go through state reported training in this area. Another big goal is compliance with Title 5 mandated Math and English competency requirements for Fall 2009. Beyond changing the wording in the catalog, decisions are needed about what to do about courses that are now competency level but which will no longer be next Fall. Do they remain degree applicable, or are they now basic skills courses? Title 5 also says that courses other than the prescribed Engl 100 and Math 120 can be considered to satisfy Math or English competency, e.g. Phil 100 for English competency, so the COI has

been working on guidelines by which this can be decided for other courses. All this must be done by the December catalog deadline. Another big task for the year is checking the unit count on existing courses. Title 5 requires all courses in the college to award units based on the Carnegie unit system. This formula is based on lecture, lab, homework and HBA time. Some courses undergoing revision so far this year did not have their units calculated correctly. The committee must also complete the PIV process. The General Education handbook, written two years ago about approving courses for GE requirements, must be revisited. COI is providing input to the District on software selection. COI has also begun discussion of how the college will address Information Literacy, in response to our stated plan for meeting Standard II.A.3.b. Two surveys administered last spring indicated that instructors would like to see a higher level of information literacy in their students, and students seem to think that they are more skilled in this area than they actually are. Some schools handle this with an information literacy graduation requirement, while others tack on an information literacy module to an existing course. Canada has a computer literacy graduation requirement, and has brought up having an information competency graduation requirement.

COI meets once a month and has about 20 members. Each division should have two representatives, but not all do. Two students and a few non-voting administrators sit on the committee. Stacey and Laura Demsetz volunteered for the district task force to select curriculum management software.

Teresa reported the **Library Committee** meets once each semester. It has not yet met this semester. As acting chair, she asked for a callout from Diana for people to be appointed to the committee. The committee advises on library services, and was revived a few years ago during the course outline sign-off sheet controversy. It could be involved in the PIV process. The need for a standing library committee is not clear. Jeremy suggested as an alternative forming a task force or working group on an as needed basis. Teresa was amenable to that as a future possibility. Lilya suggested putting more parking spaces close to the library.

**DAY OF REMEMBRANCE** Diana introduced Lewis Kawahara, a Social Science adjunct who is asking the Senate to approve CSM giving honorary AA degrees to the 45 Japanese-American former CSM students who were pulled out of CSM in 1941-42 and sent to concentration camps. 21 of the 45 have passed away. A few graduated in Fall of 1941, but by June 1942 persons of Japanese ancestry on the West Coast were in the camps. President Mike Claire told Lewis the college can't award degrees to people who have not completed the requirements, but it can award honorary degrees. Mike felt that in deference to faculty primacy on academic matters, such a decision should be approved by the Senate. Lewis is also asking President Claire to approve having a ceremony in February 2009. February 19 is a day of remembrance for Japanese-Americans because Feb. 19, 1942 was the day FDR signed executive order 9066. That order authorized the internment of persons of Japanese ancestry.

Bernard said he would be happy to make a motion to recognize the 45 with honorary degrees. A February ceremony would draw faculty and the Japanese-American community, but a ceremony during commencement would be a greater reminder to the community at large, for whom the event is not in their consciousness. Lewis said he does not want to take away from the current graduating students. He also noted Feb. 28 is a more likely date than Feb. 19. Members asked about posthumous honorary degrees, and actual degrees for the persons who earned them in 1941 but could not attend the 1942 commencement ceremonies. Jeremy and Diana called having a ceremony a great learning opportunity for the community. Lewis has sent seven letters and has had two responses, one from Seattle and one local. They have heard enough about the experience and are not necessarily interested in AA degrees at this point in their lives. Madeleine asked whether the honorees might be receptive to hearing a reading of the names to commemorate the event. Some would be diffident about actually receiving a degree. Maybe someone from their family would accept it. Lewis said there is still a connection. It could be huge, and have a big impact. MSU to approve awarding the honorary degrees and to support the Day of Remembrance.

**ADJOURNMENT** The meeting adjourned at 4:18 pm. The next meeting will be Oct. 28, 2008.