



Governing Council Meeting

Jan. 27, 2009 minutes

Members Present

Diana Bennett President
 Eileen O'Brien Vice President
 Lloyd Davis Secretary
 Rosemary Nurre Treasurer
 Bernard Gershenson Language Arts

Teresa Morris Library
 Madeleine Murphy Language Arts
 Jim Robertson Creative Arts/Social Science
 Huy Tran Math/Science
 Ruth Turner Student Services
 Kevin Sinarle Student Services

Members Absent

Janet Black Creative Arts/Social Science
 Craig Blake Business/Tech (excused)

Joe Mangan P.E./Athletics
 Linda Phipps Math/Science (excused)
 Lilya Vorobey Business/Tech (excused)

Others Attending

Tania Beliz Math/Science
 Michael Claire CSM President
 Durella Combs Business/Technology

Laura Demsetz COI, Math/Science
 Patty Dilko DAS President
 Marilyn Lawrence KCSM
 David Locke Math/Science

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:20 pm. The agenda was approved, with the addition of information items on the design/build process and the District Committee on Budget and Finance. The minutes of Dec. 9 and Dec. 16, 2009, were approved.

UPDATE OPENING DAY MEMO CSM President Mike Claire presented an update to his August 2008 all-college email. That email set as priorities accreditation, construction, campus communications, enrollment management, budget, the educational master plan, and institutional planning. Mike said Senate President Diana Bennett and Past President Jeremy Ball do an excellent job carrying the faculty voice forward in President's Council and elsewhere, and acknowledged what he called the great work of the senate during the college's wild ride over the last two years.

Mike reflected on his presidency so far, and on where the college may be going. He started as president mid-year, in January 2007, at a time of major administrative turnover, lining up interim administrators, working with a new VPI, and in Fall 2007 hiring three deans. The college was putting finishing touches on the accreditation self study and was busy with construction planning. The first crisis of his presidency was the expensive flooding of the new planetarium. He commended the work of faculty and classified staff in getting it back up and running.

2007-08, Mike's first full academic year as president, was a year of changes. He took a big picture look at college organization and recognized the need to balance workload among deans. He studied their duties and their numbers of faculty, and noted, e.g. differences between occupational and academic programs. He has served in two divisions and been dean of one. Workloads were ironed out, and a new management team put in place, with brand new deans in Business/Technology, Language Arts, and Social Science/Creative Arts.

College Development and Marketing Director Bev Madden is working on outreach and recruiting, including building the new college website. People are out recruiting every day. In Students Speak focus groups, students gave accolades about instant messaging from Admissions and Records. When it comes

to capacity building, we move the mountain one pebble at a time. We are making major changes in the finance system. The final design of most capital projects was completed last year, and they are now in full construction mode.

The second crisis was the accreditation warning. Seeking to respond in a responsible way, Mike talked with folks in ACCJC and will get a view from the other side when he chairs a site visit next month. Things probably won't change for us, so let's keep our eyes on the ball and continue to respond fully to accreditation issues.

One such issue is the complete restructuring of our planning systems, including program review. We are implementing a well designed cohesive planning system, which will change over time. We hope everything will be in order by Fall 2011, with a new campus and with the third crisis, the fiscal crisis, behind us, but getting there won't be easy. We can protect the college from its external accreditation and budget threats. We must actively manage our construction money, making sure promises are fulfilled and we create a comfortable environment. We do not want to lose students during construction due to inconvenient parking or an unattractive campus.

Mike summarized our challenges over the next two years under three broad themes: identity (defining who we are); capacity building (using our resources more effectively); and engagement (making CSM more of a community.)

Identity. Who are we going to be? In designing our new buildings, the architects paid homage to John Carl Warnecke, the architect of our original campus. The present architecture could be called Warnecke 2.0. We should make ourselves CSM 2.0. Hold on to our tradition of academic excellence while embracing that our students have changed and have a very different set of needs. We can't do everything, but through concentrated discussions on the Educational Master Plan (EMP), and research rather than guesswork, we can determine how best to support and retain students. We can get hold of and validate our identity.

Capacity Building. We need to adjust our priorities to respond to the threats in accreditation, budget, and construction. The EMP shows a need for professional development for all. That does not mean forgoing department level development opportunities. Focus professional development around common themes. Look at creative ways to integrate student services with instruction. This is frustratingly hard to sustain because of our limited resources. We need to generate more, or consume less. Job one now is to look at a model for Building 10N's Learning Center, a new space to support students. We are all feeling the tension between budget realities and workload. Chancellor Galatolo acknowledged at the all-college meeting we are already thin. It is tough to balance workload issues, get the job done, and not burn out.

Engagement. We need better communication and more transparency, and simply to know one another better. Mike noted that unlike at Canada, where he started as an adjunct and later served as VPI, our campus is spread out and often people don't know each other after many years. We need across the board accountability. We need to keep morale up all year, not just in September. We should move to a prototyping approach to change. Rather than forming a model with every contingency and debating it for years, we should get comfortable with trying something out, even something not fully fleshed out, and change it from there. Mike credited the senate and the college for moving quickly on lots of things in the last year.

Mike said this is what is on his mind, his view from 50,000 feet. There will be time later to talk about details and statistics. He discussed other issues with Governing Council. He said ACCJC is not budging on teacher evaluation in its exchange of letters with CFT. As for the prospect of the state treasurer issuing IOUs and warrants, he said the District has good cash flow management so we should be fine. DAS President Patty Dilko noted the state is deferring payments to community college districts. They always

defer the July payment to September, and will now pay for the January to June period in July. The district has plans for loans.

Jim Robertson asked that professional development extend beyond support for pedagogy to support for discipline activity. This would benefit students by keeping instructors current. Conference registration costs are small, but travel, hotels and meals are expensive. The college has money for whizbang gizmos, but there is no money for scholarship. It is not easy to keep up with discipline literature. Mike said travel is always the issue. Occupational deans can usually tap into federal money. Social Science has no separate funding source. How can we involve the senate and be proactive?

Mike said the college needs to move quickly on **strategic planning**, based on the November accreditation visit. We need to hone measurable outcomes. The senate will have a voice to help shape a draft document. We are in good shape meeting the October 2008 requirements.

In private conversations with visiting team chair Marie Smith and ACCJC President Barbara Beno, President Claire heard their concern that while we had redesigned the planning system and our EMP looks great, and we had met all October 15, 2008 requirements, we had not been specific enough on the EMP and on our priorities. We had identified indicators, but they were not necessarily measurable.

Smith said we are on the right path, but to get through the entire cycle by October 2009 we must quickly identify measurable outcomes, execute our plan, and measure those outcomes. There was not enough time for discussion through the shared governance process. Smith said it would be OK for Cabinet to make the first pass at outcomes, to get things going.

The college received a 22-page preliminary report in December. Mike will put it on line. The commission is looking for some key measures of institutional effectiveness, perhaps like those found on Skyline's institutional website, and for objectives. The Educational Master Plan and strategic plan define strategic priorities and objectives in six areas: student success, enrollment management, fiscal stability and efficient allocation of resources, quality programs and services, institutional dialog, and professional development.

We came up with a nested set of indicators in each area – reasonable, simple measures to track our progress. All are up for discussion. For example, the primary indicators for student success are our academic success rate, which John Sewart calculates, and student satisfaction, which is influenced by a number of secondary indicators. We can pinpoint component parts and set goals around them. For example, we could initiate text-messaging to under-20 at risk students, and measure and correlate the number of text messages with student success. We have a preliminary layout of the indicators, but we need to accelerate the conversation – have it now, not in March.

Measurable objectives for 2008-2011 have been prepared for each strategic priority, with baseline values and targets for '09-'10 and '10-'11. This shows ACCJC we can move around the cycle and manage it successfully. For example, we have a baseline 76% academic success rate, with a '10-'11 target of 80%. We must discuss the reasonableness of such targets. Of course the real magic that happens, the influence faculty have on students, cannot really be measured. We can implement a system like this without a lot of pain. The process will go through the Institutional Planning Committee, and we will make sure we have the right measures and plan.

Rosemary asked whether Skyline, which ACCJC approved and whose model we are now fortunately following, is doing a better job than we are. Skyline students do not say Skyline is much better. It is bothersome to have to come up with all this, and frustrating that Skyline got approved and to think if we had put together a chart like theirs we might have too. Did we do something different that is important? Bernard echoed Rosemary's frustration with being on warning and having this administrative activity imposed on top of our teaching load.

Mike said what irks the commission is for a college to ignore, or never quite fulfill, a commission recommendation. Our first recommendation on planning was in 1995. Mike was on the Strategic Planning Committee in 2001 and thought we had it right, but the goal posts moved. A big debate is starting on whether all this makes a difference in student learning. Our transfer rate is twice the statewide average, and our success rate is off the charts. He wants us never ever to be on warning again.

Mike said he would have preferred not being put on warning. The clear rubric we have now was released in September 2007, after our self-study was in. We do have a better planning system now. Hopefully our path to decisions is less mysterious now. Our budgeting system is much better. We did need a knock on the head, but not with a baseball bat.

Madeleine said for launching programs, it is nice to have a structure: Decide how long we will pursue it and with what resources, and have a way to measure success, rather than have it ride on the interest of a faculty member. Mike said when we don't have institutional structures to support new ideas, good work may go away when the budget dries up. Our new system forces us to be more disciplined in planning.

Diana asked Mike to address the **design-build process**, and **institutional committees**.

Mike discussed the "hike" project, as in 15/17/10N/34/hike. The good news is we are ready to start the last phase of construction: remodel buildings 15 and 17 and the lower level of 12, and retrofit 34 to garage fire equipment. We can't use 34 for classrooms because of seismic restrictions. These are separate projects, with separate contractors, and the work will be similar to that done on Buildings 2, 4, and 14.

We decided to create another design/build approach, with architects, engineers, and construction folks at the same table. The market is good for us now. 18 firms responded to this proposal. More firms qualify since we are not building something out of the ground. A CSM committee has been formed with Jeremy Ball and Teeka James from the faculty, a cabinet member, a student, and two from classified. The competition was whittled to three firms, which gave great presentations. The committee was unanimous in its selection last month of Pankow Special Projects, L.P. as the design build entity, and a contract was successfully negotiated, primarily for a freshening remodel. The work in 15 and 17 involves asbestos removal, installing new ceiling panels, new flooring, repainting, new furniture and fixtures, and some rewiring. Peek into faculty offices in buildings 2 and 4 to see the new standard. There has been back and forth on whether Building 15 or Building 17 vacates first. Right now it looks like 15 will be first, which was the original plan. That decision is made by construction people. A big task is to figure out where faculty will be in the future: 15, 17, or 10N. The Student Activities Center is slated for Building 17, but that will require discussion and agreement. The timeline now is to move 15 out at Spring break. The District contracts out asbestos removal work, then the contractor comes in as early as the end of this semester. Diana said the current plan is for Building 15 faculty to move to Building 12 at Spring break and return at the end of 2009. Then Building 17 faculty would move into 12 and return for Fall 2010. Building 12 classrooms will be retrofit for Fire Science and Administration of Justice.

The new planning model, approved by Governing Council and College Council, creates several **institutional level committees**. Financial, technological, and human resources are needed to reach our goals. We need committees around those resources. We will reintroduce the Enrollment Management Committee. Diversity is an important value of the college. DIAG, which has always reported to the president, will report to College Council. The Institutional Planning Committee is on top of the other committees. Chaired by Diana and VPSS Jennifer Hughes, it takes the place of the Strategic Planning Committee. The chair or another member of each committee will be on the IPC. The committees will be smaller, with one each from administration, classified, and students, and two faculty members. Diana distributed drafts of mission statements and tasks for several of the committees. President Claire said the Budget Planning Committee refined its draft and came up with guiding principles. Other committees will refine their drafts. We need to standardize how we do committee work and planning.

Diana said Susan Estes wanted the committees ready to go at the start of this semester. Diana is gathering names. The committees will get start work when their members are named. Susan and Jennifer will conduct an orientation meeting with all committee members.

DESIGN/BUILD PROCESS Diana reported she just heard Building 15 will move first. Building 15 and 17 faculty will meet with Susan Estes and CIP construction people, including Michele Rudovsky, the project manager and contact person for faculty. Contact her at ext 7353 or rudovskym@smccd.edu about special needs or circumstances, e.g. relating to privacy needs or physical limitations. During this period we want meetings of 15, 17, and future 10N faculty to decide who will end up where, looking at what is appropriate for our programs. 10N will have the Integrative Learning Center.

Present plans are for the front of Building 17 facing Building 19 to be opened up and turned into the Student Activities Center. Building 15 has concrete walls which can't easily be removed, but Building 17, which was built a few years later, has wooden walls. Diana said the construction people know about the need for soundproofing, students are happy with moving to 17, and it is good to have student activities near faculty offices. Bernard asked why Building 17 faculty have not been consulted, and asserted we have to be in the loop of communication.

Laura suggested we look at where faculty will be located by program, rather than by individual preferences. Perhaps instructors who teach mostly developmental courses could be in one place, and those who teach mostly transfer-level courses could be somewhere else. For some programs, having students nearby is good. Diana said faculty locations will be decided by faculty, based on what makes sense for the college, not on individual personal preferences. There will be plenty of office space. Diana said the student activities center will include an office area, where, for example, students can get ID cards and ASCSM can make arrangements with vendors, and an area where students can socialize, complete with pinball machines. Work space and social space will be in the same area. With a student lounge in Building 19, students now go there who never did before. Building 15 and 17 occupants will be updated by email about possible moves. Laura asked whether Building 34, which will be used for garaging firefighting equipment, might have storage space for welding equipment. Diana, Jeremy, and Teeka are working with the administration on faculty moves.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND VIABILITY (PIV) UPDATE

Laura reported on the Special Welding Task Force initiated at our Dec. 16 meeting. The members are Lilya Vorobey, Durella Combs, Dave Newman, industry representative Byron May, who is a reliability engineer at Genentech, Laura Demsetz, Bus/Tech dean Kathy Ross, and a member of President's Cabinet to be named later. The Task Force will meet and discuss new locations for the program and the possibility of using Building 34 for welding equipment storage. Fire Science needs a garage for its truck, not permanent storage. MSU to approve the composition of the Special Welding Task Force.

Laura reported the Machine Tool Technology and Industrial Technology PIV committee has not met because of members' health issues. Its report will go to the Committee on Instruction Feb. 12, and to Governing Council Feb. 24.

At our Dec. 16 meeting, Ed Remitz sought changes to the Media Group PIV recommendations. Marilyn Lawrence asked Ed to work with her over winter break to alter the language, but neither Marilyn nor Diana has heard from Ed. Absent modified language, Governing Council approved accepting the original PIV recommendation, with the word "hiatus" removed from language about the *San Mateo*.

Mike and Diana met with the press before the break, including reporters from the *San Mateo County Times* and the *San Mateo Daily Journal*. Mike and Diana answered questions and talked about sustainability and being financially responsible. Diana said the two papers gave opposite reports. The *Times* report was reasonable. It covered courses being cut and the 20-student minimum class size. The

Daily Journal article was by staff writer Christine Karavas, *San Matean* editor. The photographer was a CSM multimedia student. Diana said the *Daily Journal* article distorted the briefing. Journalism courses, not the newspaper, are on hiatus. With enrollments of only seven and five the related Journalism courses aren't running. Journalism faculty would need a different way to produce the paper.

INSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEES – Diana reported two faculty representatives are needed for each of several institutional committees. Laura said a draft Distance Education report for accreditation says COI should keep track of distance ed courses and how well they are doing. COI was never asked about this, and is not necessarily equipped to do it. The idea is to get communication going to come up with something workable.

Diana distributed drafts of the missions and tasks of the Diversity in Action Group (DIAG), Technology, Human Relations, and Enrollment Management committees so members could find colleagues interested in serving. Diana will consult with Eileen O'Brien about people who have served on such committees in the past and might want to continue. Only the Human Relations Committee is new. We need to identify the two faculty reps for each of those four committees at our next meeting, so Diana can forward the names to Susan, Jennifer, and Mike. Members will have staggered two year terms. Each committee will meet once or twice a month. Diana, Jacquelin Gamelin, and chair Rick Ambrose represent faculty on the Budget Planning Committee. At Laura's request, Governing Council approved herself, Madeleine Murphy, and Rosemary Nurre as members of the Distance Education Committee, so that group can start its work.

OFFICERS REPORTS College Council meets Jan 28 but has not met since our last meeting.

President's Council met during winter break, to be sure everything was ready for opening day. Mike sent a memo to District Facilities about parking problems and the fact that some classrooms were locked opening day. We will design a semester checklist of what needs to be done when a semester begins, and of construction issues.

The next DEAC meeting is in February. Diana reported the most recent DSGC and DAS meetings conflicted with the CSM Budget Committee, which she attends. The next DAS meeting is Feb. 2. DAS President Patty Dilko reported DSGC is considering a proposal from district administration prohibiting using college employment affiliation when on personal business. For example, an advocate for marine mammals demonstrating against SONAR could not identify their college or program. The policy protects the institution from individuals representing the institution in ways it would not choose to represent itself, but there is a free speech issue. The policy was recommended by the Community College League of California because of action at Pepperdine University by a faculty member who was a local organizer around Proposition 8. The university asked him not to identify himself with Pepperdine. A big lawsuit ensued between him and the university. Teeka is interested in rights issues, intellectual discourse, and how to stay professional.

COMMITTEE REPORTS The District Committee on Budget and Finance will meet tomorrow. Reports on SLO/Assessment and the Nonsmoking Task Force were postponed. Jim Robertson expressed discomfort with the procedure by which the Nonsmoking Task Force was put together and its meetings scheduled.

David Locke and Tania Beliz of Math/Science, Librarian Teresa Morris, and Joe Mangan of PE/Athletics are on the **Compressed Calendar Task Force**. Teresa reported its Jan. 29 meeting of the calendar task force was cancelled, but conversations continue. Patty Dilko reviewed the situation: Canada faculty, followed by CSM faculty, asked a year ago to look into the compressed calendar and what it would mean for the district. A task force was formed, but it is not getting the data it needs from the colleges for planning and evaluation purposes, to answer questions like can our classes be sequenced to fit our facilities and give students reasonable schedules? Faculty need to see alternative class schedules, but get pushback from the colleges and no enthusiasm from district administration. Without information, we

can't do anything. David Locke said at the end of summer the compressed calendar timelines he got for lab classes had too few contact hours. Laura said we need to see how programs on a compressed calendar will look to students, in terms of both how many semesters will be needed and what their days will look like. For this we need to know what courses students take to get through the curriculum. Science majors would be in school from 8 am to 7 pm to complete the program in a reasonable time. There has to be in a feasibility study before the calendar can go to the state for approval.

Patty asked whether we should work on the calendar, or in view of the pushback, just let it go. Do we as faculty want to pursue finding out its benefits and challenges? Tania Beliz, who was on a similar committee in 2002, said the colleges were divided then, and the proposal disappeared. Patty said DAS asked unsuccessfully for mock schedules, first for a full year, then for one semester. It finally got schedules for specific high impact programs, including ESL at Canada, Math/Science at CSM, and Automotive Technology at Skyline. Marilyn McBride did most of the work at Canada, and supported the change before the accreditation and budget crises arose. Skyline's administration has generated information, but has not shared it. CSM deans have been very helpful. We can't make decisions until all disciplines have information. We know our students want to finish quickly. They need jobs.

Laura asked is now the time to put resources into this? Go whole hog, or stop. Madeleine said if we think we can get a result, pursue it, but if it just means a lot of meetings, wait. Patty said people are not likely to work during the summer unless they are under pressure. This may not be the time for faculty to spend political capital on what may or may not be a good idea. Diana asked people to email her with ideas. The next task force meeting is Feb. 19.

The Curriculum Tools Task Force is arranging demonstrations of three packages in February:

Mon 2/9	2:30-4:00	District Board Room	ITPI-WebCMS
Wed 2/11	2:30-4:00	District ITS Conference Room	Decision Academic – Curriculum Manager
Tues 2/17	2:30-4:00	District ITS Conference Room	CurricuNET

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 4:22 pm. The next meeting will be Feb. 10, 2009.