



Governing Council Meeting

Feb. 10, 2009 minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

President Diana Bennett
Vice President Eileen O'Brien
Secretary Lloyd Davis
Treasurer Rosemary Nurre
Past President Jeremy Ball
Business/Technology Suzanne Russell
**Creative Arts/
 Social Science** Jim Robertson

Language Arts Bernard Gershenson
 Madeleine Murphy
Library Teresa Morris
Math/Science Tania Beliz
 Huy Tran
Student Services Kevin Sinarle
 Ruth Turner

MEMBERS ABSENT

P.E./Athletics Joe Mangan

OTHERS ATTENDING

CSM President Mike Claire
AFT Dan Kaplan
San Matean Chris Cowan
 Chalon Johnson

Business/Technology Rick Ambrose
Language Arts Teeka James
 Anne Stafford
Math/Science Bob Hasson

SUMMARY (Detailed minutes begin on the next page.)

Budget Rick Ambrose reported all construction projects under way will be completed in spite of the state budget crisis, but our north gateway project is likely to be put on hold. The District is working on putting retiree health benefits in an irrevocable trust. Colleges will not be required to make progress toward the 75/25 full-time/part-time ratio next year, but must not lose ground. CSM will approve no new full-time faculty positions for next year. Our enrollments are up 3%, and because of class cuts load is up 16%. The deans have saved about \$500,000. Governing Council discussed the use adjuncts, the loss of reassigned time, and the loss of sections which fill late, such as in beginning ESL.

Buildings 17 and 15 Jeremy Ball and Teeka James, faculty representatives to the district construction and planning group, emphasized their role was to participate in the selection of the design build team. They learned about the decision to put the Student Activities Center in Building 17 at the January design build meeting. President Claire apologized for inadequate communication about the process and the decisions on the future of Buildings 17 and 15. The college faced many issues last semester, including accreditation and the budget, which delayed design build planning. Mike learned in late December that Building 15 could not be structurally altered for the Student Activities Center. As a result, over winter break the Student Activities Center was slated for Building 17. Mike met with ASCSM about this, and regrets not meeting with faculty as well. Council members discussed their concerns about the decisions and the process leading to them. A new group has been formed to improve communication on campus. The senate will seek more faculty participants for the design build process. Mike promised to call a meeting for all Building 15 and 17 occupants next week, and to be open to other points of view.

Smoking Teeka James reviewed the ongoing work of the smoking task force. It is studying moving smoking areas to, or closer to, parking lots. Council members discussed problems with how the task force was formed and the timing of its meetings, as well as the substance of smoking policy.

Institutional Committees Several people were approved for the new institutional committees, but more need to be found, in particular for the Human Relations and Enrollment Management Committees.

Accreditation Update CSM has been removed from warning by the ACCJC.

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:18 pm. The agenda was approved, with some changes to the order, and the minutes of Jan. 27, 2009 were approved. Reports from Rick Ambrose, faculty offices, and reports from Teeka James and Jeremy Ball, in that order, will precede other business.

Rick Ambrose reported on the Jan. 27 meeting of the **District Committee on Budget and Finance**. With no state budget yet, an 18 month budget is likely, covering the second half of '08-'09 and all of '09-'10. For '08-'09, that will be the latest budget in California history, and for '09-'10, the earliest. Kathy Blackwood reported COLA and categorical funding are not final and we have no idea what the final numbers will be. K-12 and community colleges will be first in line for funding with general funds. The state has run out of money for infrastructure and school projects. All current construction projects now under way at CSM will be finished. Our north gateway project involves tearing down buildings at the north end of campus and putting in a parking lot and a nice front entrance, and will most likely be put on hold.

Colleges do not have to improve their ratio of full-time to part-time faculty obligation numbers next year (the goal is 75-25), but it cannot fall below last year's numbers. We are at 71 or 72% full-time. Student fees may increase, though the state Legislative Analyst's Office and Community College League of California president Scott Lay favor holding them at \$20/unit for now. Sacramento is discussing making Prop 98 money available to K-12 only. That would leave us competing for the money now in the pool for CSU and UC. The legislature, which is now meeting privately, could put this change in the budget at the last minute, or in trailer bills. There is a lot of concern. If it passes, it will be a different funding ballgame for us. Most K-12 districts would go to basic aid status. A district study showed if the current funding model continues, with 2-3% annual growth, 80% of community colleges would be basic aid by 2050. Changing Prop 98 is a bigger concern. Also the governor has proposed that categorical monies could be shifted to the general fund. This would require hearings before our Board took action.

Enrollments are up. As of Jan. 27, CSM had the lowest percentage increase but had cut 11-12% of class sections, so our load is up about 16% to 561, greater than Canada's and almost as high as Skyline's. 525 is our target. The other colleges increased theirs as well. We have no figures on numbers of students lost.

The District is making progress toward putting our retiree health benefits in an irrevocable trust. A trust committee has been set up to select the company to run the process. We can choose how much to put into the irrevocable trust. Senior district administration has not yet decided how much would be appropriate. Once the trust is established and funded, the district can count those funds toward reducing our postemployment benefit liability. Money in the trust is secure from creditors in case of liability issues. As of January 2007, our postemployment benefit liability was \$150 million. Future studies every two years will show us how much we put aside each year. Taking that liability off the books could improve our credit rating, which affects interest charged us.

The district needs an investment strategy for the \$30 million it has accumulated for retiree health benefits. With an irrevocable trust is we can pick a manager to invest longer term, for higher rates of interest. The county stays with short-term investments because of liquidity issues. A committee to pick the broker has made a tentative selection. The District's consultant thinks the economy is at its low point and will only get better. Dan, who is on the committee, disagrees. He advocates a very conservative investment strategy, and will argue aggressively against the consultant's likely recommendation to put 60% in the stock market. This issue needs to be resolved soon. AFT has not yet taken a position, and will discuss it at its Feb. 11 meeting.

The CSM **Budget Planning Committee** (BPC) recommended at its Feb. 2 meeting that the full-time tenure track nursing position not go forward, though it has been in the pipeline for several years. The committee recommended Susan Estes work with Jane McAteer on other options, including outside funding sources and working with the four applicants for the position if they want to be adjuncts. No new faculty positions will be approved for next year. Rick said BPC should focus on policy and not get involved in details. Teeka asserted as a member of the faculty and the union she does not like the policy of relying on adjuncts.

Adjuncts are wonderful teachers but are being exploited. The use of adjuncts may be OK for this year in nursing, but not as a policy. BPC is trying to save classes and help students get courses. Teeka said the use of part-timers is not good for the institution, the faculty, or the students.

Rick said division deans have saved about \$500,000 by cutting and consolidating sections. Reassigned time offered to WAC, some learning communities, and the honors program was all given back to the college. The WAC group decided it could not do its work in the available reassigned time. The BSI committee's reassigned time has been reduced from 9 units to 3. That committee also gets state funding. The BSI Coordinator position has been advertised, and three or four people have expressed interest. BPC is waiting to see what happens with the state budget. It will start strategizing for '09-'10, look at operating benchmarks and appropriate loads, and start identifying external funding sources.

Mike said it was hard to say no to any of the programs seeking reassigned time. Maybe Governing Council rather than BPC should decide what the college should focus on. Anne noted the honors program, WAC, and most learning communities are gone. Maybe we could have saved one of them. Rick said BPC reports its recommendations to College Council, which passes its own recommendations to President Claire for final decisions. We all need to work on directions for the future. Diana said while some faculty members say all or nothing, maybe others would work with less. Teeka said some learning communities are continuing, like her own. Bernard said if money comes back in, it should go into the classroom. The faculty appreciates we needed higher loads, but in some departments that was counterproductive. In ESL, all lower level classes were cut because those classes do not fill until the last minute. Many of their students do not have computers, and being unfamiliar with the college culture, do not register early. Our sister colleges did not cut their low enrollment classes. ESL and perhaps other departments lost students due to such class cuts. Students enter ESL at all levels, so mid-level ESL courses will continue to run. We need an across the board policy for fairness, but we need to look at details.

NEW GOVERNING COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES Diana welcomed new representatives to Governing Council: Tania Beliz for Math/Science to serve in place of Linda Phipps, who is on leave, and Suzanne Russell for Business/Technology in place of Craig Blake and Lilya Vorobey.

FACULTY OFFICES IN BUILDINGS 15, 17, AND 10N. Diana reviewed the situation. Jeremy Ball and Teeka James attended design build meetings as faculty representatives. There was a meeting for Building 15 and 17 occupants on Thursday, Feb. 5, but the announcement from Jennifer Hughes came late or not at all. That glitch is being looked into. Faculty complained that decisions on permanent locations, in particular of the Student Activities Center, were made without informing us. Diana noted it was not a snap decision. It was made by administration. Diana put it on our Jan. 27 agenda as soon as she found out about it.

Jeremy said an early decision was to use a new approach to construction, design build, not design/bid/build. The institution tells its needs and budget to the design build entity, and that entity comes back with recommendations. Bernard said people in 17 were surprised to learn instead of being faculty offices, 17 would be a student activities building with some faculty offices, and lots of faculty would move to 10N. To understate it a little, there has been some resistance. Jeremy said early on there was knowledge there would be redistribution of faculty, and that the original plan was to tear down either 15 or 17.

Teeka said she was made building 17 representative after the Student Activities Center decision was made. She went to a meeting in January at which contractors did bid interviews, and the committee decided which it liked best. She learned then that 17, not 15, would get the Student Activities Center. This was totally new to her. Teeka was a representative in picking the contractor, but had nothing to do with the 17 decision. She does not disagree with concerns about the process. The faculty was not represented when the key decision was made, but the representatives did do their jobs at design build meetings.

Jeremy and later Teeka were representatives to the district construction and planning group when it opted for design build, put out an RFP, and got bids from 16 entities, from which it selected and interviewed three.

Anne said everyone knew there would be offices in 10N, but most faculty, on learning 15 and 17 would only be renovated, assumed faculty would return to their old offices. There was very little concrete information. No one knew how much of 17 would be involved. People are operating on bits and pieces and rumors, since we haven't been given a clear, comprehensive idea of what will happen. Many people didn't know about the Feb. 5 meeting just because of a technical glitch. Governing Council members were informed on 1/27 there would be meetings of 15 and 17 faculty with construction people. We need to inform our constituents.

Bernard said it's not that it wasn't discussed, but that the decision had already been made. We were only informed of it. Jeremy said 10N will have as many faculty offices as either 15 or 17 does now. The college is way overbuilt on offices compared to classrooms, which negatively affects our state funding.

Construction planning people want to reclassify space from office to classroom to get more money. 10N has space for three division offices, each a suite of three offices. Jeremy suggested making room for the Student Activities Center in Building 15 by taking out the walls in the office suite which had been used by Al Acena and Linda Avelar, but 15 has concrete interior walls which are expensive to remove. 17, which was built four years later, is the best option for removing walls. Bernard asked why Student Activities is not in 10N.

Diana invited CSM President Mike Claire to today's meeting. Mike quipped this is not his first visit to Governing Council to apologize for a mistake. He said there are multiple issues, such as how was the decision made, and why didn't faculty know about it? Faculty are working with bits and pieces of information. There is no conspiracy, though such notions arise when there is a lack of information. Bob said most people don't see a conspiracy. Mike said Bob Hasson and Anne Stafford emailed him legitimate points and questions. Let's pull back and do it right. With all present and future potential occupants of 15 and 17 present, put everything on the table and have the conversation we should have had last semester.

By way of explanation, not excuse, last semester Mike and his cabinet were focused on accreditation. The work through November was great, and December's work put it over the top. Then this arose. Mike said he also hyper-focused on the budget. With other distractions, including a power shutdown, faculty location slipped off the radar. We also need to improve communications. A group formed for that purpose had its initial meeting Friday. Last fall a clear budget process was communicated. The current issue is an example of how not to do it. The construction planning department in Fall '08 pressed Mike for input about 15 and 17, but Mike couldn't fit it in – an honest mistake. At that time 10N and 15 were possibilities for the Student Activities Center, and 17 was not.

In the last week of December, the Construction Planning Department told Mike they would interview design build firms, but when it came to 15, 17, and 1, those firms don't know what they're bidding on. At that time he learned 15 could not be structurally altered. He met with students and laid it out. He met yesterday with Teeka and Dan Kaplan. It would be politically easy to leave everything the same, but Mike felt he had to do the right thing. He had a conversation with students to lay out the pros and the cons to them. The mistake was not having the conversation with the occupants of 17, 15, and 1. We have a lot of space in 15, 17, and 10N, and we are not using our office space as efficiently as we could be. Over the years we have assigned offices all over the place. We now have a chance to capture interests and needs, and through the senate, get a scheme that will work. With Building 36, we told faculty here is the new space, figure it out, and they did.

This was way off Mike's radar, but he had to make a decision. Besides communication, clarification of decisions and where they are made is an issue. When we move anyone, we should consult with the people impacted. As for the Student Activities Center, we are not sure what the ultimate decision will be, but we will be open minded and think of the best way to go for the institution. Madeleine asked whether it is a done deal, or can faculty look forward to a session where the decision will be made. Mike said nursing and probably Community Ed will move out of 17. We want solutions that will work for everybody. This is not an attempt to pit people against each other, either students vs. faculty or faculty vs. faculty.

Anne asked whether the location of the Student Activities Office has been determined. Mike said the step not taken is making sure we have met everyone's needs, within reason. There is a lot of evidence in Mike's

mind this is the best decision, but he is willing to consider other points of view. He changed his mind on the Language Arts labs, from moving them to 10N to keeping them in 18. Anne said we have too little information to form an opinion about the Student Activities Center.

Teeka said we want what will make CSM a great college for students. That includes having space for student government and activities. As faculty our concerns are noise and having our academic community broken up. We certainly do not look down on, or want to avoid, students. Students probably feel booted around in this process. Mike said it is sad we have not had a chance to celebrate the major accomplishment of getting off warning. We should be giving ourselves high fives as a college. The present communication issue is a perfect example of what we as an institution have to work on. It is a challenge in any institution. Mike is committed to it. The communication group includes Teeka, Diana, Jing Luan, Huy Tran, and Andreas Wolf, and is looking for classified staff. What does it take to have an effective communication process/system, in which roles and processes are well understood?

Bob said it is important to distinguish between the Student Activities Office and student activities. He said 5N will have very little to do with the college – it is for community outreach. Mike said in fact 5N will house CSM's cosmetology, nursing, and dental programs. The college needs to communicate a clear understanding of what we have been working on since 2004. Bernard asked where noisy outdoor activities will take place. Last semester, classes in 14, 16, and 19 were disrupted by such activities. Mike pointed out those have to be somewhere, regardless of where the offices are.

Madeleine said people don't always grasp the weird exigencies of project planning. Not all ideas are absorbed. There has been input from students. If people come up with a better idea, fine. It is good to have a concrete plan to chew on. She suggested a brief monthly development update – what we are deciding, and our current thinking. Jim said periodic updates should include maps which are clear, large, and legible.

Mike offered apologies to those who are upset about all this. In the context of designing 350,000 sq ft, we have done well. Mike will go back for input to make a more informed decision. He said he feels comfortable with Governing Council and its leadership. It is not a rubber stamp group. It is a tribute to the group that senior administration can open up the cabinet by having Senate leadership as a voice at the table. Those individuals speak for themselves, not for the senate, on college operations and logistics.

Diana will resend the email seeking faculty reps for both 15 and 17. Teeka said in not responding, some instructors are saying they are choosing not to be informed. Jim suggested cc'ing the deans. It is hard to get people to sign up for committees that lack pizzazz. Diana reminded us there will be an email from administration on a meeting for 15 and 17, probably sometime next week.

Teeka James talked about the **Smoking Task Force**. College Council decided to change smoking policy to allow smoking only in parking lots, and needed the task force to implement that. The main concerns at the first meeting were safety and logistics. We don't want people getting run over in parking lots, or made to walk too far, particularly employees who are tied to a particular location and have little flexibility with their time. Diane Martinez and Security supervisor John Wells walked the parking lots. Wells said it wouldn't be safe. Also, ash trays and benches to cluster people would take up parking spots. One proposal is to relocate the benches now between 17 and 19 and near 8 to spots at the edges of parking lots. VPSS Jennifer Hughes realized College Council had decided to consider restricting smoking to parking lots, not to areas next to lots. College Council had discussed revisiting what we have currently, but sent it back to the task force without a vote. Teeka apologized to Governing Council and to Jennifer (who was not present) if she, in fact, had misunderstood Jennifer's explanation of the task force's charge as assigned by College Council. Teeka inferred that perhaps College Council may be looking to a future nonsmoking campus, and the task force had noted that some colleges allow smoking only in private cars.

Diana, who had been at the College Council meeting when the task force was "created," reported that the task force was also supposed to look at smoking locations, track the effect of construction on smoking areas,

ask about the effectiveness and the policing of the policy, and consider moving smoking areas to parking lots or the edge of parking lots, or becoming a nonsmoking campus. Teeka said they did look at some of those but didn't realize doing so was part of the charge. Jennifer is calling county counsel about possibly citing people for smoking. Teeka said she likes the idea but it would be better to make it an internal student discipline offense, like cheating on a test or fighting on the quad. We don't want people getting a third strike or going to court over smoking a cigarette. Megan Claire, Fauzi Hamadeh, Diane Martinez, and Jennifer Hughes are on the task force. Consensus was the smoking areas don't work, especially on the walk to the parking lots past building 1.

Teeka talked with Jim about having smokers on the committee. It would be good to have a smoker's view of things, and the task force regretted that there were no smokers on the committee, but none had volunteered to serve. Are there people who smoke who want to advocate for faculty? People who want and need to smoke should not have to go really far. Jennifer will take task force work back to College Council.

Chalon Johnson from the *San Matean* observed the more you try to police people, the more they try to break out of it. Policing will take a lot of time and manpower, and will cost more. Cutting fantastic programs like welding but spending money on restricting smoking doesn't make sense. Teeka suggested Chalon take her views to ASCSM. Chalon said the thought of going to a parking lot to smoke between classes is not appealing. Having smoking areas in the middle of spaces spreads the smoke everywhere. Instead, tuck smoking areas into corners of spaces. Students also want a smoking area by the bus stop.

Suzanne Russell said cosmetology students have to walk across the quad to smoke. Cosmetology clients park in lot 11. There could be a smoking area near where there used to be a temporary cafeteria. Teeka said there was concern about client safety if the smoking area was too close to the parking lot. Suzanne stated there is a grassy area with a bench smokers could use. Clients could walk in the opposite direction, around the building, rather than having to walk past smokers. Suzanne thinks it's a good idea.

At the last meeting Jim Robertson reserved the right to comment on task force procedures. We all got an email from Jennifer Hughes a week before COI had its big December meeting where everything get done, when PIV work was scheduled for completion, and final exams were approaching. A single email asking for faculty for one or two meetings suggested a hidden agenda. It was presented as if it were a *fait accompli*. The task force was poorly presented, didn't come through Governing Council, and there was no time to respond. No time frame was given for making or implementing decisions. The process was poorly handled. Mike took the fall for the 15/17 situation. Jennifer needs to take the fall for this, for not scheduling the work at a time when faculty could do it. Teeka said she also found the timing of the initial meeting burdensome, but she believed it to have been College Council's doing, not Jennifer Hughes'. The task force is a College Council body, not a Senate body, so Jim could take his concerns to College Council. She will take Jim's concerns forward as well. She acknowledged she was not cognizant of task force processes last fall.

Diana agreed with Jim the communication and timing were bad. She referred Jim and Teeka to College Council meeting summaries for smoking task force reports. Teeka acknowledged misunderstanding some of the instructions to the task force (her concern being that she may have misrepresented the charge in an earlier statement.) Bernard observed if parking lots become smoking areas, they will need ash trays. Butts are toxic and bad for the watershed. Teeka said the task force is concerned about health, safety, and litter, and spent time on ash trays, but made no final decisions. Smoking while walking from one place to another is no longer permitted. Smoking must be done in a designated area or a parking lot. Some students flaunt their smoking. The percentage of smokers is higher among students than among faculty.

Diana asked members to email any comments on substance or process to Jennifer, cc'ing Teeka and Diana.

INSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEES At our Jan. 27 meeting we approved Laura Demsetz, Rosemary Nurre, and Madeleine Murphy for the Distance Education committee, and Rick Ambrose, Jacqueline Gamelin, and Diana Bennett for the Budget Planning Committee. Mission statements and task lists for all

the committees exist in draft form, and will be finalized when the committees meet. We have no faculty reps for DIAG or Enrollment Management. Diana will contact faculty who have served on DIAG in search of two or three to serve on the new committee. Kevin Sinarle has agreed to serve if needed. Ruth Turner said a large group will continue to participate in DIAG activities, only not as committee members. Web services librarian Michele Alaniz and philosophy adjunct Robert Schwartz will serve on the Technology Committee. Members are being sought for the Human Resources and Enrollment Management committees. Eileen emailed all counselors but got no takers for Human Resources. Enrollment Management was a large group, from which members for the new group are being sought. Someone on each committee will chair the committee and automatically go on the IPC committee. Completing mission statements and task lists is an important first step. Diana will contact and confirm any nominees she gets for these committees.

OFFICERS REPORTS College Council did not meet. **President's Council** reviewed how registration and construction went at the start of the semester, and discussed having a semester checklist, e.g. who is the administrator on call at night, what does the security office know, is there adequate lighting? The cosmetology end of the campus is very dark for evening students. College Council will meet with Diane Martinez and others about this. Eileen reported DEAC has yet to meet. Diana and Patty Dilko met with the student senate on the plus/minus grading pilot, which conflicted with the most recent DSGC meeting. Treasurer Rosemary Nurre reported we have over \$2500 in our account, and asked Diana to send an email reminding faculty to pay dues.

ACCREDITATION UPDATE Diana gave out information from Barbara Beno's office on the accreditation status of many colleges. Many schools are being put on probation. More information is in the follow-up report on our accreditation website. We have three things to work on for Oct. 2009, including program review for labs. Our getting off warning did not address tasks the District needs to do for the college. All of the campus stuff is satisfactory. Diana emailed the annual update on program review to faculty and deans.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 pm. The next meeting will be Feb. 24, 2009. We need to review the rest of Ch. 6 of District Rules and Regs, including intellectual property.