



Governing Council Meeting

Feb. 24, 2009 minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

President Diana Bennett
Vice President Eileen O'Brien
Secretary Lloyd Davis
Library Teresa Morris

Language Arts Bernard Gershenson
 Madeleine Murphy
Math/Science Tania Beliz
 Huy Tran
Student Services Ruth Turner

MEMBERS ABSENT

Treasurer Rosemary Nurre
Business/Technology Suzanne Russell

P.E./Athletics Joe Mangan
**Creative Arts/
 Social Science** Jim Robertson

OTHERS ATTENDING

ASCSM Francisco Duarte
 Roger Nishimoto
San Matean Chalon Johnson

Business/Technology Rick Ambrose
Language Arts Merle Cutler
Math/Science Laura Demsetz
 Bob Hasson

SUMMARY

- **Role of Governing Council, and responsibilities of its members to communicate with their divisions**
- **President's Task Force on Buildings 17, 15, and 10N: the process going forward**
- **Budget: district cash flow; funding post-retirement health benefits**
- **Drafting/Industrial Technology PIV committee recommends minor curriculum changes; recommendation postponed to 3/10/09**
- **Accreditation update: Oct. '09 site visit not required by ACCJC; lab program review; implementing integrative planning**

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:29 pm. The agenda was approved, with some changes to the order. Reports from Diana on President's Council and discussion of Buildings 15 and 17, and a brief budget report, will precede the Drafting PIV report. The minutes of Feb. 10, 2009 were approved, with an opening summary. Members suggested using bullet points in the summary, and making fewer attributions of remarks to individuals.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF GOVERNING COUNCIL Diana distributed excerpts from Title 5 on the role of Academic Senate for members to review. It came out of the Building 17 discussion that faculty are unclear about the role of the senate and the responsibilities of Governing Council members. On the future of Building 17, the role of the senate will be to provide updates. It is not covered by the 10+1 academic and professional matters. Members need to inform constituents about issues raised in Governing Council. One way is to speak at division meetings, but some divisions rarely meet. Another way is for reps to email their constituents about relevant issues, then gather responses from them and report back to Governing Council. We are looking at changing district rules and regs, program review for labs, curriculum changes, and PIV issues.

Points in discussion: We need to strike a balance between too much information and having a routine for reps to consult and represent the views of their divisions. The latter should be habitual. We could send a summary to constituents with a link to our website. We could put a request for feedback in the text of the message. Reps from division with two reps can alternate in this duty. Reps on other committees have

things to report as well. It would be a huge plus to have regularly scheduled division meetings. Math/Science meets monthly, and Counseling twice monthly, with space on the agenda for reports and feedback. Governing Council and the Committee on Instruction need a vehicle for reporting and for conversations with the people they represent. Diana will send a memo to administration about the value of division meetings and request Academic Senate reports be put on division meeting agendas.

We could recommend a vehicle for communication be the monthly division meeting (implying divisions should have one.) Some divisions do not meet monthly. They should, with budget, accreditation, and other critical issues facing us. Regular division meetings would be a great way to communicate from Governing Council, College Council, and various committees – a lot is going on and it is hard to read emails. We could have a report from Governing Council be a feature on division meeting agendas. Diana will take that back to President's Council and College Council and to instructional deans.

We could do updates the day after our meetings. It might be better not to unless something was discussed that required input from reps, and the next meeting is so important constituents need to get in touch with their rep before the regular exchange at the next division meeting. If the next Governing Council meeting is not a decision meeting, don't bother. The summaries could flag items for which a decision is needed. Lots of communication gets down to a certain level and stops. It is up to individuals to filter it on down. We should encourage regular division meetings, or else discussions won't happen which should. Do a Wednesday email for a decision situation.

The college also has a communication task force. Faculty members on the committee are Diana Bennett, Huy Tran, Teeka James, and Yaping Li. We have to figure what form of communication is best for various areas and situations. On the 10+1, Rick recalled that when he was Senate president the Board of Trustees decided to rely primarily on the Senate for all 10+1 issues. This came as a surprise. Diana noted we are a recommending body.

The 10+1 does not cover parking and smoking, which are working conditions issues. We get roped into co-administration. There are campus issues that are the responsibility of administration, not the Senate.

PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON BUILDINGS 15 AND 17. President Mike Claire sent an email just before today's meeting on the presidential task force he is forming for 15, 17, and 10N. He has asked Bob Hasson, Susan Estes, and Jennifer Hughes to facilitate the task force. The final decision is needed by 3/16. Mike is also asking people who want to serve on the task force to contact Bob, Susan, Jennifer, or himself by Thursday, Feb. 26.

Points in discussion: This is not a Governing Council issue, but is very important to all of us. Let's clear out things that do not pertain to Governing Council. The task force will be charged with gathering needs of stakeholders, figuring out who needs to be where and what is the best configuration. The decision is Mike's. The task force is to come up with a menu of options, and how to prioritize them. These are programmatic decisions. Where departments go will be determined; who is in what office is a lower level decision, presumably made with conversations with departments.

The Building 17 meeting with Mike Claire resulted from the Student Activities Center move. Which faculty groups will be in 10N has not been decided. The counseling staff will be. Faculty from, or going to, 15, 17, or 10N can contact Bob about being on the task force. The solution might involve a group that didn't think they were involved. Be sure people who might be involved are represented. It would be good to have two or three people from each of 15 and 17, as well as people going to 10N, e.g. from 27, and the "homeless", such as the Health Center and CTL. A decision is due by March 16.

Merle Cutler said Building 17 faculty felt broadsided, not adequately informed in a timely manner of something with so much impact on our professional lives. The proposed changes in communication are great, with solutions other than blanketing emails being proposed. Get representatives to report back

quickly on anything that will impact people personally. Is a monthly division meeting enough time? This happened in such haste. English is meeting tomorrow, and could have missed an opportunity without the special meeting. Merle thought the role of Governing Council was to represent faculty. She heard 50% of faculty agreed with the proposed Building 17 changes. We need informational sessions, polls, and greater reporting back before people purport to say what we want. A lot of people were very upset with this move and had no opportunity to say so. If the role of the senate is to represent us, how can it do that better? No one should speak as the voice of the faculty until reps speak with faculty. Faculty need to know of things coming up that involve us. How can the senate speak for us in a more accurate way?

Madeleine said Jeremy organized a poll about faculty preferences. Polling might be a routine method to sound out something fairly concrete. If more discussion is needed, have a meeting. Have a Wednesday update asking for feedback on strong-feeling issues.

Bob Hasson said as a statistician he has trouble with online polls because of nonparticipation and multiple responses. Bob prefers paper polls with at most two questions. A poll is a measure of opinion, not a vote. Points in discussion: Next year's calendar has many flex days since an AFT poll said yes to them, but in the sciences they mess up labs. The impact on people who said no was not considered. It would be better to inquire and report back by division. Even within divisions, different programs are run differently. If more faculty are involved in more committees, instead of the same faces, then more people will know more things. The chances of people having heard about an issue will be greater. Bernard said before email he conducted polls as Bob suggested, on plus/minus grading. Language Arts was for it in 1998 and was generally for the compressed calendar the first time it came up. Some part-timers thought the poll was discriminatory because it asked respondents whether they were full- or part-timers. The purpose was to see who had more of a stake. It worked well in presenting the Language Arts point of view.

More points in discussion: Administration made the Building 17 decision over winter break, without faculty participation. The senate was proactive in making it clear faculty needed to be involved. Diana called it a train wreck. It slipped thru Mike's radar. We need a process. The faculty is now on the radar. The Construction Planning Department has dropped the ball about getting information to administration and to parties who need it. The result is 11th hour issues which they decide, then inform us. Diana has asked President Claire to inform us immediately. Diana asked for Barry Chen to be at the Building 17 meeting and for a clearer map of Building 17, but neither came through. Things are happening fast and are controlled by time and money regarding construction. She asked for plain language, e.g. "concrete walls we can't tear down" not "structural problems". Administration consults with the construction people, then informs us. Let us know, even if only a heads-up. There were hurt feelings, fingers pointed, and heated discussions, all because the process failed from the beginning. Emailing everyone when something controversial comes up is not great, but we could live with that.

Diana said there is a lack of effective communication among the Construction Planning Department, administration, and faculty. President's Council has asked for construction timelines, but to date we have not received anything. A task force has been formed to address communication issues and find other options. What we do now isn't working. Diana, Huy Tran, Yaping Li, and Teeka Jones are the faculty members in the group, which also has staff and administrators. Madeleine suggested listing members of all task forces in a bulleted update or the bulleted meeting summary. Diana will add this to the senate site. Members thanked Bob Hasson and task force members for attending.

BUDGET Rick Ambrose reported the impact on us of the recently passed state budget is not yet clear. There will be trailer bills and the May revise. Karen Blackwood says we can weather the storm in '08-'09, based on the cuts we made to class sections, reassigned time, and supplies. Next year, '09-'10, is yet to be looked at. We will need to discuss long term strategies on where CSM needs to go. The District prepares worst case, best case, and middle-of-the-road scenarios. The effect of class size on load and productivity will be an issue again next year. Rick will have more information at our next meeting, after District and college budget committees meet.

Cash flow is a concern to the District. The District payroll is \$7 million/month. Legislators are delaying funding community colleges, a tactic used in the past. We get money in April for February, and in June or July for April. We need to look for temporary funding. One source is TRANs (tax revenue anticipation notes.) The total dollar amount is about \$30 million.

A District committee has been put together with four constituencies represented, to decide who will administer and investment advise the irrevocable trust to fund the insurance premiums for **post-retirement health benefits**. We now have about \$33 million in the post-retirement fund, none yet in an irrevocable trust. The group selected will consist of an administrator, a trust company, and an advisor. The four constituencies from all campuses narrowed the choice to two groups. What percent of the current \$33 million balance will go into the irrevocable trust, and into what types of investment, are being discussed. Some on the faculty are concerned about not putting all of it into the trust. Any money in the trust is safe against creditors. Money left outside is not. We set aside \$1.5 million/yr. Actuarial studies will be done every few years in the future to determine how much the fund needs. We should have approximately \$150 million now. However, we are in better shape than many colleges. We are lucky to have a fiscally responsible board who committed to it some time ago. Money with the county is invested short term, to maintain liquidity. With an irrevocable trust we can commit money longer term, and thus earn higher rates. The greater the return, the faster it builds, reducing obligations to add to the fund in future years. Kathy Blackwood sees to it the District complies with GASB Statement 45, the accounting standards for post-retirement benefits other than pensions.

Kathy Blackwood is proposing changes to how funds are charged for post-retirement health benefits. Salaries and post-retirement benefits now come out of fund 1, our operating funds. Fund 3 is for mandatory areas like DSPS, EOPS, and nursing and health services, and state funding for equipment. Faculty and staff paid out of fund 3 have their health benefits come out of Fund 1. Kathy suggested we spread health benefits around to other funds to take pressure off fund 1. We could then get grants from fund 3 to absorb some costs. Kathy will meet with the CSM Budget Committee next week.

Diana suggested guests connect with the Secretary or the speakers for notes or more information.

DRAFTING PIV Laura Demsetz presented the Drafting/Industrial Technology PIV Summary and Recommendations. The Drafting program has been at CSM for a long time, and was a healthy program with a very strong reputation, but as employer needs changed and staffing changed, the program withered. A PIV group was formed to see what could be done. Manufacturing and Industrial Technology is down to three classes, one of them last taught in 1999. Only MANU 130, Blacksmithing and Forging, is still vibrant. With buildings coming down it faces the same space issue as welding. It has an active student population but is not in a career path to high paying jobs.

The committee felt if the budget permitted bringing it back, Blacksmithing should become part of Art or Community Ed. We don't want it to go away, but as construction proceeds there is no place for it. Its focus is on wrought iron works of art, but its techniques are used in industrial processes.

Drafting is all done on computers. AutoCAD is the industry leader, followed by SolidWorks, which, like the Mac, is prettier and easier but has a smaller industry base. The program has a core drafting course, four semesters in AutoCAD, a fifth AutoCAD course in mechanical design, and a SolidWorks course. The committee looked at industry demand, and found lots in infrastructure work. Local government databases for home remodeling use AutoCAD. Our program prepares for mechanical design.

Problems: The loss of feeder programs, technical programs including drafting that used to be at local high schools but are no longer there, except at Burlingame. Our program needs better marketing and branding. People search Google for AutoCAD, not drafting. The committee felt a board class in drafting like our

120 is a turnoff. That vehicle seems old fashioned, even for important content. The course used to link to machine tool technology and welding facilities for students to make things. We've lost some of that.

Software packages are updated yearly. To attract people, we need current versions. A stress is funding for current hardware and software. Space is an issue. When student activities went to 19, it took up a CAD lab. The program needs a second lab.

Opportunities: the economy is down. 31 students are in starting AutoCAD, the highest it's been for a while. We have a window to reform and re-grow programs. AutoCAD will continue to be used extensively in design, if not in industry.

Recommendations: continue the program in drafting with minor changes. Modify the curriculum so the program is attractive to a broader range of students. Ensure access to the latest software and hardware. Get modeling back in to the drafting curriculum. We need to increase marketing and recruitment efforts.

Other programs in the area: SFSU offers authorized AutoCAD training. It is a big deal, and expensive. De Anza has a program with good marketing, and both AutoCAD and SolidWorks user groups. A course runs for alumni whenever there's an update. There is room for a Mid-Peninsula program. Other programs are like ours, but are remnants of traditional programs. It is hard to exist as a small potatoes program. There is room to grow. Modify the program so the board course goes away, and integrate its intellectual content into a three semester CAD sequence which is more reasonable for the job market. After the three course core, there will be application courses, 1-4 units each, not offered every semester. Example: laying out plans for a city building department, run every two years for the community. We also need a second SolidWorks class.

The committee recommends minor changes in curriculum. To be competitive, we need institutional commitment to fund software updates. We would like the program to obtain funding for two small "clean" manufacturing units, demonstration model building boxes which do not require space and infrastructure. They cost about \$15,000. Each of the two labs should have one.

Marketing: change the names of programs and courses; emphasize software brands as De Anza does well. Most other things are similar to issues in other programs, such as having a web site.

Summary: keep the program with minor changes in curriculum.

Drafting PIV committee members are Laura Demsetz, Roy Brixen, and Kathy Ross. Lilya Vorobey, who is teaching the classes, worked with the committee and signed off on the report but was not a committee member. Lilya would be responsible for implementing the changes. She is stretched thin and cannot staff the program alone. She needs adjuncts. She emailed her concerns but was not able to attend today's meeting.

Points in discussion: We give tech-prep credit for students who take drafting in high school. They go into the first AutoCAD class. DRAF 120 is the entry point. We should get rid of it and spread its content into the other courses. Issues include the cost of software, finding a location, and having enough faculty. The curricular changes are minor. Technology has access to funds. The problem is thinking we don't need the current version. Not having it hurts the marketing of the program. Faculty commitment level is a concern. People are tired, and we hope for a spark of enthusiasm. Curriculum changes now are too late for next year's catalog, but we can modify courses, such as the first AutoCAD course, and run them as 680s in Spring 2010. Marketing can start right away. Update the web site. Stay in touch with industry. Faculty can dive into the courses. There is a pool of adjunct faculty. Adopt a standard textbook. Assigning workbook exercises as homework allows spreading board class ideas into two AutoCAD courses. The program has lost faculty to retirements. Jim Cullen retired 5 years ago. That and the loss of feeder high school programs knocked out the day component.

Skyline has no such program. Cañada has AutoCAD in interior design and a transfer course in graphics using AutoCAD and SolidWorks. Engineering does its own drafting in engineering design. A problem is the current drafting courses don't articulate to major courses in four year schools. The program as a package could articulate. Our program once gave people a first course in what it means to have visual representation, but our present first course is a turnoff to new students. We can thread that information into computer applications. The committee proposes putting that content into the other courses, with computer applications showing not just how to use software, but what to use it for.

Drawing boards are not used anymore. Students want AutoCAD skills for their resumes. Drafting has changed. It is now closer to engineering. Engineers produce their own drawings. There is still demand for people who can manipulate these, for example in designing mechanical parts. The intent of the fourth class in the applications area is to offer architectural applications one year, mechanical applications the next. The three courses, with both mechanical and architectural examples, prepare students for both. A landscape class uses the drawing boards. Drafting will need the boards next year because the curriculum will not have changed. The horticulture program includes two weeks on landscape design, for which it might not make sense to computerize. Horticulture might use the old drawing boards, or get smaller lap size boards.

The PIV committee looked into partnering with other programs, but didn't come up with as much as it had hoped. There are three possibilities for sharing software costs: engineering, which has a small program so should share; architecture, which is struggling to come back and is not interested in AutoCAD at this time, relying on free trial versions of software instead; and the DGME cluster, which has software used to make visual representations in preparation for making something real.

Diana is not comfortable with the PIV committee recommending "minor changes." She recommended tabling the PIV recommendations to the next meeting. The program has met the minimum class size requirements. Laura recommended approving it with some way to ascertain the commitment level of faculty. We know there will be no new positions next year, and there is a market for the program. Diana's own program is on a timeline. Laura said she doesn't see a change coming in two weeks unless there is a demand for the change to be made, so she recommends accepting it contingent on the faculty member's commitment. Diana recommends not approving it. Laura noted Skyline and Cañada are not offering it, but San Francisco State and De Anza do. In this time of economic downturn, occupational programs are worth re-growing if there is faculty commitment to do so. People on the committee looked at demand and felt there was a market for it. Faculty would have to modify the content of three courses. The concern is whether the energy level is there to revitalize the program.

Points in discussion: The plan is acceptable but there needs to be faculty commitment. If another body is approving the money, they could look at it. An argument for keeping the program is it funnels into a variety of areas. If students need it, it should stay. Employers need it too.

Laura said she doesn't think we can extract any level of commitment not already demonstrated. Diana recommended postponing the vote until the next meeting, to allow members adequate time to review the recommendations. If members have questions, contact Laura. Laura and Governing Council accepted this suggestion and Laura will contact everyone on the PIV committee. Members agreed SolidWorks and AutoCAD are definitely needed, and the name of the program should be changed. Tania will check with Matt Leddy about Horticulture's interest in the drawing boards. Diana will send an email about Governing Council's concern with this PIV recommendation. The PIV proposal will be on the March 10 agenda.

Some discussion items were tabled until the next meeting: Chapter 6 of District Rules and Regs, which ACCJC wants the district to look at. This includes intellectual property rights, an issue which also

involves AFT. Diana will send us what the latest proposals, for us to comment on. Discussion of a legal opinion from the state disallowing the use of Fs or incompletes to discourage cheating was also tabled.

ACCREDITATION UPDATE – There will be no actual visit to campus in October 2009, but there can be no letup in our efforts, and the midterm report and the next six-year self-study are not far off. Linda Avelar sent out a draft of a program review document for all labs on campus. Diana will send it again in an email. It is modeled after our program review. Those in charge of labs need to examine it soon to be sure it is complete. Most work on it will be done by April or May, but there may be some summer work. Diana will send us the latest from the state on Hour by Arrangement rules, which are still in flux.

Several meetings have been held on implementing integrative planning. All faculty positions are filled on the new institutional committees:

- Distance Education (Rosemary Nurre, Madeleine Murphy, Laura Demsetz)
- Diversity in Action Group (DIAG) (Martin Bednarek, Kate Motoyama)
- Technology (Robert Schwartz, Michelle Brown, Michele Alaniz)
- Human Resources (Eileen O'Brien, Yuriy Sushko)
- Budget Planning (Rick Ambrose, Jackie Gamelin, Diana Bennett)
- Enrollment Management (Cheryl Gregory, Kevin Sinarle)

Diana, Susan and Jennifer will meet with each committee to give orientations, including expectations, guidelines, and reporting. For example, Enrollment Management will track how people are being enrolled. Will a waitlist of 60 translate into a new section? Follow through by 10/09. Each committee will have several tasks resulting from the Educational Master Plan. Chairs will be on the Instructional Planning Committee. A recorder will post minutes and agendas, and the committee will report on its tasks.

Diana emailed faculty asking for volunteers. She got mission and task lists for each committee. Many people are active in DEAC. A nomination from Ruth Turner for the committee slipped through the cracks when names were submitted to President's Council. Diana will take that name to President's Council. Having three faculty members is desirable since sometimes one can't make the meeting.

Diana distributed a smoking task force update and a statement about reducing copying costs. Points in discussion: Faculty members were told we could request my.smccd.edu accounts, but to get one we must register for a class. Many students still don't read my.smccd email, which includes a modest number of announcements about college events.

ASCSM representative Roger Nishimoto asked for faculty blessing and counsel on ASCSM's plan to recruit students and faculty to go to Sacramento on Monday, March 16 for a statewide protest against budget cuts. All community colleges will send students and faculty. The state has reduced community college cuts, but there is still lack of awareness in the legislature and the public of our situation. Roger wants to give five minute presentations in classes to sign up people for the protest. He will go to department meetings to ask to go to classes. The college can't give a day off to either instructors or students. ASCSM has approved funds to rent buses for faculty, students, and community members.

ANNOUNCEMENTS On the **March 11 flex day**, CTL will offer WebAccess training in the morning, and departments are advised to work on program reviews in the afternoon. the **alternative calendar** committee is collecting information about its feasibility from faculty and students in different programs.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 pm. The next meeting will be Mar. 10, 2009.