



Governing Council Meeting

Nov. 10, 2009 minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

President Diana Bennett
Vice President Huy Tran
Secretary Lloyd Davis
Treasurer Rosemary Nurre

**Creative Arts/
 Social Science** Jim Robertson
 Benedict Lim

Language Arts Kate Motoyama
 Daniel Keller
Library Michele Alaniz
Math/Science Tania Beliz
 Carlene Tonini
Student Services Ruth Turner
 Kevin Sinarle
P.E./Athletics Joe Mangan

MEMBERS ABSENT

**Business/
 Technology** Suzanne Russell
 Lilya Vorobey

OTHERS ATTENDING

VPI Susan Estes
COI Laura Demsetz
**Creative Arts/
 Social Science** Krys Bobrowski
 Mitchell Klein
 Jesus Moya
 Robert Schwartz

AFT Dan Kaplan
Language Arts Jing Wu
 Amy Sobel
Math/Science Kate Deline
 Linda Hand
Student Services Steve Cooney

SUMMARY

- VPI Susan Estes reviewed the administration response to last year’s PIV recommendations. It accepted those on German, Drafting, Library Studies, and Digital Media, but recommended eliminating Welding (lack of facilities) and not offering Machine Tool Technology (which exists to support Welding.).
- Members raised questions about the role of, and salary and funding issues related to, Community Ed.
- Counterproposals to Cabinet’s revised list of reductions are due Nov. 12. The final proposals will be on our Nov. 17 agenda for a Nov. 24 vote.
- Faculty from Language Arts and Creative Arts/Social Science spoke in support of their programs and questioned budget reduction criteria. The possibility of a separate faculty proposal through DAS to the Board of Trustees was discussed.
- Language Arts introduced a resolution requesting information from district office and facilities on the FTE impact of its budget cuts on employee classifications, and asking them to consider deeper administrative cuts. Our vote on the resolution will be Nov. 17.

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:17 p.m in 36-109. The agenda, and the minutes of the Nov. 3 emergency meeting, were approved.

BUDGET REDUCTIONS – ADMINISTRATION PIV RESPONSE VPI Susan Estes was present to address the process followed by President’s Cabinet. Responses to PIV recommendations were based on last year’s work, not on the current budget situation or what may happen next fall. Cabinet accepted most PIV recommendations.

German: the PIV committee recommended consolidating the transfer level 100 course with the conversational 800 sections, and offering them together to boost enrollment. Senate and Cabinet agreed sections under 20 had to be cut, and that the Certificate of Specialization in German had to be removed, since we no longer had enough units for credit on campus.

Drafting, Manufacturing & Industrial Technology, Machine Tool Technology, and Welding: Cabinet supported having drafting look at its course work, and keep sections supporting CTE courses. Cabinet did not accept Senate recommendations on the other areas: Blacksmithing seemed standalone and one of a kind. It is not a prerequisite and no part of a program. It should go to Community Ed. Cabinet recommended not offering Machine Tool Technology, because it is to support welding, which we suggest should be eliminated, considering load, enrollment, and cost. Welding buildings are scheduled to come down. The college has known that for years. Welding faculty asked to rewrite curriculum to adjust for loss of facilities, but that did not happen. The college facilities plan does not include rebuilding the welding facility. There is no money for facility and equipment, especially with low load. These could come back, say through a community partnership. For right now, there is no way to run a welding program without facilities and machinery, and given the number of students and load, those are too costly compared to other needs.

Rosemary asked whether this is part of a move to emphasis on transfer. What of nursing and dental assisting, which also require small classes? Susan said the Cabinet has had no discussion on getting rid of those. Mike has mentioned a focus on transfer. Look at the Educational Master Plan. Our transfer population has been declining. We want them back, and we do not want to be only transfer. Susan is committed to CTE. It serves an important part of the community, and we need the balance in our curriculum.

The welding decision was based on welding facilities coming down. Nursing and Dental Assisting have new facilities. We need to look at CTE offerings to be sure they are suited for the community. New programs are being considered for the Technology division as others pass away. For example, it will launch a new utilities program in Spring 10 and develop it. Cosmetology is moving to new facilities. There are no long range plans to get rid of CTE.

Rosemary observed that when the economy gets better, we could be in same boat as five or six years ago, with transfer students on the decline. Will people who are now sending their kids to community college send them to four year schools when their portfolios get better? How realistic a goal for us is building transfer?

Susan called that a valid point. After these first round discussions we will have all college meetings facilitated by IPC and bringing in the Office of Instruction and Academic Senate. Diana is co-chair of IPC. What do we want the college to look like? Do not build something on a short time frame. We want transfer students but need to think about the numbers of students in CTE and basic skills. 75 to 90% of our students place into basic skills in English and math. When we have all college meetings in spring, be sure to express opinions, and be sure they get captured in meeting minutes.

Dan Kaplan asked when Cabinet recommended blacksmithing be shifted to Community Ed, had they determined Community Ed is willing to take it? Community Ed is pretty autonomous. Susan has met with Community Ed. She said they have no responsibility or obligation to take our recommendation, and what we recommend often must be transformed and reinvented to be a good fit. Ed. Dan noted there is no agreement yet. He thought there was a possible community partner for welding. Susan said we have nothing substantial. Diana said the Senate asked a subcommittee to look for an alternate location, but it had no success. Susan said she does not want to say never, but for now we need to take welding out of the curriculum.

Library Studies – The Senate recommended adding information competency to the curriculum. Laura said that process, undertaken by COI, is parallel to review of the library program. We fell short in not having an information competency requirement, but now we have it. It will help library courses, some of which are being reinvented or banked. The subcommittee recommended it because assessment showed students didn't do well on information competency. Susan said information competency is not just Googling something. We

want students to become critical investigators of what things mean, and identify good vs bad research. When they go to the internet, we want them to have sophistication as to what to read.

Digital Media– Journalism, Film, Multimedia, Graphics, with Broadcasting in an advisory role. It was a hard process but they have a plan, outlined in the PIV process. Stacks of curriculum papers are going to COI. As soon as the program is in place, it must be sent to the state for approval. We want to give Digital Media people time to make it work. Four programs have merged into one, Digital Media, which will launch in Fall 2010. Diana called it a tough process, with lots of emotions. We have agreed to move forward to allow the individual programs to survive.

Steve Cooney asked about Cooperative Work Experience Education (**Co-op Ed**.) Susan pointed out Co-op Ed did not go through PIV last year.

Carlene asked what happens to the money Community Ed collects. Susan said Community Ed is self-sustaining. They have to support themselves. They can be more creative as long as they have students. If something does not succeed it isn't offered again. Community Ed will probably become more a district function, and will probably grow. Skyline and Canada may send courses there. An idea under discussion is if they become profit generating they might feed some money back to the colleges.

Krys Bobrowski asked about connecting and integrating with electronic music. We used to have four core electronic music courses part of a digital track. Diana said coordination with other programs is happening. Diana has looked at electronic music's courses. There are issues about prerequisites. Krys also asked about coordination with Skyline and Canada. Canada has a music course, Digital Music for Film, which is basically Audio for Digital Media. Diana said the COI course outline form asks whether there are similar courses here or at other campuses, have we talked with them, and how did those discussion go? In this case that should be checked. Krys said the courses we had here are popping up elsewhere. Laura said if they are distinctly different we want to keep our courses. We are three separate colleges, and once prided ourselves on our autonomy. We are not well-coordinated. There is a tug of war between preserving our own college and working together.

Dan Kaplan asked how Community Ed salaries are determined. Susan said it involves numbers of students, operating costs, and breakeven level. Roughly, salary is a percentage of fees charged, after Community Ed has covered its costs. We have been letting Community Ed use our facilities without charge. Some instructors do quite well in Community Ed, others do not.

BUDGET REDUCTIONS – REVISED BUDGET LIST Susan took questions about Cabinet's revised list. She first corrected a recent administration statement that a \$100 million endowment would yield \$200,000 at 2%. In fact, 2% of \$100 million is \$2 million.

Jesus Moya asked why three sections per semester were cut from the **Ethnic Studies** curriculum. Susan said criteria for cuts were sent out several weeks ago. Professionalism was not one of the criteria. To find cuts we have to look at programs. Cabinet saw it essential to protect some courses to help our students progress through other courses. Without basic skills, e.g. in ESL, English, math, and reading, students cannot succeed in transfer and other courses. This influenced discussion, and is in the rationale preceding the latest grid. We had to look at other areas to find where we could reduce and still meet the needs of students. We have no ethnic studies requirement. Title 5 says students need to be introduced to global issues and diversity, not solely in ethnic studies but also, for example, in foreign language and communication. Susan stressed nothing is personal. We are looking at data, needs of students, and the college overall. Making the best judgment is based on several factors, especially the Oct. 16 criteria. Not all will agree. Something would be really wrong if we all agreed. That is not how a good robust discussion takes place. We need to be able to engage in give and take.

Steve Cooney, from **Co-op Ed**, asked what "no recommendation" means on the grid. Laura explained a statement about why a program should stay is a comment. A recommendation proposes a cut, possibly an

alternative to a cut already on the list. The submissions were read by the Ad Hoc Committee and Cabinet. Susan said we have another weekend for discussion. There is time for more consideration.

Mitchell Klein, who teaches **Music** 665MN, Peninsula Symphony, asked what is the process for recording factual errors so they are addressed, and for initiating further discussion? Diana replied we will talk about counter proposals.

Daniel Keller said Language Arts offered up online **English** classes, which have extremely high attrition rates. He asked whether English can offer to cut sections to save other courses. Susan said in general no, but case by case consideration is possible. She has printed out current overall fill rates (by program, not by instructor.) The fill rate is the number of enrolled students as a percentage of the enrollment limit. Instructors are reminded to drop students who are not attending. Our overall fill rate is now 82%. English is now at 88%. In foreign languages, Italian has 94%, Japanese 78%, and Chinese 52%. Fill rates suggest how many people are seeking courses. We are looking not at intrinsic value of courses, but at demand. How many students are being served? English 100, 110, and 165 students transfer. We must consider that English 100 is a new degree requirement. Cabinet felt we must protect basic parts of the curriculum. Waitlists for English and math are huge. They are not huge for all foreign languages. It is a difficult situation. We tried to make the best decisions overall for students. Chris Phillips said it would be wonderful to get more specifics from Cabinet on its rejection of the Music Department's Form B revised proposal.

Susan said we will cut **concurrent enrollment**. For example we will not offer classes at Hillsdale unless they have outside funding sources. That piece of the music program was cut. Cutting Peninsula Symphony and Masterworks Chorale is hard to do. Many students take such courses over and over. Those courses will go to Community Ed, which seems frustrating to those offering the courses. We will work on facilities and other aspects of the courses. How do we get students through the curriculum, especially CTE, transfer, and basic skills? There is also a Title 5 repeatability issue. We could have to pay money back to the state.

Mitchell Klein stated it would be fiscally ruinous and musically impossible for the Symphony to be in Community Ed. Community Ed people said they could not guarantee we would have the only suitable space on a given evening. In considering this alternative, Cabinet failed to realize they were proposing something not possible. We are rather frustrated. The gap is huge in philosophy, viability, and fiscal issues. Also, some statements of fact in the recommendations were not correct.

Amy Sobel asked whether our input is likely to change minds. Language Arts and its departments know our programs well and are passionate. We came up with ideas, and some were rejected, possibly for good reasons. How much of a conversation is it? How much is it possible to change Cabinet's minds about their recommendations? Is it worth our time coming up with options? If there is only a 5% chance of changing minds, we will take it as it comes. If it is fairly open, we will approach it a different way.

Susan said the original grid is very different from the current grid. Most proposals were accepted and appreciated. A few were not. Susan said there is about a 90% chance the latter will not change. Cabinet cannot see taking English courses out, with their long waitlists and high fill rates.

Jing Wu asked why **Chinese** 111, a high fill rate, high load online course was cut. Susan addressed how Cabinet chose the languages. First, instructional administrators (instructional deans and the directors of nursing and the library) discussed it. Putting ASL back served the need of IGETC. We also need an Asian language. Japanese is thriving more than Chinese. Italian is thriving, so it is back in also. We are not taking off English courses, so we took off Chinese to make things add up. Online courses cost as much as on campus courses, and Cabinet is looking at features other than fill rate and load.

Responding to a question from Kate Deline, Susan said what is occurring on the other campuses will be addressed outside this forum. Diana will suggest to Cabinet that some programs need more courses. Susan said such programs could contact her directly, but need to do so quickly. Mitchell Klein said

Peninsula Symphony was founded in 1949. It is a 501c3 organization. It has been on campus for 15 years, with a collaboration for the past 5 years making it available to students and providing concerts here.

Diana said she is hearing we need discussion with Community Ed. Susan will ask them for a memo on how salaries are arrived at. There may be a separate college meeting, or workshops, on how it functions. Diana and Laura will talk to them.

The Ad Hoc Committee collated, organized, and submitted the proposals to cabinet. Diana asked for questions for the Ad Hoc Committee members present, herself and Robert Schwartz, but there were none.

We are through 11/06 on the **timeline** we approved a few weeks ago. Faculty with counterproposals should attend a 10 a.m. meeting on 11/11 with deans. Diana will email its location. For the counterproposals, look especially at the rationale. Go farther and deeper. Final counterproposals are due 11/12 at 10 am. The Ad Hoc Committee will accept and collate all counterproposals, and will meet at 1 pm to review them. If there are questions they will contact submitters. They will submit the proposals to Cabinet at 1 pm 11/13. Cabinet will send out their answer ASAP. Final proposals will be on Governing Council's 11/17 agenda for a vote 11/24.

Mitchell Klein asked whether the document he sent is a counter proposal. It is what he wants sent to Cabinet. Diana replied she hasn't looked at them yet.

Rosemary asked how people in one program can come up with alternative cuts in other programs. Diana suggested working within your division, for support and buy-in. Math/Science, Social Science, and Language Arts looked at everything and sent in division proposals. Huy said what we have to go on is Cabinet's rationale in the revised list. Respond to that.

Chris Phillips said Mitch Klein is putting information forward from the music department. We can't weigh Peninsula Symphony against Masterworks Chorale, and other ensembles are in danger. A format for submissions will be available at the meeting 10 a.m. Nov. 11, and Diana will email it to all faculty. Submitters should attend the 10 a.m. meeting.

Kate Motoyama said she has spoken with individuals in her division about revisions the division made to the original Cabinet proposals. The faculty wants to work in unity and present one proposal to the Board on 12/9, but what about the possibility of a competing proposal on behalf of faculty? The division had consensus. Diana said the administration is rejecting parts of the division's proposal, and she did not foresee separate submissions from cabinet and faculty. She has not seen the division's counterproposals. President Claire makes the final decisions on budget recommendations. We cannot have large discrepancies, and we cannot make everybody happy.

Kate noted the 10+1 give faculty primacy on curriculum and educational programs. The tenth item in the 10+1 is "processes for institutional planning and budget development." Courses have everything to do with budget. With accreditation, people could submit a minority report. Here, faculty are not a minority. Kate Motoyama foresees the possibility of a faculty proposal separate from the one submitted by the Cabinet. Points in discussion: The hard work matters. If we can submit separate proposals, what do we have to lose?

Ad Hoc Committee member and philosophy adjunct Robert Schwartz said we've been handed nothing short of Sophie's choice. An alternative to this process is to apply pressure to the district and state to make them stop taking money from us, but if those efforts are not fruitful, we risk letting them decide which parts of this school will be dismantled. We have a chance to say if there has to be a choice, we would rather have it this way. Diana said courses will be banked and programs put on hiatus, not eliminated. We have three years to bring them back. They can undergo the full PIV process.

Jim Robertson said Susan made a good point about whether our work makes a difference: compare what Cabinet first sent out with what they sent out Monday. It's a big shift. It came from all of you, the hard effort you put in, division by division or as individual contributions. The two documents are very different. You

made the difference. Social Science made big cuts, more than some other divisions, and they signed off on them. We put in time and effort, with three division meetings, one at 7 am. We came up with a plan, submitted it, it made sense to them, and they bought it. They are looking for primary advice from Academic Senate. They did not accept everything, but they went for a lot of proposals, e.g. spring/fall complementary courses. From here on out, we have a shorter time line. We must give administration credit for paying substantial attention to all the work we have done to this point.

Dan Kaplan said Language Arts did not win its debate with the Cabinet. It makes sense for Language Arts, through Susan, to make a counterproposal to the board, to make the observation forcefully the Board has a relationship with the Senate that gives faculty primacy on curriculum. Here we have a dispute between Cabinet and faculty. The faculty position should be privileged. It was a struggle some years ago to get sign off on this. Everything is to be gained by assertion of faculty primacy. Make the argument aggressively.

Jim Robertson suggested having DAS make one presentation to the Board, rather than having separate presentations from each individual program. Think of all the programs across the district that did not get what they wanted. Dan agreed that would be better.

Diana summarized: There are unresolved areas in Language Arts and Creative Arts, and some Business/Technology programs are up in the air. Social Science and Math/Science are OK. Language Arts could include the impact on students, enrollment, and fill rate if we canceled English classes. Decision makers deal with data points, not whether we are meeting our mission with students. Dan said Susan was nonresponsive to attrition rates in online classes. There is no data to contradict Language Arts' attrition rate arguments on online classes. Kate Deline said we thought preservations and cuts faculty proposed would be respected. Daniel Keller said Language Arts proposed cutting six online sections, and did not propose increases elsewhere. It is cutting six classes. Diana suggested checking the PRIE website for data.

Discussion followed on cuts at the other two colleges and related issues. At the 11/5 All College Meeting, Mike said information on proposed cuts at Skyline and Canada will be available 11/17. The District Strategic Planning Committee will meet with the Chancellor, but no information will be sent out until 11/17. Diana has asked about Skyline and Canada cuts, and possible consolidations at several meetings, and has heard acknowledgements that things are happening, but not much about what. At DAS, Skyline's Academic Senate President Ray Hernandez said certain programs are going through the full PIV process at Skyline, through its BPC. Skyline's Senate relinquished the right to PIV since no one brought anything forward to it. Canada is looking at Adaptive P.E. and Real Estate. No firm information on cuts or consolidation is available.

Bumping issues: Seniority in the district is used in bumping. What if a faculty member who has won a grant is bumped by someone with higher seniority? What happens to the grant and to matching funds? Be sure to remind all faculty to review their FSAs and submit any changes ASAP.

Assertions in discussion: Any consolidation would go through the District Strategic Planning Committee, but none has to date. CSM's recommendation for cuts goes to the Board for a decision in January. The Board will have a study session Nov. 18 to find out about our process before they make a decision. Mike said on 11/09 that CSM's '09-'10 budget is balanced, but '10-'11 is a new scenario. Summer '09 has not been addressed but reductions are reportedly in the works at Skyline and under consideration at CSM.

Diana said we are moving through the process quickly, trying to do it with respect for programs and people. Now the emotional part is setting in. Programs and courses have a human side. The cabinet ~~is giving~~ gave us a starting point and through our process, and this is saving money, but the human side needs to be addressed. Carlene asked about the student side. Students are coming to her saying I waited to go to college and got my life together. Now what is going to happen?

A petition for students to sign, asking the college not to cut classes, is available from Associated Students.

Diana reported plans were due yesterday from all IPC committees. The plans, including the technology plan and the diversity plan, will be reviewed, after which they will come back to us.

BUDGET REDUCTIONS – LANGUAGE ARTS RESOLUTION Kate introduced a second resolution from her division, with several changes from last week. The Whereases remind us in law and regulation California Community Colleges are teaching institutions, the 50% law and 75/25 ratio have been upheld. Apportionment is generated by instruction. The District Office and Facilities provide services, not teaching, so they cannot generate apportionment. Statewide, 5% of community college FTE is for educational and classified administrators. The percentage in our district is 8.2%, so we are top-heavy.

The resolution asks the District Office and Facilities for “a breakdown of how its budgetary reductions affect its organizational chart and employee classifications by FTE” and to consider deeper cuts “in the employee categories of educational administrator and classified administrator.” The packet includes FTE data and the mission of California Community Colleges. The use of academic temporary employees skews the numbers.

Our last resolution has gone forward to BPC. This resolution will be up for adoption at our next meeting.

Diana said this is amended from last time. The last resolution went to BPC and will go to District. Diana showed Kathy Blackwood that resolution and said there will be others. Kathy has agreed to supply any information we ask for. Send a list of specifics. Carlene said your data agrees with what the chancellor says. Fiscally and administratively we should be a two college district. That would get our numbers close to 5%. Rather than trim, restructure. We are a three college district in a two college region. Points in discussion: We have added administrators with overlapping responsibilities for which there is no need. When we got the list of cuts we did not understand it. It seemed executive management wasn't taking any of the cuts. This operation is funded by our labor. We cannot tell the District what to do, but we want it accountable. We need custodians and groundskeepers. Do we need three vice-chancellors and an executive vice-chancellor?

Diana and Jim said there were few questions **by faculty** at the Nov. 5 All College Meeting about what comes next and the future of the district. Student questions about fund-raising initiatives occupied much of the time.

Kate Motoyama spoke on the value of the resolution process. When we pass a recommendation on the part of the senate it is more than a Q&A answer. It is moved on in an official way. We are grateful to have Senate leaders there to ask questions.

Diana said she has been sending documents relevant to the agenda to all faculty. Diana announced she plans to be away for the rest of the week to attend ASCCC Fall Plenary in Ontario, in Southern California. Governing Council agreed that would be fine even though budget work continues here. Diana can be contacted electronically.

Other agenda items were deferred to our meeting next week. The minimum quals equivalency process is not on our agenda but a draft came through DAS for local senates to look at. It will be coming up soon. Other tabled items include District Rules and Regs, and smoking policy.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:18 pm. The next emergency meeting will be Nov. 17, 2009. The next regular meeting will be Nov. 24, 2009.