



Governing Council Meeting

Mar. 23, 2010 minutes (April 12, 2010 draft)

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	Diana Bennett	Language Arts	Daniel Keller
Vice President	Huy Tran		Kate Motoyama
Secretary	Lloyd Davis	Math/Science	David Locke
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre		Tania Beliz
Creative Arts/ Social Science	Jim Robertson	P.E./Athletics	Joe Mangan
Library	Michele Alaniz	Student Services	Ruth Turner
			Kevin Sinarle

MEMBERS ABSENT

Business/ Technology	Ed Seubert	Creative Arts/ Social Science	Benedict Lim
---------------------------------	------------	--	--------------

OTHERS ATTENDING

COI	Laura Demsetz	Business/Technology	Michelle Brown
DAS	Patty Dilko	Math/Science	Charlene Frontiera
COI	Laura Demsetz	San Mateo Daily Journal	Bill Silverfarb
San Matean	Alex Farr, Editor	Veteran	Mario Mihelcic
	Margaret Baum, Executive Editor	Student Alliance	Octavio

SUMMARY

- Governing Council heard the status of **PIV programs**.
- **Digital Media (DGME)** has not met PIV recommendations. A coherent single program has not emerged, some courses have not been revised appropriately or at all, and some DGME faculty are not involved in the process. **A resolution was passed to reconstitute the original DGME PIV committee. That committee is asked to work with the Media Advisory Committee and DGME faculty regarding submitted DGME curriculum, and to bring back to Governing Council by April 13, 2010 a curriculum satisfying the recommendations in the PIV report.**
- In addressing the DGME situation, Governing Council discussed the PIV process, including the roles and responsibilities of the Senate, COI, the PIV committee, administration and faculty.
- Veterans attending CSM asked for Senate support for flying the **POW/MIA flag** under the American flag on campus, to make the campus more welcoming to veterans and to recognize their sacrifices.

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m. in 36-109. The agenda, and the minutes of March 9 and January 26 were approved.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND VIABILITY (PIV) UPDATE As a Digital Arts and Media (DGME) faculty member, Diana recused herself. Vice President Huy Tran chaired the discussion. Huy gave background. On March 10, just before the most recent Committee on Instruction (COI) meeting, the Senate sent out a memo with concerns about how DGME is being reorganized. There is lack of coherence, the old programs did not form into a single program, not all faculty were involved in the course outline process, some courses may not fit into the PIV recommendation, some courses were not revised, and there is possible duplication of courses within DGME and across other divisions. COI did not honor the request from AS and decided to move forward with DGME curriculum knowing issues existed.

In the memo, the Senate requests that:

1. All DGME course agenda for the 3/11 COI meeting be placed on hold until the Senate reviews them;
2. Courses reviewed and subject to approval by COI be placed on hold until reviewed by the Senate;
3. Courses not vetted by all DGME faculty be removed from the COI agenda

Points in discussion: Most DGME faculty attended two meetings at which they discussed how to meet PIV recommendations. Courses comparable to some but not all DGME courses are offered at the other campuses, by different departments and with different numbers. Senate members commented: Nobody wants to discontinue programs, but we must. Who will do it? If there are comparable courses at Skyline or Canada, let's consolidate at one campus to get demand. DGME faculty favor collaborating and consolidating at one campus. DGME faculty have been told that will never happen. We are building state of the art facilities. What if we cancel the program at all three campuses?

Jim Robertson, who served on the German PIV committee, said the Senate is the primary recommending body for the 10+1 academic and professional matters. The President, with the VPI, has responsibility for discontinuing programs, and they rely primarily on Academic Senate's recommendations. The buck stops here. Administration has the ultimate say, and they are responsible to the Board. It is difficult to be here and have responsibility for those decisions. DGME was put under PIV not just for enrollment issues, but because of differences of opinion within programs, and problems of consolidation and rationalizing the program to reduce overlapping courses and come up with a small but tight program. That was the PIV recommendation. But now that idea is no longer being upheld. The program is growing again. At some point it will have to shrink it down to a coherent, closely knit program, and some courses around the edges may be banked or just not offered as often.

Tania Beliz, a member of the DGME PIV committee, said outside experts identified by faculty fed into the committee's recommendations. Curriculum needs to be tight, and courses need to feed into each other. The DGME group needs to abide by DGME recommendations. DGME courses had dismal enrollments. We need to cancel classes with fewer than 20 students. DGME faculty need to come together. If they don't follow recommendations, the program should be eliminated.

Points in discussion: The senate can recommend today that the three colleges integrate the program across the district. Identify courses that are similar, perhaps offered in different modes. Look at enrollments. We are all district faculty. The DGME program went through the PIV process. There are two options: eliminate, or drastically restructure. In any case, all courses offered in the fall are subject to the 20 student rule.

DGME Professor Michelle Brown said she and colleagues have tried to follow PIV recommendations since May 2008, and have worked on consolidation for 20 months. Inquiries to other DGME faculty about whether they were turning in course outlines to COI were ignored. Course outlines were submitted to COI but in at least one case the faculty member who submitted the outline did not attend the COI meeting at which it was considered. New courses came to COI that still overlapped. Most DGME faculty met all deadlines, went to the November DGME meeting with the faculty, dean, VPI, and COI chair, and shared courses that had been done. They were told then that overlapping courses in audio and video could not go through. At the last emergency COI/VPI/DGME meeting on March 17, overlapping audio and video courses were reviewed. The facilitating COI chair recommendation was to split the overlapping audio and video courses into two tracks, rather than merging as one as recommended in PIV.

Rosemary said we must have a districtwide approach. After two years at this, we must do something – cut it or keep it. It is not fair to faculty, the program, or the students to let this continue for years. The Senate must get tough, or let somebody else get tough. Jim said it must be us. Unless the Media Advisory Committee finds severe problems, why move away from the PIV report? Otherwise, what good is all the PIV work?

Points in discussion: Some DGME faculty did not follow PIV recommendations. We need to say if a recommendation has been made, do it or you're out. We had a process. If you don't play ball, you're not in the game. President Claire has told the Board to let the process go forward. If it is running its course and not doing what it should, we have egg on our face. It has got to work.

DAS President Patty Dilko offered a district perspective. DGME is not a concern at the other colleges, and their VPIs are reticent to share with faculty any discussion of districtwide consolidation. DAS has asked to be involved earlier in reciprocal conversations, and there may be some movement in that direction. PIV was presented to the Trustees as a stellar example of how faculty can work together and make recommendations we might find painful. In the case of DGME, joint responsibility is not being honored by faculty. Interesting, equally challenging things are happening at Skyline and Canada. We risk Trustees making decisions at the course level, based on recent semester enrollments. That is an arbitrary and destabilizing process, but the Board says they are ready to do it. If we do not want that, we need to make the hard decisions and the administration needs to operationalize them.

Rosemary said it is critical for us as a body to recommend that the district look at this situation. VPIs holding things close is not serving the students. We will end up making bad long term decisions. Patty said there is good communication among the VPIs themselves, and among some of the deans. From above we hear communication is good, but from below we do not.

Jim moved we recommend the PIV recommendations be implemented. Points in discussion: How do we figure out what that means? This has been going on for 20 months. COI got courses in December and curriculum changes through January, but does not know who has talked to whom, who has vetted the courses, or how well the PIV recommendations are being followed. The PIV report mentioned boutique courses offered every once in a while. COI doesn't know what they are. Who will determine what it means to follow the process? Can the process be amended to have more frequent checkpoints to assure the process is being followed? When a PIV recommendation is made to overhaul a program, all courses need to go to COI as a package, reviewed for consistency and overlap, and sent back if it does not follow the recommendations. The deans worry about faculty load, but load is not a COI issue. Jim's motion died for lack of a second.

Points in discussion: DGME needs to address overlapping classes to satisfy the PIV, but finding load for faculty is the dean's problem. At the implementation level, finding load and meeting catalog and schedule deadlines complicates things. COI assumes faculty participation has occurred when it gets a signed course submission. For PIVs we need a mechanism in place, worked out with the VPI, dean and faculty to assure that. Faced with a packet of courses, COI must defer to DGME faculty expertise. COI has identified areas of lack, and is not moving forward until there is resolution. That will take compromise among DGME faculty. COI gets courses, approves them, leaves it up to deans and faculty when to offer boutique courses, and hopes core courses are offered regularly. There is no one-to-one map between PIV recommendations and course outlines.

Jim suggested reconstituting the PIV committee to decide on the content of a specific program, not just make recommendations. It is too late for the printed schedule; we don't even have CRNs. The ball was dropped. Laura pointed out no other groups who went through PIV were asked to merge programs. That is hard to do in best of circumstances. COI was asked to put courses on hold but elected to treat them all the same way. COI will vote on them by the end of this week, and might put them all on hold. A concern is DGME faculty cannot reach consensus. At the COI/VPI emergency meeting in March it was made clear the program must meet COI deadlines and publication deadlines and provide faculty load. The Senate's responsibility is to assure we adhere to PIV procedures. Speaking as a DGME faculty member, Diana recommended the PIV committee, together with the Media Advisory Committee, look at all courses.

Tania noted that during the process, DGME faculty were invited to come to discussions. Some chose not to. Some came and were silent. Implementation should go forward, but put it back into PIV committee hands. Laura said if this body decides to do that, to follow our processes and allow options for students, she would recommend putting the DGME curriculum on hold, but continue to offer the existing program, with milestones for the process put in place, so when the PIV committee review is done, the new program can be put in place. We would run afoul of accreditation if we do not implement the DGME courses or an agreed upon subset of them, and do not offer the courses students need. Tania said the faculty members who took the responsibility to revise courses according to the recommendations should be allowed to run them. Laura pointed out COI doesn't know which those are. Diana recommended banking all the old courses. If, say, we offer both MULT 292 and DGME 151 in the fall, students will be confused. Have a clean cut in Fall 2010. The recommendation was to put the new program in place by 2010. A handful of courses are holding up the process.

Laura said we as faculty recommended a course of action that has not worked. We must figure out what to do. She suggested two approaches. 1) run existing courses in Fall 10 and DGME courses in Spring 11. A disadvantage is both sets of courses would be in the catalog, creating confusion. An advantage is it allows the PIV committee to make decisions without great time pressure. 2) Have COI complete its review this week, approving some courses but not others. The approved courses could go into the catalog. DGME faculty, the Business/Technology division, and the PIV committee could decide what will be offered in the fall. That may happen too late for the printed schedule, but the offerings could go into the online schedule. There would be no DGME courses in the printed schedule. Registration for fall starts in late April.

Michelle said she is more concerned about the overall viability of the program than about which courses will be offered in the fall. She supported offering only DGME courses. Those who worked hard to create them want to teach them.

Diana supported the second option. The risk is not having it in the printed catalog. Laura said for the second option, the Senate should remove its request for COI to hold the courses, then reconvene the PIV committee with a mid-April deadline to come to a decision about courses. The March 25 deadline for the printed schedule of classes is not a COI concern. Diana noted the PIV committee could use the chart COI got from DGME faculty to follow what courses are being approved or held.

Laura said if the Senate decides to go forward with this, COI will report what courses it received, what it reviewed, and decisions from its emergency meetings. COI received revised course outlines it thought the whole DGME group had agreed on, and is voting on them now. Many changes came after the November deadline for course submission. COI is working on overlapping courses so the full DGME program could be offered in the fall. Everyone on the COI side was working in good faith to help DGME faculty.

The role of the COI chair is to explain COI actions, roles, and responsibilities. The senate needs to decide on a course of action, then send a memo about a reconstituted PIV committee, providing guidance, timelines, and who would be involved, to Susan, Kathy Ross, and COI or its chair, also requesting from COI the outcome of their review process as input to the PIV committee. It is disturbing to hear of 20 months without full participation. Responsibilities of DGME faculty in the process should be spelled out.

Language Arts representatives Kate Motoyama and Daniel Keller said they were not prepared for this discussion. It was not agendaized as an action item. Governing Council's purpose is not to work out the issues but to get a study group to do so. In December this body voted to support the PIV committee recommendations. For future meetings be sure the agenda indicates what the body will be expected to do and what issues will be discussed. Diana said County Counsel told DAS that as recommending bodies local senates are not subject to the Brown Act. DAS president Patty Dilko said the agenda needs at least to indicate in some detail what will be discussed.

Points in discussion: The PIV process is clearly not being followed in this case. It is not fair that everyone has to sit through fixing it. The next round of PIVs should specify clearly what will happen next. It was our

understanding that the dean, VPI, and faculty would put PIV committee recommendations into place. In the end the Board of Trustees should see that all voices were represented and a procedure was followed. Last spring ASGC said the processes were followed. The senate approved the recommendations and we assumed they would be followed. If there are problems, it needs to come back here. Some faculty chose to do nothing.

Laura said the COI does not have the expertise to move forward. Recognizing that the process has not come to an appropriate conclusion, the Senate should send it back to the PIV committee, which has the appropriate expertise. Kate said it is dangerous not to have clarity on the agenda. She questioned the advice of county counsel on the Brown Act. [Secretary's note: An article in the Nov. 2009 Senate Rostrum says under a 1983 California Attorney General opinion, local senates are subject to the Brown Act, because governing boards must recognize local senates and in some areas rely primarily on their advice.]

Jim moved this be held over as an action item to the next regular meeting, that the chair of the COI present us with a plan in consultation with the DGME faculty involving a referral to the PIV committee that establishes deadlines for reporting back to ASGC. That motion also had no second. Laura said COI has tried to have this discussion but lacks the expertise of the PIV committee. Time is of the essence. If the will of this group is to reconstitute the PIV committee, it should do so ASAP. Registration starts 4/28 but a few days are needed to input course information. To give COI and division assistants time to act before registration starts, the PIV committee would have to meet before spring break.

MSP (Motoyama and Keller abstaining) to reconstitute the original DGME PIV committee. That committee is asked to work with the Media Advisory Committee and DGME faculty regarding submitted DGME curriculum, and to bring back to Governing Council by April 13, 2010 a curriculum satisfying the recommendations in the PIV report.

Diana gave the status of the following PIV recommendations: **German, Drafting Technology, Manufacturing and Industrial Technology, Machine Tool Technology, Welding, Library Studies.** There were no objections to the VPI's response memo dated October, 2009. Cabinet's recommendations remain with no opposition from Academic Senate.

POW/MIA FLAG ON CAMPUS Mario Mihelcic asked for Senate support for flying the POW/MIA flag on campus. Mario, who works in Admissions & Records, also gave this presentation to College Council. An increasing number of veterans are here at CSM, and CSM Veterans Services provides a variety of support and assistance to vets. The Post 9/11 GI Bill provides a basic housing allowance of \$2562/month for veterans with dependents who are full-time students, the highest in the country. There is an emergency loan process, and contacts with off-campus veterans organizations. This week our certifying officials and psychological counseling department will have a workshop on traumatic brain injury and PTSD. The Veterans Student Alliance is advised by Kevin Sinarle. The idea of flying the POW/MIA flag came up last semester. The flag was designed during the Vietnam era, and is officially sanctioned by congress; it is not a political flag. It is an acknowledgement we recognize the sacrifices military vets and their families and friends make for their country. In past decades, Vietnam era vets came forward for benefits. We now have wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have learned the experience of vets returning to the classroom is isolation and alienation. It is hard for them to connect in terms of their experiences coming from war. We are trying to raise awareness and acknowledge vets, to let them know they have a place here. The banner in front of the library saying Welcome Home Veterans is one way to show that. Flying the POW/MIA flag under the U.S. flag would be another.

In discussion, Jim noted the law authorizing the flag specifically referred to Southeast Asia. This should not be a precedent for every group that wants recognition, such as clubs or minorities..

David Locke reported he was asked at College Council if he could represent faculty on this question, and he did not feel he could. Kate Motoyama said she trusts our faculty reps on College Council, and yielded her time on the agenda to a veteran, Octavio. Octavio served in the Coast Guard, 2000-04, followed by six years in the Air Force reserve out of Travis AFB. He knows people who are over in Iraq and Afghanistan. The pilot of a C130

search and rescue plane that crashed last month in San Diego was the first pilot Octavio flew with. Military missions outside the Middle East include Africa and Haiti. Official KIA flag. There is not a lot of support in colleges for veterans except near Travis and Camp Pendleton. CSM is far from both, but Mario and Kevin have been very supportive. They provide information to help veterans maximize their benefits. At age 34 it is hard to relate in class. People work full-time. Not all are traditional vets. They are concerned about getting W's if have to deploy. They are grateful for the Veterans Student Alliance. Kevin emphasized the goal of the Veterans Student Alliance is to make this a more welcoming environment. Veterans see this as a safe place for vets to come to school.

At its 4/13 meeting Governing Council will make a decision on the flag, for David to take to College Council.

SPRING PLENARY RESOLUTIONS will be discussed at the March 26 Area B meeting. Among the resolutions are two related to **SB 1440**, a bill which would allow an associate degree for transfer students. Colleges could decide whether or not to offer this degree, but if they do they cannot add their own requirements to the bill's requirement of 60 transfer units including 18 in a major field. Patty said ASCCC wants all curriculum kept out of legislation, and sees SB 1440 as a slippery slope. It would legislate a path that would circumvent local curriculum requirement, and would set the precedent of having degrees defined by legislation. The CSUs are opposed. They do not want to have to accept any lower division major prep. Members spoke against it. Email comments, questions and concerns about this or other resolutions to Diana.

The 2010 California Community Colleges **minimum quals** document is almost ready.

Kate Motoyama and Diana Bennett walked in the 3/22 March in Sacramento, and will report next time on the **teach-in** at CSM.

ABCs: Accreditation: Susan Estes emailed that our substantive change report was approved and that the Oct. 15 follow-up report is in preparation. The Accreditation Oversight Committee is looking for two faculty editors for the next six-year accreditation. They will get released time. **Budget:** BPC is developing a zero-based 2010-11 budget, and is discussing the district allocation model and its impact on CSM. **Construction:** the ribbon-cutting for B5 will be March 24 at 3:30 pm. Tania reported the Edison Project group is meeting March 26 at 2:15 in 36-109. The task force hopes to make its final recommendation at that meeting. The project is on hold and will be brought back as part of the Northgate project. This avoids the added expense of change orders.

COMMITTEE REPORTS The Senate is awaiting the membership list of the **College Assessment Committee**. The work of FSA committees continues. David Locke reported **College Council** addressed the Art on Campus policy, heard a presentation on the POW/MIA flag, and discussed smoking policy. CSM is lacking in signage. At Skyline, signs are plentiful and nice. Skyline signs are nice, and plentiful. At CSM there are lots of places with no signs. From Fall 10, smoking will be allowed only in parking lots. The college may be able to get some old SamTrans shelters for smokers. The Board will put a \$34/parcel parcel tax on the June ballot. It would bring the district \$6million/year, to go only to the three colleges for classes and services. The vote will be close. It needs 2/3 and is polling around 70%. The use of parcel tax money does not have to be defined the way bond money is. Patty is looking for faculty volunteers for the campaign.

Huy reported the **IPC Ad Hoc Steering Committee** plans to have a memo out before spring break. There will be campus activities after spring break. .

OFFICERS' REPORTS Diana reported **President's Council** had a conversation on the Sacramento marches and CSM guidelines for advocacy. **DAS** will hold an emergency meeting March 19 on the parcel tax. Patty has been asked to sign the ballot argument. She has met with the senate presidents, faculty know about it, AFT voted to support it at its March 17 meeting, and there has been no pushback.

The FINAL DRAFT of the FSA/Min Quals policy will be presented at the April DAS meeting and be shared among local senates for approval.

In April, DAS is meeting with AFT to define roles and responsibilities where they overlap, and identify where to collaborate and work together.

DSGC heard its regular update from Kathy Blackwood. **BPC** is looking at visioning. President Claire confirmed that the Foundation is funding the President's Innovation Fund, not courses and programs. **IPC** heard from the Ad Hoc Steering Committee. Diana, Milla McConnell-Tuite, and Jennifer Hughes and Susan Estes are working on finalizing the new planning calendar to present at the next IPC meeting. The original comprehensive planning calendar is now broken up into individual areas. It shows who has responsibility for what. The CSM college index was updated. It has indicators and outcome measures, with 2008/09 and 2009/10 baselines and 2009/10 and 2010/11 targets. Institutional Planning priorities and other documents are on the PRIE website. Everything must be aligned with institutional priorities. IPC is working with PRIE on updates. **CPD** reported on the status of the library bathrooms project. They were scheduled for early April completions, but have been postponed to June. There have been exhaust fan problems.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS Senate by-laws will be addressed at the next meeting. Program review surveys will be available after the March 25 program review due date. Assessment of ASGC should be finished by the end of the semester to add to the Oct. 15 follow-up report. Other future agenda items include the FSA/Min Qualls policy revisions, appointment of two accreditation self-study editors and an SLO coordinator for Fall 10, and Senate elections.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting adjourned at 4:26 pm. The next meeting will be April 13, 2010.