



Academic Senate

COLLEGE of SAN MATEO

Governing Council Meeting

Sept. 28, 2010 minutes (Oct. 22, 2010 draft)

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	Diana Bennett	Creative Arts/ Social Science Language Arts	Jim Robertson
Vice President	Huy Tran		Benedict Lim
Secretary	Lloyd Davis		Daniel Keller
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre		Teeka James
Business/Technology	Ed Seubert	Library	Michele Alaniz
	Lilya Vorobey	Student Services	Jackie Gamelin

MEMBERS ABSENT

Math/Science	Tania Beliz	Student Services	Kevin Sinarle
	Carlene Tonini	P.E./Athletics	Joe Mangan

OTHERS ATTENDING

AFT	Dan Kaplan	VPI	Susan Estes
BPC	Rick Ambrose	VPSS	Jennifer Hughes
COI	Laura Demsetz	Business/Technology	Patti Appel
P.E./Athletics	Larry Owens		Michelle Brown
San Mateo	Margaret Baum	Language Arts	Ed Remitz
	Alex Farr	Math/Science	David Laderman
			Charlene Frontiera

SUMMARY

- Members discussed drafts of **Min Quals/FSA** policies and the request for reassigned time for the **AS/AFT Trust Committee**. Diana will take suggestions to DAS.
- Diana is accepting applications for **SLO Coordinator**. Chandra Vanajakshi will continue with TracDat .work.
- Governing Council accepted the revised **DGME** program resulting from the recent PIV process.
- Discussions of **Senate by-laws** and changes to **District Rules & Regs** will continue.
- BPC approved funding four full-time **faculty positions**. Two have been earmarked: the assistant head football coach and a nursing med surg sims coordinator. The other two will be selected by the standard process. All hiring will be completed by January 2011.

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:19 p.m. in the SoTL Center, 12-170. The agenda was approved, Approval of the minutes of Sept. 14, 2010 was deferred pending distribution of a revised draft.

MIN QUALS/FSA POLICY Diana reviewed the FSA equivalence procedure. Committees are formed as needed. When an existing faculty member requests an FSA, the VPI identifies a dean at Skyline or Canada to serve on their committee. Screening committees check FSAs for new hires. In the past, HR did a preliminary screening. Now we want screening committee faculty to do it. Daniel Keller pointed out this could create a lot more work for screening committees. Some positions have many applicants.

Diana will take comments and suggestions back to DAS. Teeka said the document has lots of grammatical errors.

It also has value-loaded words like outstanding, substantial, and sufficient. We need terms that are explicit and measurable. Daniel Keller asked whether the language is from Title 5. Diana said degree-equivalence addresses foreign degrees.

The committee submits its report through the Senate president, who makes sure it contains all the required documents. The Senate president must deal with any issues when the equivalence is presented to the Board of Trustees. In the original policy there was no appeal procedure. In the new policy, if the FSA committee denies the request the applicant is notified and has ten working days to appeal. Guidelines for the equivalence committee should be in the list describing appeal procedures.

Ed Seubert spoke in favor of ambiguity in terms like ‘outstanding.’ The alternative could be too restrictive. Diana said these are guidelines, not checkboxes. Daniel Keller said phrases like “outstanding professional achievement” are subjective and open to favoritism. Teeka said anybody can publish anything. If there is a check box for being a published author, it could be checked even if the published work is bad. Diana said there are guidelines in the policy. Diana said the FSA committee is accountable for what it has approved. Some committees have expressed second thoughts on FSAs they have already granted. Be sure FSAs are valid. All FSA committees must be sure to take their work seriously. The Min Quals proposal was sent to all deans, VPIs and VPSSs.

DRAFT AS/AFT TRUST COMMITTEE STATEMENT The committee working on the statement includes Diana Bennett and Ray Hernandez (DAS) and Monica Malmud and Nina Floro (AFT.) Jackie Gamelin reported one of her Student Services colleagues was concerned that the hard work being done across campus to assure fair evaluation was not acknowledged. The statement felt negative. Lines 12-13 assert “inconsistencies and deficiencies (in our process) have resulted in ... ineffective faculty evaluation.” Lines 81-82 call the current processes “cumbersome, confusing, and incomplete.” Line 244 speaks of “the negative impact of our deficient evaluation process and its tools.” These statements suggest that these inadequacies occur more often than not. Our evaluation process does not have an overarching negative impact. The faculty evaluation document is outdated and needs work, but we should not imply all evaluations have been inefficient. Another concern is whether four faculty members on the Trust Committee will be enough to represent all campuses and constituencies. Diana said the committee penciled out several ways to assure representation and was comfortable with four. Nonteaching faculty, for many of whom the current forms are unsuitable, are included. The statement to the Board is an overview, and is not meant to take away from anyone’s work. Teeka recommended cutting the statement down to two or three pages, and editing it for grammar and style.

Teeka said the four faculty members on the committee (lines 201-208) will facilitate the process but cannot do it alone. The bulk of the work will be consulting with faculty across the district. The committee also needs to talk with counselors, librarians, contact people, about how effective we are being with our students. We do things differently at the three colleges. How can we be better? The mandate is not just to do an editing job, but to find majority opinion about what will and will not work. This will take collaboration and discussion. Those writing the statement should keep in mind who they are writing it to, and focus on what we want: a committee with sufficient reassigned time. Make it clear the job needs coordination and will take time. It is not just four people writing 60 pages. Be precise and persuasive, and talk about exactly what the job is.

Dan Kaplan reported the AFT Executive Committee discussed the paragraph (lines 111-115) on accreditation standard IIA1c. AFT is opposed in principle to any linkage between faculty evaluation and SLOs, and wants principled opposition to that linkage expressed in this paragraph, in clearer, more emphatic language. The *Advocate* has run several editorials on this.

Huy suggested the statement clarify the charge of the committee to include meeting with other groups on campus. Teeka noted we both write and evaluate SLOs. There are no checks and balances. Jim observed people want the statement to be short and hard-hitting, but to elaborate on a number of points. He said it might help to take out redundancies about negativity and failure. Diana said a goal of the committee was to keep it short. Diana and Dan will take the draft and our comments to DAS and AFT.

SLO COORDINATOR We have gone through several SLO coordinators. Chandra Vanajakshi will continue her TracDat work, but TracDat and SLO coordinator are too much for any one person. Finding a coordinator might be easier now that we have a job description stating duties, responsibilities, and desirable qualifications. The position carries six units reassigned time per semester.

TracDat manager and SLO coordinator used to be one job, but now they are separate. The newly defined duties of SLO coordinator include working with people on campus, reporting to IPC, and serving on the Accreditation Oversight Committee. A major part of TracDat responsibility is at the District level, not at CSM. The District TracDat committee includes someone from each college. Chandra Vanajakshi represents CSM. CSM's TracDat position is needed to start the flow of information into TracDat. This is a transitional effort, and does not need an ongoing full-time position. Our TracDat person, Chandra, will be on the campus SLO committee and will help promote and implement what people should do with SLOs. Laura said these duties feel administrative. Is it the Senate's job?

Diana sends SLO coordinator application information to all faculty, and receives completed applications. A small ASGC group (a small committee, or the Executive Committee, or the senate vice-president) reviews the applications and lets Governing Council know which three or so applicants we want to move forward. Their applications are forwarded to the Accreditation Oversight Committee, then to the Accreditation Liaison Officer (the VPI) and the Senate president. Those two will interview the candidates and make the final selection. Jim questioned having the Senate president at two levels of the selection process. It is more important she be in on the final decision, so the ASGC group could be, for example, the Executive Committee without the president.

Having too few applicants is a concern. We need an SLO coordinator, even if SLOs are a fad that will end. The Journal of Higher Education addresses this frequently. Teeka said having someone do it badly is not an option. Skyline and Canada have coordinators. MSU to approve the draft with the change Jim suggested.

MEDIA PIV Diana has sent out the PIV recommendation approved by Governing Council in May 2008. We received the latest recommendations of the PIV committee on 9/10, and saw the DGME faculty document at our 9/14 meeting. Our duty is to acknowledge that the process has been completed and to accept what was submitted, including timelines for DGME. All curriculum material is going to COI. COI chair Laura Demsetz thanked DGME for communicating along the way, which will facilitate COI's work.

Diana said we will continue to follow District Rules and Regs §6.04 about class size. If classes don't fill the program will be discontinued. Since May 08, DGME has been protected by its PIV status. Other programs without that protection were cut last year during the Fall 2009 budget reductions. Laura urged having some wording that the program could remain viable while tracks or degrees or certificates that do not have enough students will be discontinued in part. Also, students already in a program being discontinued must be able to complete it in a reasonable period of time. They cannot if some critical mass of courses is not offered because they do not fill. Diana asked about a reasonable time for students to complete their concentration. Laura cautioned against mixing the timeline for DGME to get courses approved and running with timelines for students to complete their objectives. We need to define under what conditions the program would be discontinued. Susan said once the PIV report is accepted, the PIV process is complete and the program will follow the same procedures as do all other certificates and degrees on campus. Diana quipped we cannot PIV a PIV.

Teeka asked whether and how two issues in the May 2008 document were addressed: non-success rates (page 8 of 45), and the journalism paragraph in attachment A (pp 7-10.)

Susan said we want high enrollment in journalism courses. We hope journalism will offer students more opportunity, now that it is more integrated with DGME and offers certificates of achievement. Advisory Board members wanted stronger classes and better enrollment. PRIE has reports on success and nonsuccess percentages. Success means students go on to the next course. Susan looks at start/end enrollment figures, which show journalism has not had high attrition rates. Ed Remitz said journalism addressed the concerns in the May 2008 document. The program is integrated into DGME and broadcasting students have to take newswriting for

video journalism. Michelle Brown noted broadcasting is not included in the DGME PIV. Ed Seubert pointed out this will be a final decision on DGME.

Teeka said the course outlines were approved last year and the courses are in the catalog and being offered. The Senate and the PIV committee meet with DGME faculty to look for more consolidation and to streamline and fine tune the program, so some course outlines are being revised. The whole packet is coming back to COI to be reviewed, to go into next year's catalog. Some courses have SLOs which topical course outlines do not indicate are taught in the course.

Laura said COI does not yet have an example of a program that went through PIV and was later discontinued. At some future date, guidelines on post-PIV discontinuance could be addressed. Teeka noted future PIVs could be undertaken for very different reasons.

Michelle Brown compared the emergency COI process to a mini PIV, and Jim said the April 2010 reactivation of the PIV committee was like a mini re-PIV. The program has lots of scrutiny. Let's accept it. A process for discontinuing PIVed courses can be worked out separately. MSU (Robertson/Nurre) that Academic Senate accept the revised DGME program that resulted from the recent extensive PIV review process.

DISTRICT RULES & REGS Issues include §2.80 recognitions, including honorary degrees and the naming of "rooms, plazas, gardens, and walkways. We will discuss proposed changes and send the results to DSGC. Points in discussion: Naming public buildings after private donors is not comfortable. Who gets the money? Is money previously earmarked for a program taken away if the program gets outside money? MSU (Tran/Nurre) to discuss the recommended changes.

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE BY-LAWS Diana will send out a draft, and previewed changes. Officers will serve two-year terms, consistent with DAS, Skyline, and Canada. Reporting relationships of COI will be clarified. The Student Development Committee is now part of IPC, not the Senate, but the SLO Committee should be under the Senate. The Professional Personnel Committee does not go through IPC. Move the Library Committee from the Senate to IPC, and take out the KCSM Committee. The Technology Advisory Committee and Professional Development should be under the Academic Senate umbrella. Jim said it is unclear why the Library Committee is not under the Academic Senate. It is at most universities. Teeka said professional development is under AFT. Further discussion will take place on revising our by-laws.

BUDGET Rick Ambrose reported on the work of the CSM Budget Planning Committee (BPC) and the District Committee on Budget & Finance (DCBF). A member of both, Rick has seen the 2010-11 final budget for the District, 142 pages with glossary. There is not yet a state budget.

BPC had its first fall meeting Sept. 20, with a full agenda. In CSM's budget, surplus or deficit is defined by how much current year salaries and supplies needs compare to what we get from the district in the allocation model. We request more than we get or vice versa. The ending balance and reserves are not part of the calculation of surplus or deficit. We started this year at a deficit, but Measure G brought us to an surplus currently estimated at about \$620,000. Measure G monies go into fund 1, for operations. We also have an ending reserve about \$1.8 million and another \$400,000 freed up from Corporate Ed.

Rick reported Jim Keller chaired the most recent DCBF meeting in the absence of Kathy Blackwood. The District wants to put Measure G money into our budgets now, based on current Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES), though actual money will not come until property taxes are paid in December. CSM would get about \$1.5 million. Rick asked if DCBF will be present at discussions among the three college presidents about the allocation of Measure G funds. At DCBF, AFT representative Masao Suzuki asked about a rumor that the District would park \$2 million of Measure G money in Central Services. Jim Keller assured DCBF this was temporary; in the end the District will get none of that money. Measure G is for the classroom. Jim Robertson asked whether the money is in an income-producing investment.

Points in discussion: Skyline and CSM are now almost the same size. CSM used to be relatively larger so we used to get more money. When will the money parked at Central Services be distributed to the colleges. Who is watching to be sure it does come back? DCBF has an obligation to track that closely. The Measure G Citizen's Oversight Committee is there, and Dan Kaplan asserted they are segregating all that money. Teeka questioned the use of San Mateo County parcel tax money for students from San Francisco.

Rick reported BPC approved four faculty positions for this year. Two are spoken for: an assistant head football coach, and a med/surg sims coordinator for Nursing. A nursing position was approved in Spring 2005, but no one was found to fill it by the 2008 hiring freeze. Rick did not know when Cabinet will decide about the other two positions. Mike's goal is to fill all four positions by spring. We need to think about next year's hires as well.

BPC approved an increase from 48% to 80% of full-time, about \$29,000 in salary and overtime, for an aide position for SARS tracking. The Language Arts staff person doing this now handles all check-ins for HBA. The need for this is identified in the accreditation report.

A BPC goal is external funding. Ideas include renting out facilities, finding donors, grant writing, and fundraising events. Corporate Ed lost money for several years but in recent years was a net money maker. Laura asked whether we have lost that capability. Hiring an experienced fund-raising specialist will be discussed. Teeka asked about duplication of effort with the Foundation. Diana said although grant writing will not get us big money, we should include it. Jackie reported the Board of Trustees and the District have discussed renting out part of B10. Design changes are making its cafeteria more upscale. Diana said the college president should be in charge of making money from the new buildings.

Jim Keller told the District Committee on Budget & Finance (DCBF) the allocation model would be looked at. Many see a lack of fairness in the current model, made worse when budgets are shrinking. We do not have the luxury of having lots of money coming in. DCBF also discussed how Measure G money will be used.

FACULTY POSITIONS Diana said BPC approved funding four new faculty positions this academic year, but does not decide which ones. Two from the 2008 list have been earmarked: an assistant head football coach, and a med surg SIMS coordinator for nursing. Susan told BPC the 2008 list will not be used to determine which programs will get the remaining two mid-year hires. Requests supported by program reviews will be prioritized within divisions, then brought to instructional deans meetings at which the Senate president will be a voting participant. Discussion of asking that the Senate vice-president also be a voting participant will be on a future Governing Council agenda.

Diana announced all PRIE data needed for program reviews will be available Dec. 1. Program reviews are due March 25. Teeka asked for future Governing Council discussion of delaying the program review due date, because PRIE data had been expected in October.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 4:28 pm. The next meeting will be Oct. 12, 2010 in 12-170.