



Academic Senate

COLLEGE of SAN MATEO

Governing Council Meeting

Oct. 12, 2010 minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	Diana Bennett
Vice President	Huy Tran
Secretary	Lloyd Davis
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Business/Technology	Lilya Vorobey
Creative Arts/ Social Science	Jim Robertson

Language Arts

Daniel Keller
Teeka James

Library

Michele Alaniz

Math/Science

Tania Beliz
Carlene Tonini

P.E./Athletics

Larry Owens

Student Services

Jackie Gamelin
Kevin Sinarle

MEMBERS ABSENT

Business/Technology	Ed Seubert
----------------------------	------------

Creative Arts/ Social Science

Benedict Lim

OTHERS ATTENDING

AFT	Dan Kaplan
COI	Laura Demsetz

Business/Technology

Terry Kistler

Language Arts

David Laderman

Math/Science

Charlene Frontiera

SUMMARY

- The **SLO Coordinator** position is still open.
- At the **DAS/VPI** meeting, the role of deans on FSA committees, district-wide computerized prerequisite checking, and the importance of dialog and transparency across the district, were discussed.
- The **DAS/AFT** Statement will emphasize a clearer evaluation policy and procedures.
- **Program Review surveys** (Annual and Comprehensive) will be reissued.
- **Senate by-laws revision** work is focused on updating committee structure, and includes two-year terms for officers.
- Division **AY 10/11 faculty position requests** were heard.
- **AY 10/11 Budget Reductions** will be discussed on 10/26. Focus will be on the process for bringing back courses on the 09/10 course reduction list.

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:18 p.m. in the SoTL Center, 12-170. The agenda, and the minutes of Sept. 14, 2010, were approved. Approval of the minutes of Sept. 28, 2010 was deferred pending distribution of a revised draft. In the future the secretary will send all changes to the president, then the membership, prior to the meeting.

SLO COORDINATOR Diana reported no one applied for the position, but it is essential for accreditation that the position be filled. Points in discussion on how to recruit appropriate people: It is not fair to individuals to get strong suggestions from administration that they should serve. The faculty is at the saturation point. People who are going to do things already are, and have no more time. Those who are not will continue not to. We do a lot that is not our job. Let's go through and see what we can jettison.

The position gets 12 units reassigned time the first year, perhaps divided 6/3/3 among several people, and 6 units for the coordinator only in future years. Members suggested a "you get what you pay for" stance when it comes to taking on additional work without reassigned time. What does it take to get the job done? Diana will check

reassigned time for this work in colleges outside the district, and ask the Accreditation Oversight Committee to assist in recruiting for the position.

DAS/VPI MEETING Diana and Huy reported on the DAS/VPI meeting they attended. DAS leadership has been concerned about lack of discussion and coordination across the district. Over the summer DAS met with leadership on each campus about collaboration across the district. There was also discussion regarding senate leaders meeting with the three VPIs, and agreement was reached on having such a meeting once each semester. The first meeting took place two weeks ago, coordinated by DAS President Ray Hernandez.

One area of discussion was the role of deans on FSA committees. Does the dean have a vote on granting the FSA, or just sign off that the process was followed? Deans are concerned about not being able to talk with deans at other colleges. Diana emphasized the process is confidential. That applies to the faculty members and to the dean on the committee. Also, there is no appeal process if the committee does not reach consensus, and what does the senate do if the VPI and/or the college president disagrees with the FSA committee? All these and other issues will be addressed in the revised FSA policy and process.

Math/Science dean Charlene Frontiera said if the role of the dean is just to assure the process is carried forward, it doesn't matter which dean does it, but the dean who will manage the person getting the FSA has traded away their right to hire. The dean is part of the hiring process except in the case of FSAs.

Diana said minimum quals must be met when a person is hired. FSAs are for layoffs and seniority. Dan said FSAs were specifically designed in AB 1725 for layoffs. The author of that part of the bill is now a lawyer for AFT. Teeka pointed out that seniority is district-wide, and when full-timers are transferred between campuses the receiving dean has nothing to say about it. Diana said in the next revision of the policy, the role of the dean on the FSA committee will be spelled out and there will be other changes. That is why the policy has been sent out. DAS is getting feedback from faculty, local senates, deans, and VPIs, and will continue to rework the policy.

Huy reported about 80 courses are now subject to district-wide computerized prerequisite checking. Agreement has not yet been reached on about 60 courses. We need faculty involved in agreeing on prerequisites.

Diana reported when faculty across the district cannot come to consensus on prerequisites, the District Curriculum Committee (DCC) makes a recommendation to DAS. DAS then makes the final decision. The DCC is the three curriculum committee chairs, Vice Chancellor for Educational Services & Planning Jing Luan, and a rotating VPI.

Curriculum is faculty purview. For computerized prerequisite checking, faculty members in a discipline, across the district, come to agreement. Deans sign off that the process has been followed. There are rumors of deans completing program reviews. Dan Kaplan said the issue is that deans are exceeding their authority and not honoring the authority and areas of responsibility of the faculty.

Diana said the VPI/DAS meeting was good. All parties are willing to work together. Points in discussion: DAS asked VPIs to talk district-wide with deans about faculty positions and sharing resources across the district. We want dialogue and transparency. For example, Canada has no full-time speech instructor, but Skyline and CSM do. Should Canada hire a speech full-timer, or should Skyline or CSM? Where is the need? What is best for the district may not align with what the colleges see as best for them. More importantly, what is best for the students? DAS's concern is that discussions and decisions were not transparent. They happen at a district and administration level, but DAS would like DAS leadership in on the discussion. VPIs were open to including DAS in a once a semester meeting together. DAS felt position and resource questions should be discussed even if we do not have funding issues.

What if Canada faculty had not prioritized a speech position and Skyline faculty had? Also, how does a program review get written for a program with no full-time instructor, like economics at CSM? There has been talk in the past about looking at things across the district, but DAS felt that has not been happening. The VPIs acknowledged that at the meeting. Even if we didn't have funding issues it should be discussed.

P.E. has already looked at programs from a district-wide perspective. Larry said 15 or 20 years ago, men's basketball and other sports were taken from CSM. The balance between men's and women's sports required by Title 9 is a definite issue. Students go to Skyline or Canada for men's basketball. Diana said we have a culture supported by the Board, chancellor, and college presidents that is territorial. No way do we share or coordinate, as we are all unique. The district asked us to be creative, and sharing is a way to do that.

Diana said the goal is transparent, open dialog. DAS/VPI meetings are part of this. No decisions are made at those meetings. Also VPIs are taking care of things in the purview of senate without including the senate. Jackie said funding allocation pits the colleges against each other. This creates a real inconsistency with doing what is best for everyone.

Dan Kaplan spoke about the plight of programs like economics at CSM. With full-timers no longer in the department, program reviews are not being done, so a decision to prioritize economics could not be made, as part-timers do not have time. When full-timers are not replaced by other full-timers, the problem gets more serious over time. Teeka asked who can write program reviews in this case: people in allied areas? Diana reminded everyone that it is the faculty's responsibility, not the deans', to complete Program Reviews.

Laura asked whether DAS meeting with the Board of Trustees would accomplish something. Diana said the DAS president has weekly meetings with district leaders, and Diana is confident the issues are raised and discussed at those meetings.

DAS/AFT MEETING There was a joint DAS/AFT meeting Oct. 11. The rough draft of the DAS/AFT statement was discussed, and all responses from faculty were reviewed and considered for inclusion. The recommendations will go to the four members of the AFT/AS statement committee – Diana, Ray Hernandez, Nina Floro, and Monica Malamud. Huy reported the meeting was mostly to go over the DAS/AFT statement.

Teeka said there was much enthusiasm at the meeting about the opportunity of the Senate and AFT to collaborate. A united front of faculty in agreement on the trust committee issue would be effective to move the Board to take action. Ray and Patty expressed concern the document is too long, and the meeting agreed an abstract of the document would be presented – what needs to be done, quick examples emphasizing the workload and the relatively low cost of four units per campus. Huy said the full document will be a white paper. The goal is to have the statement finalized and approved by DAS and AFT by January for a fall start, should the Board agree.

Dan said the approach discussed yesterday was to present to the Board a cost-benefit analysis of comprehensively reviewing and clarifying evaluation language. A lot of the grievances filed since the original trust committee met in '91-'92 are related to murkiness in the evaluation language. In the long run, clarity will save money. There will be fewer grievances, and less money spent on preventable problems, when language around evaluations is more coherently written. Teeka suggested quantifying using prevention on the front end to defuse and solve problems before they become expensive grievances. Something people can count could be more persuasive.

Ray and Nina, a subset of the original group, will produce an abstract by the end of this semester. It would be good if faculty turned out when the statement is presented to the Board. Potentially more compelling than presentations by individuals and articles in the *Advocate* is having AFT and the Senate working together as a united front. Dan expressed cautious optimism on making real progress. The Senate and AFT have distinct roles, but they overlap and it is imperative that we work together. Dan announced there will be a joint AFT/Senate social event this spring.

Jackie recalled the Trust Committee produced evaluation forms in the early 90s but there were so many problems all evaluations had to be stopped. The committee reconvened, changed the procedure, and evaluations resumed. In 93-94 there was a faculty vote to select either 1) each college would have an evaluation committee with reassigned time and substantial responsibility for all evaluations at their college, or 2) each college would have an evaluation guidance committee, with one member from each of administration, senate, and union. Option 2 won and the district has saved money since then as a result. Divisions do the evaluations. A peer review committee called the guidance committee is available to resolve problems. The reassigned time issue was left to be

determined, and so far has not been resolved, or even discussed or negotiated. Diana asked Jackie to send additional information on this to Teeka, Dan, and Diana. This will be on a future Senate agenda.

PROGRAM REVIEW SURVEYS These include surveys on the annual and comprehensive program reviews, labs and centers program reviews, and the PIV process. This will be on the Oct. 26 agenda. Review the survey information Diana sent on PIV and Lab Centers.

No faculty member filled out the annual or comprehensive program review survey, so there is no data. The survey was developed by PRIE, with consultation by Diana. Suggestions for improving the survey included showing how far into the survey you are (Carlene) and being able to preview the questions so you can see where to make your comments (Lloyd.) Daniel Keller said it was required to complete the surveys about the labs and centers reviews, but there was no such mandate for the discipline program reviews surveys. Those came out right after the spring Talking Points survey, and some may have confused the two. Diana will ask PRIE to make its surveys brief and user-friendly, and to provide a preview of questions and a status bar showing where you are in the survey, then Diana will send the program review survey back out to the faculty. It will be important for faculty to participate in the survey. Diana is not able to justify extending the submission deadline request by faculty and deans.

By Dec. 1, PRIE will have all data for program reviews available. Discussion of program review due dates occurred at the Oct. 8th IPC meeting. There is a history of inconsistency on when we get data. Last year we got it in two pieces. Diana spoke with Cabinet and PRIE last year and said it would be imperative to have Program Review data available to faculty by October, 2010. If we do not have data by the agreed time, how can we enforce the program review deadline? PRIE offered data in two pieces, in November and January. A compromise was reached that all program review data will be published by December 1st, so faculty would have data before the end of fall semester.

Teeka was on the committee that rewrote program review, with Sandra Stefani Comerford, Jeremy Ball, and Marsha Ramezane. Teeka wrote the program review portion. The issue is when the Accreditation Oversight Committee, before the summer of everyone help us not get lost – had summer workgroups, the program review committee just named wanted program review due after spring break but before finals, and wanted data in the fall since it felt the value of program review is in the conversations it could create among faculty in departments and divisions. Faculty need time to receive data, have meetings and discussions, and write things up. Departments met once a month. The March 25 due date was predicated on getting PRIE data in October, and this faculty-driven recommendation was agreed to by the deans. Late April was too late – deans need program reviews for deans' reports. The data did not come in October, and in 2009, the Office of Instruction would not extend the due date. Teeka asserted this reduced the value of the process.

The request for an extended due date issue will be on our Oct. 26 agenda. Jim, who was a member of the PIV process committee that summer, said another reason for the March 25 date was to allow decisions to be made about putting programs on PIV and PIV committees to be constituted. Diana will allow 30 minutes on this next time, including how to revise and update current reports.

DISTRICT RULES & REGS was deferred to the next meeting for editing and consensus on sending it forward. DSGC next meets after that meeting. The agenda has links to individual regulations. **District R & R – 2.13, 2.19, 2.25, 2.28, 2.60, 7.21 will be an action item.**

CSM SENATE BY-LAWS The draft will be on our Oct. 26 agenda. Laura Demsetz asked about the intent of item a in the proposed changes. She said the changes to COI's reporting responsibilities was fine. COI carries on a review of the entire college curriculum through the program review process. Skyline and Canada curriculum committees are stewards of oral as well as written presentations of program reviews. Oral presentations are not done at CSM. CSM's process for position and equipment requests is based on program review. IPC has a big picture direction of the process, and PIVs for programs in trouble. COI is busy but could be the venue for the proposed changes. Laura asked how making COI the venue for decisions would layer on what we already do?

On item b, Laura said COI is not concerned with how many sections of a course are offered. It deals with things in the ed code like HBA, flex hours, and adherence to curricular aspects of the ed code in our overseas programs. Laura said items c and d are OK. Diana and Lloyd will work with Laura on appropriate language.

Other points in discussion: The Library Committee should no longer be listed as a COI subcommittee. Shouldn't the college have only one Distance Ed committee, and that one under the Senate? Look at the 10+1 and be sure non-Senate committees do not take away from our purview. For senate officers, we should match DAS by having two year terms. Nothing has been finalized. This is an internal draft for senate members. Discussion and consensus on revisions must occur by Governing Council members before the draft is sent to all faculty members for review.

PRIORITIZING AY 10/11 FACULTY POSITIONS The Instructional Deans' met this morning (Oct 12) for discussion and information sharing, in preparation for prioritizing new faculty positions for academic year 11/12.

This was the first of two meetings. The final process (the dot procedure) will take place on Oct. 19. The senate president or her designee has three dots to vote. Diana designated Treasurer Rosemary Nurre and summer ad hoc committee member Jim Robertson to attend the Oct. 12 meeting in her absence. The senate president and vice president were not able to attend due to conflicts with their classes. Jim reported each dean presented a wish list, but there was no prioritization. A program review for economics, prepared by a part-timer, was submitted recently so economics was considered.

Jim Robertson, who attended the morning meeting, listed the disciplines requesting positions: dance, math, microbiology, English composition (2), economics, two-dimensional art, psychology/AOD (alcohol and other drugs), electronics, and cosmetology. In addition there were requests for a librarian to improve online research by students and faculty, a counselor specializing in transfer, and a full-time coordinator for counseling in the multicultural/basic skills area. Some areas currently have no full-timers, and others had recent retirements.

Diana will be attending the meeting next week. Susan will send her the packet of position justifications. Past practice is the senate president takes a position at the meeting, but that position is not instructed by Governing Council. It is also confidential. The technical process is everyone gets three colored dots to stick on a flip chart. The ten participants are the five instructional deans, the two program directors, the Library director, the VPI, and the senate president. The hires are supposed to be for January 2011, so a request to postpone the vote would probably not be well-received.

Discussion followed on whether Governing Council should have an emergency meeting to make a recommendation to Diana. Diana is asking for direction from Governing Council. Lloyd said there isn't time for Governing Council to study these issues adequately. The deans have the responsibility and the expertise for these decisions. Larry said we could move forward on a new procedure for future hires. For this year, the Senate president should have the same role as in the recent past. Jim said Diana should take the responsibility delegated to her and vote. Governing Council has never taken a position on individual hires, and Susan feels strongly the process prohibits our doing so. Also there are confidentiality issues we do not want to get involved in. Teeka said it is not responsible for Governing Council to take a position without a discussion. The faculty voice is through program review and division prioritization, not Diana's vote. Diana can abstain.

Jim said Susan made clear the two Governing Council members at this morning's meeting should brief Diana, and Susan will mail documents to Diana. Rosemary and Jim will brief Diana confidentially on personnel issues.

Discussion regarding Diana's participation in the current process took place. The term "vote" was used but Diana clarified it is not a vote because there is no formal motion on the floor. She asked for a show of hands on whether she should 1) follow the current process, or 2) abstain. Consensus of Governing Council was for Diana to abstain from participating at the 10/19 meeting, and to place on the agenda at a later date the role of the senate president or her designee in future hiring cycles, and the current process.

BUDGET REDUCTION PROGRAMS AY 09/10 Discussion of how Cabinet is using the 09/10 list and Measure G to bring back courses and programs will take place at our Oct. 26 meeting. David Laderman urged the Senate to take some kind of action regarding the process for program currently on reduction – how long they will stay on, and how they can get off. As one of a few full-time faculty in the district on reduction, David wants to know for how many years he will be on reduction, and would like us to act on this immediately. What impact will measure G have on programs on reduction. What criteria and process will be used?

Diana said last fall the agreement was that the cuts were for the 10/11 academic year. We need to talk about a process for reviewing the list in conjunction with measure G and state budgeting. David said the default should be to take things off reduction unless a process is followed to put them back on. We need to address that.

Diana reported discussion took place at the Oct. 8 IPC meeting about Measure G, other funding, and the process for looking at the list. Diana asked Susan whether a program we are not bringing back will go on PIV. These questions need to be asked and discussed campus-wide. Faculty asked for clarification on the Measure G process, the state budget, and the impact on the budget reduction decisions list.

Tania said the talking points committee sought ways to guide future cuts. Huy said a course not offered for three years must be banked. Diana reminded faculty that programs on reduction are technically on hiatus, and if a program remains on hiatus then it would need to go through the PIV process. David said program reduction is not hiatus. He is pressing on behalf of full-time faculty and adjuncts. He needs to know if he is on reduction, to come up with his spring schedule. Diana said all programs and courses must adhere to the agreement through Spring 2011. This is another issue for which participation of all faculty members is important, and it will be included on our next agenda as a top priority. Dan said no committee has addressed this issue. David offered to help address it.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT The final draft of the **campus art policy** went to College Council and is being disseminated to constituent groups. It addresses policy and procedure for acquiring art for the campus, such as the Butterfield Horse at Canada. The policy includes the makeup of the art committee (faculty, administration, classified, and student). The senate will approve the two faculty appointments. Diana will take back comments and consensus approval from the senate to the November meeting of College Council.

PUBLIC COMMENT Lilya Vorobey asked for support in keeping a \$15,000 Torchmate CNC machine used in several areas, including machine tool technology, industrial design, and drafting. It is among the equipment in the welding lab being auctioned off at the end of this month. The Torchmate can be used with any CAD program, to make life-size objects, and with Photoshop to make signs. A design project manager donated the machine to the lab. Eventually there will be classrooms and a small manufacturing area in B19. The machine could also be used by architecture and engineering and possibly DGME. Members suggested horticulture, landscape design, art, student services, and facilities might find use for it. Points in discussion: It has a large footprint (4.5 x 10 feet) compared to alternatives. It is cheaper to maintain than a 3-D printer. Other departments might prefer something else. Nothing is coming forward to replace it. Technology needs \$750,000. Now it is in B25. There is a room in B19 in which no classes are taught. There is no cost to keeping it aside from the space it occupies.

Diana will work with Lilya on talking to Cabinet about it. It is a small request considering the loss of the welding program. The Foundation would know whether a gift has to be kept five years before being sold.

Finally, Diana announced the top priority items on our next agenda are AY 10/11 faculty positions, AY 09/10 budget reductions, the program review deadline, and by-laws revision. Please review all documents pertaining to these issues so we are prepared to engage in discussion.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting adjourned at 4:40 pm. The next meeting will be Oct. 26, 2010 in 12-170.