



**Governing Council Meeting**

**Oct. 26, 2010 minutes (Nov. 6, 2010 draft)**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

<b>President</b>	Diana Bennett	<b>Language Arts</b>	Teeka James
<b>Vice President</b>	Huy Tran	<b>Library</b>	Michele Alaniz
<b>Secretary</b>	Lloyd Davis	<b>Math/Science</b>	Tania Beliz
<b>Treasurer</b>	Rosemary Nurre	<b>P.E./Athletics</b>	Carlene Tonini
<b>Creative Arts/ Social Science</b>	Jim Robertson	<b>Student Services</b>	Larry Owens Jackie Gamelin

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

<b>Business/Technology</b>	Lilya Vorobey Ed Seubert	<b>Creative Arts/ Social Science</b>	Benedict Lim
<b>Language Arts</b>	Daniel Keller	<b>Student Services</b>	Kevin Sinarle

**OTHERS ATTENDING**

<b>CSM President</b>	Mike Claire	<b>Business/Technology</b>	Terry Kistler
<b>AFT</b>	Dan Kaplan	<b>Language Arts</b>	David Laderman
<b>COI</b>	Laura Demsetz	<b>Math/Science</b>	Charlene Frontiera
<b>Floristry students</b>	Brenda Bennett Sandy Fusaro		Matt Leddy Lin Bowie

**SUMMARY**

- Governing Council reviewed the proposed **Campus Art Policy**
- Proposed changes to **District Rules and Regs** were tabled pending clarification of AFT issues.
- Governing Council heard an update on the **Edison project**.
- There will be midyear full-time **faculty hiring** for cosmetology and economics positions,
- BPC approved four full-time **faculty positions** for AY 2011/12.
- Governing Council has asked its members to initiate **division-level discussions of curriculum and programs**, including those affected by Fall 2009 budget reductions, and their alignment with CSM’s institutional priorities and IPC ad hoc committee taking points.

**CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 2:20 p.m. in the SoTL Center, 12-170. The agenda, and the minutes of Sept. 28 and amended minutes of Oct. 12, 2010, were approved.

**ART POLICY** The college art policy is to be approved by College Council. It is going to constituencies for consensus approval. Teeka asked why this is a Senate issue. We haven’t talked about it. Diana said like Rules and Regs, the art policy goes through College Council, which represents all constituencies, and goes to

constituencies for review and discussion. After several years of revision, the final draft of the art policy is coming to us. We tabled it earlier, but now it is an action item open for discussion. There is no formal motion for approval by Governing Council. Diana and David Locke can say it went to faculty through senate and has been reviewed. Teeka asked if we're not making binding recommendations, why spend time on it? Why have a vote? Huy said if we feel this is not a senate matter, we can say it's not a curricular issue so we won't take a position. Carlene asked who covers maintenance costs for major art pieces like Canada's Butterfield Horse and CSM's mural? Having the mural hung is expensive.

Diana said the art policy talks about donated works, student and outside art. The Art Committee will be reconstituted, following IPC guidelines, with representatives from administration, students, classified, and two faculty members approved by Governing Council. That committee will consider and recommend art work being purchased, donated, and art by students and faculty.

Diana said which faculty members to recommend has not been decided. Teeka stated ways campus art could be seen as part of curriculum, Art creates atmosphere. It may be welcoming, intellectually challenging, stimulating, and conducive to academic work. Many of Teeka's students were irritated that so many CSM parking lots were named after white folks. By contrast, art can communicate inclusion and celebrate our various groups.

Diana said this is a shared governance activity and the parking lot names were initiated by the Associated Students. We will be involved in recommending and approving faculty for the committee and included in selection of art on campus. David can tell College Council the senate has looked at the policy and accept its being approved by College Council.

**DISTRICT RULES & REGS – 2.13, 2.19, 2.25, 2.28, 2.60, 7.21** Diana announced these would be addressed one at a time. Teeka objected that some of these are negotiable items. On 2.13, Dissemination of Employee Information, paragraph 4, Jackie said changing a couple of words changes the entire meaning.

Dan Kaplan spoke on why this discussion should not be taking place. The regulations listed above, and 6.32, were brought to DSGC last year. The law requires all of them be negotiated. In November 2009, AFT asked the District to meet and negotiate. The District says these are not negotiable, but has offered no legal citations to justify its position. AFT has demanded DSGC and the Senates not adopt the policies. Bypassing bargaining is a violation of law. It may be illegal to discuss these in DSGC or Governing Council. So do not discuss it today.

Diana said the senate's intent is to comment on the policy, not to approve it or get into bargaining. She will take our comments on the policy to DSGC. Dan said when these items came to DSGC, the District honored AFT's request that they be removed from discussion there. The policies are now being discussed, but not negotiated, at the bargaining table. There is agreement on two of the seven. AFT is saying they should be negotiated.

Teeka stated under California Government Code Section 3543.1 (a), the District must refrain from dealing directly with other organizations or with faculty members on negotiable items. It undermines the negotiation process. This is not a negotiations meeting, so we should not be talking about these. Diana tabled the items until AFT and the District figure out where we can proceed, and we hear from DSGC.

Jim said it might help to have the Senate and AFT together with clear lines of demarcation, and asked that AFT share the opinion of county counsel when they get it. Teeka noted AFT has been waiting a year for it. Diana, who is on DSGC, said DSGC has seen lots of Rules & Regs and these require immediate attention. Teeka said AFT made its position clear to DSGC on 10/4. The District is creating its own urgency. As leader of the faculty, Diana can say we need our time too. Teeka asked Diana to report to DSGC that we tabled the items, and asked the senate to stand together with the union. Jim said it is not the senate's intention to conflict with the union on this. Diana said ASGC and AFT issues cross over and the senate's charge is to review, discuss and report on policy matters pertaining to the 10+1. We do not and will not interfere with contractual nor collective bargaining issues. Those are in AFT's purview.

Diana reminded the senate that DAS and AFT are working together in a number of areas. Jackie sent an email with her concerns about two other items in the rules and regs.

**EDISON PROJECT** Tania reported a year ago the Math/Science division learned buildings 20 and 20A, used by horticulture and floristry, would be razed for a parking lot. Concerned faculty wrote the president, vice-president, and deans that this would remove a program. Programs and courses are in the senate's purview, and cannot be removed without faculty consultation. A task force met several times a week for a number of weeks. It made presentations to facilities people and to faculty and administration, and prepared a document describing the needs of the horticulture program. The task force compromised, accepting a 2000 square foot teaching greenhouse in place of the existing 6000 square foot greenhouse. The greenhouse has plants for both horticulture and biology. The group visited area greenhouses, including the \$480,000 teaching greenhouse at Foothill. At the end of the presentation, the group met with Susan and Mike for more compromise. The horticulture and biology programs need lab space, and can share. Two chemistry and two biology labs were lost in the move to B36. Karen Powell of the Construction Planning Department (CPD) attended the meetings. Every time a solution was found, Karen changed the target. Horticulture needs a greenhouse and lab facilities next to B36. One suggestion was to send it to Coastside, but ours is an academic program, not a farming program.

At the last meeting with Mike, Susan, and Charlene, administration made a \$500,000 total budget offer, but a greenhouse alone costs \$500,000. The master plan included renovating 20 and 20A (lab and greenhouse). Facilities decided on more parking spaces instead. Affected faculty members believe instructional facilities should have priority over parking. Some feel bond money that could have been used on B20/20A was misapplied to Coastside and a fourth floor on B10.

Tania said the horticulture program is well integrated with the sciences, including chemistry and biology. Both need facilities and green space. At the end of the spring conversations, after waiting for but not getting an assessment of horticulture from Cabinet, faculty met with Chancellor Galatolo, who talked about refurbishing B20 for more labs and said he might find more money to update facilities and that we can find other parking areas. A few weeks ago President Claire said B20 is coming down. Tania said he is overstepping his authority in taking down the building and the program. Tania said faculty, not the Board or the Chancellor, should decide this. Lin expressed concern about process, including the intent and purposes of the bond issue. There is nothing about this project on the public disclosure site of the Bond Oversight Committee. The CIP2 master plan talks about the B20 complex in terms of rehab and renovation, not demolition and removal with replacement by a parking lot. Repurposing the B20 site for parking is a major change, and should trigger a process.

Most projects on campus have a paper trail. This one has no documentation similar to that for other projects. The North Gateway project has an FPP (final project proposal) The design/build manual has references about compliance with CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act.) B20 is referred to as a renovation project. Under CEQA, repurposing is a major change. By short-cutting the process, we may be missing something that may hurt the college. Lin asked Governing Council to look at all this before making a final decision. Tania said the senate follows faculty procedures and communicates its resolutions to senior administration. The Senate passed a resolution last year in regards to the B20 complex. She invited President Claire to comment.

President Claire reviewed recent history. The master planning process has been going on since 2001. It was announced then the north end of campus would come down. We're close to that. On adding a fourth floor to B10, Mike pointed out the 2006 master plan included a new faculty office building on the B15 site, with B17 replaced with additional parking. There was no way to deliver additional faculty office space. McCarthy showed to get office space, four stories in B10 would be better than three. Mike complemented faculty for doing a lot of work which helped him understand program needs. He has some ideas about what the college can deliver, within reason, to meet those needs. He meets with the chancellor monthly. The next step is to get lots of people together, including the president, VPI, Vice Chancellor of Facilities Jose Nunez, faculty, and the Chancellor and look at real costs. Agree on the need for adjacency and for a greenhouse. The conversation needs to continue. Mike said he is focused on delivering a solution.

Mike said plans change over time. There are lots of unknowns. Focus on meeting instructional needs, but balance out the needs of the entire college. In 2001 a specific intent was to balance parking around campus. Mike said he will keep working, focusing on moving forward and developing a solution that will meet our needs. We want the chancellor and president to walk the site together and look at a cheaper self-constructed greenhouse, like the Kiosko. We can dig trenches and run utilities. We must cost it out. There is a valid need for more labs in bio. We need to verify potential funding beyond the original \$500,000. Mike handed out color copies of the Site Illustrative Plan, dated September 10, 2009, of the CSM North Gateway Project and copies of the Recommendations Section in the 2001 Master Plan. Huy said the committee has made lots of efforts to compromise, and is not trying to stonewall. It looked at areas for a greenhouse, and at greenhouses on other campuses. Administration is trying to get more out of us. We can't run a program if you cut so much. Tania added there was a good partnership with the students involved in the discussion.

Jim noted B10N will be quite different from any other building. It will have the bookstore and cafeteria, and counseling, faculty and administrative offices, so there will be lots of flow in and out, and a tremendous need for parking. Tania said the task force identified alternative parking areas including re-zoning student-faculty parking. Huy said it recognized the need to move the gardens and convert some of the horticulture area to parking, but were made to feel that was not enough.

Carlene said she appreciates Lin's analysis, but we have not heard answers to her questions. Where do B20 and 20A stand with respect to the master plan, design/build, and CEQA? Mike will take the CEQA question to Jose Nunez. We have experts in Sacramento and the District Office. Our planning process has been spot on. There was careful analysis of North Gateway involving lots of people in planning and bridging.

Mike said we got 150 additional parking spaces in north campus, but had expected more. A master plan goal was to balance parking on campus. That is an iterative process. The faculty has worked with administration on compromise. We should be able to come with something to make everyone feel OK, to meet parking and program needs. By analogy, in 2006 plumbing and wiring in B36 were not properly planned, and we had to make adjustments.

Dan Kaplan said he found Lin's comments compelling. When you make radical changes to the master plan, at what point are your changes to the original conception so radical they require a new environmental impact study? Mike said he didn't know but would take the question to the District. Carlene said the DSA (Division of the State Architect) decides that. Mike said everything goes through DSA for checking such things as accessibility and CEQA. For accreditation, he is focused on aligning facilities with educational needs.

Teeka noted other impacts on parking include a huge increase in disabled student parking, which in itself is a good thing, and Athletic Club parking. She suggested shuttles to the Farmer's Market parking area and on Parrott Drive, and using part of the Athletic Club parking area. Let people who need to be close, park close. Others can walk or take a shuttle. Living plants and having people learn about them trumps parking. Huy said plans always change, but we can't make changes at the cost of a program. Programs are more crucial than parking. There will be tons of parking in North Gateway. Lin said changes inside buildings are less important under CEQA than adding impervious surfaces to the campus footprint. Parking lots are heat islands with impervious services.

The different impacts of adding a floor to B10 need to be looked at. CEQA is less flexible than our master plan. The process of going back and looking at these things are important. Lin teaches the importance of such processes, and environmental laws, in her classes. The website with this information has sustainability language. Green space is an important part of sustainability. Tania said it is important to maintain those areas, for sake of our programs. Laura said we have had problems with facilities decisions affecting curriculum. It shouldn't be that way. We have worked hard to get processes in place to prevent that.

Mike said the North Gateway project does not include Edison at all. North Gateway is the final major construction phase for CSM. It involves demolishing the buildings north of B36. Detailed plans are now at DSA for review. We have netted 157 more parking spaces in the north end. The pedestrian walkway midway through the lot provides a safe path of travel. There is a large circular area for an outdoor stage for events like Jazz on the

Hill. A hill adjacent to B36 will have a terraced seating area. There was an outdoor spaces committee. Today Canada announced it is moving its graduation ceremonies to a new site, and CSM may do the same.

Load center 8, now adjacent to B36, will have to move. It took down the college at the last power outage. It will be above ground to avoid flooding problems. The entire project is now scheduled to start about early April. Also, the parking lot project is fully funded, and there is state money for demolition.

**FACULTY POSITIONS** Mike reported instructional administrators recommended to cabinet midyear hiring for cosmetology (which is expecting a retirement) and economics. BPC has approved four positions for AY (Academic Year) 11/12, which Mike called reasonable. Diana said there is a big push for a midyear start for economics and cosmetology, but they may not start until fall. Charlene said the selection process for the four positions to be added in Fall 11 will start from scratch, but will use existing program reviews since the deans will discuss priorities this spring before program reviews are due. A new list of position requests will be prioritized at division meetings, then by the instructional administrators. Jim noted divisions will have to start the position request process very soon.

Diana said the language of the Measure G parcel tax tells how the money can be used, and there is an oversight committee. Instructional administrators have prioritized instructional equipment and position requests. No formal process has been announced yet. Administration took the spending framework to BPC. It is prioritized in line with Measure G, and includes, at the policy level, opening more class sections. Charlene added that last week, deans were asked about online courses to replace cancelled TV courses.

**BUDGET REDUCTION AY 09/10** Some programs have been reduced and some courses are on hold from the Fall 2009 approved process. These reductions are in effect through Spring 2011. Soon we will get schedule requests for Fall 11. David and others are wondering about a process to bring courses back. Right now there isn't one. Tania suggested division level discussions.

Teeka asked about programs put on hiatus or reduced. Film was reduced to a single course. What of film and Chinese? David Laderman expressed concern about adjunct reductions. How many of the programs that were reduced should be brought back, wholly or partially? Teeka noted horticulture took voluntary hiatus. Two of its faculty members have master's degrees in biology, so can teach that. Discussion needs to be division-based. David Laderman said we need to think beyond a process of discussion in divisions of bringing courses and programs back, and consider the needs of students. If there is a good justification for bringing a program off reduction, administration needs to be held accountable to use shared governance. Diana said David has a full load and is teaching in another division following a reduction in his program. Programs that were reduced to zero are on hiatus. A program can be on hiatus for three years, but then must go through PIV. Programs and courses, not full-time or adjunct faculty, is what we are talking about. There is no process. It would be great if the senate got the ball rolling toward a process.

Dan Kaplan said the shared governance process did not work in David Laderman's situation. Dan and David worked on this last semester. David marshaled a lot of data. It was not an issue of enrollment numbers. Reasons for the decision were murky. David got conflicting answers from Susan and Mike. Film has more transferability than other programs which were not reduced. The criteria being used are unclear but seem to be independent of data. Dan said we need a document with criteria that must be followed. There is no process now. Last year a list came from cabinet, and we responded. Teeka said faculty were pitted against faculty. Proposals went in, recommendations were made, and divisions sent counterproposals to administration. Discipline experts from divisions were not all in favor of what allegedly the senate was saying should happen. Either the process will get us what we need or we won't get a clear answer.

Teeka asked whether last spring's temporary ad hoc group, formed to look at future criteria, came up with something which could be a starting point going forward. Laura said the broader the group, the fuzzier the agreement, and be careful what you wish for – we do not want to pit faculty against each other, and we do not want the faculty taking on inappropriate responsibilities.

Points in discussion: The senate recommended and approved the final 2010 reductions. One from Language Arts to swap units from English was vetoed by the VPI. Mike talked of revisioning the college and the IPC ad hoc committee developed talking points on it. Then Measure G bailed us out of the crisis. Revisioning should go forward. It became clear we wanted to remain a comprehensive community college. The process needs closure. We need a vision that will help us decide what to bring back and how soon. We have a larger responsibility to the college as a whole. Make tough calls. If we take responsibility for curriculum, at some point we must say yes to this, no to that. We need such a process.

David said the college needs criteria to deal with reduced programs. Laura said the ad hoc committee last spring looked for broad campus consensus, and found strong feeling for a comprehensive campus and against a campus focused on a few areas. David proposed if a program wants to get off reduction, it provide good data and good documentation and tell how it fits into the vision developed from last spring's ad hoc study. Tania said the senate should accept processes used within divisions to recommend programs to bring back.

Teeka said the process must come from the divisions. It seems parallel to that for awarding new positions. In the position request/awarding process, administration and the president has the final say. The reduced programs in which Matt, David, and Jing Wu teach were awarded full-time hires in the last 20 years or so. There were compelling reasons to have more people, so why cut them now? Last time Jim talked about the senate wanting to revisit its role in position allocation. Maybe we should talk about these roles together. They should be parallel.

Diana summarized. Last year's budget reduction list was handed down from cabinet. No criteria came with it. There was horse trading within divisions, with proposals and counterproposals. The senate's ad hoc committee assimilated and collated recommendations from programs and never prioritized things in the face of budget reductions for this academic year, and there were casualties. We expected criteria based on the work last spring of the IPC ad hoc committee, but we have only talking points, not vision or direction from administration.

In the discussion that followed an internal senate process emerged. Our next move is for members to go to divisions and start the process there. See how the talking points and the seven institutional priorities, which are on the website, align with courses and programs on the budget reductions list and consider which programs should come back, and in what form. Pull all information together. Divisions should then report the results to the senate as information items, to be noted and recorded in the minutes. With the consensus of the senate, the reports go through Diana to cabinet. Cabinet makes its own decisions.

Laura said if only what is on last year's list is being looked at, this is a one-shot deal. We want a process that looks not just at what is being cut, but at where the needs are. Get that bigger process going, but deal with the impending fall schedule.

David Laderman asked what the administration is saying about the status of the reductions for AY 10/11 in AY 11/12. It should not default to keeping things on reduction indefinitely. Laura said we do not want to institutionalize a process that looks only at what is being cut. We should also look at needs in other areas. If we decide on a quick step now to address last year's cuts, we should make clear that a model for the long run needs to be developed. David pointed out doing one is a start on doing the other. Teeka asked whether the PIV process is part of this. Diana asked how deeply we want to be involved in decision making and responsibility. Laura emphasized that curriculum and staffing are two different things. Faculty can advocate for a strong and robust curriculum. Administration might look for utility infielders to hire – people who can teach in more than one area.

Diana said the DGME programs (Broadcasting, Graphics, Multimedia and Journalism) had enrollment issues and should have been on last year's list also, but were spared because DGME was on PIV, while other programs were on the list. Still today faculty feel the list, lacking criteria, had no rationale. Teeka said it is hard when we don't talk honestly. If we did, bizarre passive aggressive institutional behavior would be avoided. We should also have a vetting process involving the needs of students.

Laura said resources will always be constrained, and approaching this as a zero sum game – 'which child to kill' – will not work. Teeka explained 'which child to kill' was a comment internal to Language Arts.

Diana asked members to take this discussion back to their divisions and report back to senate. Senate is beginning discussions only at this time. No process, timeline or recommendation to cabinet will take place until thoroughly vetted at senate. Discussions should be kept with the 10+1. Curriculum, courses, and programs are our purview. What do we as faculty want our curriculum, programs, and courses to be? She will ask IPC to place on its agenda, and discuss with Cabinet, Governing Council's movement in revisioning our college from senate's perspective.

Diana said remember that faculty were united in senate's process across divisions last year. We chose breadth over depth. The senate had a united front. Diana reminded us that we are a recommending body. Cabinet still has the management prerogative. Teeka said there was no coherent defense of what administration ultimately did. It was just murky. Diana said we as faculty need to commend ourselves. We worked together, and have done a lot! Let's not forget our accomplishments during these tough budget times.

**ADJOURNMENT** The meeting adjourned at 4:40 pm. The next meeting will be Nov. 9, 2010 in 12-170.