



Governing Council Meeting

Feb. 8, 2011 minutes (Mar. 2, 2011 draft)

MEMBERS PRESENT

President Diana Bennett
Vice President Huy Tran
Secretary Lloyd Davis
Business/Technology Lilya Vorobey
**Creative Arts/
 Social Science** Benedict Lim

Language Arts Teeka James
Library Teresa Morris
**Math/Science
 (SLO Coordinator)** David Locke
P.E./Athletics Larry Owens
Student Services Jackie Gamelin
 Kevin Sinarle

MEMBERS ABSENT

Treasurer Rosemary Nurre
**Creative Arts/
 Social Science** Jim Robertson

Business/Technology Ed Seubert
Language Arts Daniel Keller
Math/Science Tania Beliz

OTHERS ATTENDING

AFT Dan Kaplan
BPC Co-chair Rick Ambrose
 Creative Arts/
 Social Science Chris Bobrowski
 Jude Pittman

SUMMARY

- **BPC** is discussing the district allocation model, budget contingency plans, and library funding.
- Policies and procedures for selection of faculty representatives on the **College Art Committee** will be developed.
- DAS and AFT have prepared a statement to the Board of Trustees calling for a **trust committee** on faculty evaluation, with reassigned time for faculty participants.
- **ASGC by-laws** issues include whether COI, College Assessment, and Library Advisory committee chairs should be voting members of Governing Council. Council also discussed the relationship of the Library Advisory Committee to the Senate and the IPC.
- Discussions continue on funding mechanisms for faculty laptop repair or replacement.
- Criteria used to form the budget reductions of 2009, aka “the list” will be identified
- A program PIV report on horticulture/floristry to document voluntary cuts and program needs was proposed.

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 Feb. 8, 2011 were approved.

OLD BUSINESS

BUDGET UPDATE Rick Ambrose reported the District Committee on Budget and Finance (DCBF) met twice, including 2/15. There is a report from the state perspective by Skyline economist Masao Suzuki in the February 2011 *Advocate*, <http://www.aft1493.org/component/content/article/103.html> He replaced John Kirk on DCBF and is a strong advocate for our concerns and issues. DCBF meets third Tuesdays. Read DCBF minutes on SharePoint, <http://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/dcbf/default.aspx>.

CSM's Budget Planning Committee's first meeting of the semester will be Tuesday, March 1. Possible agenda items include year-to-date actual expenditures for this year, how to fund the 5 in 5 (5 goals in 5 years) identified last semester, starting informal and formal discussions of changing the allocation model, contingency plans in case the June ballot initiative fails, and having a line item in fund one for library funding. Most library funding has dried up. The BPC will meet March, April, and May on third Mondays.

Legislators are working on putting a tax extension on the June ballot. Governor Brown is proposing \$400 million in cuts to CCC. 2%, or \$8 million, are from our district. If the tax extension fails there would be an additional \$585 million in cuts to CCC.

At a recent Board retreat, Kathy Blackwood reported in addition to past savings she built a 3% deficit factor into this year's budget. With the reserves and Measure G savings we can manage 11-12 without major cuts. 12-13 is the problem. We are now a little over cap for funding. In the past we have been a lot over. If cuts continue, we could see a 6.5% workload (FTES) reduction, with about the same state funding per FTES.

We would become basic aid if property tax and student fee revenue exceeded our state formula funding allocation. That would give us more money and more stability, but our funding from the state would drop, and property tax revenues are not that great. Getting to basic aid will not necessarily make things fine. Also, we can go in and out of basic aid from year to year. We will not know our total funding until the end of the year, which is frustrating. Going into basic aid would give credence to the argument the county is subsidizing non-county residents. As an open institution, we cannot turn students away. Serving our community is in our mission statement, but what is our community? With online classes, arguably it is the globe.

Kathy reported there is discussion at the college presidents' level to change the district's resource allocation model. It will be brought to DCBF for discussion. It uses a growth model, which is frustrating in these times. Change will probably be a long-term process.

Kathy gave DCBF a PowerPoint on Central Services line item expenditure amounts, which Rick will share with CSM's BPC. The Central Services budget saw a large reduction this year, to about 12 million, as the cost of benefits is now allocated to the colleges. The colleges get extra money to cover benefits, but must spend it on them. If we get a midyear retirement it frees up funds for us. Babies and marriages add unpredictability to benefit costs, but Rick said those amounts are not significant. BPC has open meetings, on third Mondays.

Bruce Maule and other faculty representatives of the colleges helped prepare a report on funding and auditing an irrevocable trust.

Rick concluded we are pretty good for this year and next. Kathy mentioned that two or three community college districts have to report weekly to the state on their financial situation. That is dire. More cuts down the road could double that number.

ART COMMITTEE Diana suggested there is no urgency for an art committee at this time since we lack the funds for a big ticket art on campus item. Maybe rather than having a permanent committee, one could be formed as needed on a case by case basis when money or art pieces become available. Governing Council needs to come up with policy and procedure for selection of faculty for the art committee. Art faculty and non-art faculty should be allowed on any art committee. Some members of the faculty are unhappy about not having a voice in art placed on their building.

2D-3D art professor Ray Lorenzato, who retired after 30 years, made four marble pieces on display here before the current construction and now in storage. The pieces were recently appraised at over \$100,000. His widow contacted Mike, offering to sell two to the college for the price of one. Mike will check with Ron, but feels it is not best to move forward on big ticket art pieces now.

Teeka suggested rather than purchasing art the college could commission faculty and student artists to make art. Jude Pittman said the art department has a glass mosaic made two years ago by skilled advanced CSM students waiting to be installed. It is free and it is finished.

Jude stated there are two art people on the existing art committee. The structure for IPC committees is two faculty members, one administrator, one classified, and one student. Teeka said the committee should include someone from the art department and someone not from the art department.

Diana stated at College Council a year ago, faculty representatives asked who decided the mosaic would be placed inside B36. The approximate cost of hanging it is \$10K, so a hold was put on it. B16 has a cement wall, so it could be mounted there. It could also hang in buildings with metal studs. Charlene and four members of the science faculty want it, and wonder why it is not up yet. Diana suggested Jude work with Mike regarding the mosaic. There are other faculty members in B36 who may not want it. Huy said B36 not designed to have things hung.

Teeka asserted we do need an art committee to look at this. She also questioned whether the occupants of a building should decide what goes in it. These are public buildings, so assuming safety and building integrity are not issues, it is a decision for the whole campus. Chris Bobrowski said we need a committee to bring these questions to, not to administration. Diana said Governing Council can make policy and procedure for selection of a committee. We can decide whether it will be formed on a case by case basis or be a standing committee with two year memberships. We cannot decide on art today, but we can address procedure.

Teeka proposed a standing committee with two year terms to meet initially to set up procedures. Once that is done the committee would meet as needed. Lilya and Diana volunteered to serve, with Teeka as reader. Diana and Lilya will draft a policy and procedure similar to that used for the SLO coordinator and accreditation editor. After a first reading, discussion, and approval by Governing Council, probably around April 1, it will be sent to faculty for approval. Then the committee will be populated.

The Art Committee will be an institutional level committee. We are drafting local senate policy and procedures, limited to how the faculty for that committee will be selected. The whole faculty will be notified by email. Jude will set up a meeting with Diana and Mike regarding her students' mosaic.

DAS/AFT TRUST COMMITTEE STATEMENT In a faculty-driven process, Nina Floro and Monica Malamud of AFT and Diana and Ray Hernandez of the Senate produced a faculty statement on faculty evaluation to present to the board Feb. 23. Chancellor Galatolo and Trustee Holober have concerns about putting it on the Board agenda. The Board decides whether or not to agendize it. They want administrators on the Trust Committee, which is not a problem for us. Trustee Holober did not approve putting it on the agenda, but Ray will include it in his report as DAS president. The goal to get it approved this semester so the work can be undertaken in the fall. The statement includes released time.

Teeka expressed concerned faculty might be getting a runaround. Three years ago with the original AFT Trust Committee proposal. Harry Joel asked for an administrator and full and part-time faculty from each campus (and had strong opinions about which ones) but then the administration objected there were too many people. The Chancellor was supportive, but put the brakes on over released time. Diana said the committee has made clear faculty need reassigned time, not a stipend. She and Ray have good relations with AFT and want to move forward. Teeka asserted that the District fund the work but the faculty decide which faculty members do it. Having an ex officio resource person who is not a decision-maker is fine. The faculty is in charge.

Diana emphasized the process is faculty driven. We want to fix the faculty evaluation. DAS expected it to be on the 2/23 Board agenda, but that decision is made by the President of the Board.

DRAFT OF ASGC BY-LAWS One issue is whether Library, College Assessment and Instruction committee chairs should be voting members of Governing Council? At CSM they have not been, but they are at Skyline and Canada. Points in discussion: Might this unbalance division representation on Governing Council? CAC chair David Locke is also a Math/Science rep. Council officers also affect division balance. Council membership changes every two years. Committee chairs represent their committees more than their divisions. The right question is whether the change would make Governing Council more efficient and effective, or less. The SLO coordinator and COI chair are integral part. David Locke is a Math/Science representative. Those committee chairs get released time. We should change the size of a quorum if we enlarge the Council. Diana asked members to think about that, and about term limits on Executive Committee members, and decide next time.

Teresa explained both the Senate and IPC have a library committee, but only the Senate's long-standing Library Advisory Committee (LAC) meets. It has representatives from every division. The IPC Library Committee can write workplans, allowing for a real budget. The LAC can only advise. With no IPC committee, there is no interface with the budgeting, planning, and workplan process except thru Library Director Loritta Ford. LAC advises a functioning part of the campus. \$70,000 goes to the library for services to students, mostly through the library's collection, not salaries. Subscriptions alone can cost \$18,000. Teeka suggested maybe the Senate can clear this up with IPC. Preserve the senate committee. Teresa said there are pros and cons to this complicated issue. Diana said lots of things are put forward to meet ACCJC requirements. She recommends keeping LAC as a Senate committee which could report to IPC as needed.

Diana also checked for typos in the by-laws. She will send members the latest draft.

FACULTY LAPTOPS Diana got several emails and phone calls about faculty computers after the Feb. 8 meeting. She met with ITS Director Eric Raznick, IT Support Manager Brad Witham, TAC chair Kevin Henson, President Claire and VPI Susan Estes about faculty computer issues. Brad now has an account number for replacing computer batteries. Batteries can be replaced in 24 hours. Faculty should fill out the IT Services Request Form.

Diana asked Mike about her understanding that faculty moving into the new B15 and B17 were told they would all get new laptops, but did not. Mike made reference to the possible Bond Three. Not having a funding mechanism for replacing technology in general, including faculty computers, was a Standard 3 accreditation issue last time. Find funding for replacements is being addressed. There is no pot of gold. For now, ITS forwards results of its computer check-ups to deans and works with them on funding repairs or replacements.

Teeka said B15 faculty members are concerned if their computers are limping now, will there be money later when they crash, or is it now or never? People want something predictable. Diana said we need a line item for technology replacements, but her immediate issue is taking care of batteries. Technology and BPC are meeting to come up with a constant funding resource for technology on campus. There is no such funding mechanism now.

Only a half dozen faculty members notified Diana about dead or dying computers, but some may have gone directly to their deans. B15 faculty asked Teeka how much is reasonable to put up with from a dying computer. Knowledgeable users can do such maintenance as defragging their hard drive and setting system preferences. If your computer is slow, submit a help request to ITS. ITS is good at fixing what needs to be fixed. They will fix machines out of warranty if they can. Submit a help request to ITS. They will report back to you and the dean. Desktops will be phased out in favor of laptops.

FALL BUDGET REDUCTIONS – “THE LIST” Diana said to date we have been given none of the criteria for putting courses and programs on “the list” in 2009 to be cut in 2010-11, which makes it hard to decide what to restore. Some things, such as lifelong learning, will not return. Instructors are asking to add back classes that have strong enrollments. Film, Chinese, and Italian classes were added this fall. For this to happen in general, we need to know the basis for putting things on the list. More cuts are likely for 2012-13.

Meetings to identify the indicators used for the list (but not yet for restoration) will begin next week. It is important that program reviews be completed. Later, with all data available, courses will be classified as green (good to go), yellow (caution) or red (automatic PIV, not discontinuance.)

Huy met with the Chancellor last week and pushed for a PIV-like process to determine what horticulture needs for facilities, etc. The Chancellor says the Board will ask for alternatives. Look at what is good for the program and what needs improvement. Horticulture is asking for \$500,000 for a greenhouse. The Board says justify it. Huy said we are being pushed to use facilities elsewhere, and in view of what happened to welding we do not want to lose the facility before there is a PIV process.

Diana said Horticulture and biology faculty need to attend those meetings. We should have everybody at the table. PIV is not only program discontinuance. In budget reductions, people sacrificed courses but that went unnoticed, with no formal record. Horticulture/floristry volunteered to go on hiatus, but there is no record of that. Put them on PIV to get a document the Board respects. Have evidence to show what the programs are doing and/or need to run successfully.

David said the timeline for construction is a concern. We expect a timeline from Mike today. One proposal is to put a greenhouse northeast of B36 and remodel a physics lab for at least temporary use by horticulture and floristry. But physics needs the lab, and it would be costly to reconvert it for physics. He noted that although the Edison and Northgate projects have been separated, there would be cost savings in doing them together while all the equipment is in place. Diana will request information from Mike, Jose Nunez, and the Chancellor. Dan wondered aloud whether the facts on the ground will be changed so former discussions become moot.

Points in discussion: The Board needs to be educated about the horticulture/floristry program. A PIV document could do that. Include why things look the way they do. We can complete a PIV document without going through the whole PIV process, since so much work has been done already. The Horticulture/Floristry/Edison group will meet with Math/Science division dean Charlene Frontiera soon. This will be a modified PIV. Its purpose is to get information into documents. Film and other programs on the list should do the same thing. The PIV process primarily relies on the senate. Diana asked Huy if it is feasible to do the modified PIV report in 60 days. Huy had no response. Teeka said we also need to take program review seriously. Leave a paper trail. A little extra work could be very helpful.

Governing Council had a good conversation on DGME PIV and curriculum. Diana shared it with DGME faculty and Susan Estes. Diana told DGME of the Senate discussion and concerns: load and enrollment numbers, 20 class minimum, running at a deficit, released time, and the time frame to give the program a chance. Susan responded to concerns. Diana read the email received from Susan. The DGME PIV is a senate matter, and last fall the senate agreed to monitor all programs on PIV. Ed Seubert, a DGME faculty member and Governing Council representative has not been in attendance at recent senate meetings and could have provided additional information. DGME will be on PIV through the academic year 2011/12, after which it will be discontinued if it is not a viable program.

Points in discussion: Across the district people affected by cuts have been able to maintain load, but where does an instructor go who does not have a full load and whose class is cancelled? Foreign language has enormous enrollments. Film had a major. Under-enrolled courses were needed for students to complete programs and certificates. Other programs are looking at DGME and saying it is not fair it had what looks like preferential treatment. Is allowing two semesters for it to get up to speed the answer? There are budget and transparency issues with the use of reassigned time. Reassigned time will be needed for trust committee work on faculty evaluation.

Discussion of **District Rules and Regs** will resume at our next meeting. Lilya reported a flyer is in preparation showing a \$20 bill with the top 20 reasons for becoming a **dues-paying member** of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting adjourned at 4:23 pm. The next meeting will be Mar. 8, 2011 in 12-170.