



Governing Council Meeting

April 26, 2011 minutes (May 16 draft)

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	Diana Bennett
Vice President	Huy Tran
Secretary	Lloyd Davis
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Creative Arts/ Social Science	Jim Robertson Benedict Lim
Library	Teresa Morris

Language Arts	Teeka James
	Daniel Keller
Math/Science; SLOAC	David Locke
P.E./Athletics	Larry Owens
Student Services	Jackie Gamelin Kevin Sinarle

MEMBERS ABSENT

Math/Science	Tania Beliz
---------------------	-------------

Business/Technology	Ed Seubert Lilya Vorobey
----------------------------	-----------------------------

OTHERS ATTENDING

AFT	Dan Kaplan
ASCSM	Bailey Girard
COI	Laura Demsetz

Language Arts	Kate Motoyama
Math/Science	Violeta Grigorescu

SUMMARY:

- Election results were announced and conduct of future elections was discussed.
- The budget reduction decision process, and the possibility of using WebAccess for communication with the faculty this summer, were discussed.
- The Retirement / Tenure / New Hire Reception will be May 10 at 2:15, location in College Center TBA
- The DAS/AFT Social will be May 12 at Canada Vista.
- The conduct of the Edison / Horticulture dialogue was discussed.

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:16 p.m. in the SoTL Center, 12-170, by President Diana Bennett. The agenda was approved, and the minutes of April 12, 2011, were approved with the correction that the nominations of James Carranza for President, Chandra Vanajakshi for Vice President, and incumbent Rosemary Nurre for treasurer were made at the April 12 meeting, not before.

2011-13 OFFICER ELECTIONS Kate Motoyoma made suggestions about the conduct of future elections. Nominations should be agendaized as an action item, and closed by a 2/3 vote. Governing Council needs to follow parliamentary procedure and the Brown Act. She distributed ASCCC Executive Committee agenda and minutes illustrating proper conduct of meetings. We want no challenges from constituents to our election results. It is impossible to know all about procedure, and with no official parliamentarian, responsibility is shared by every member. ASCCC is prepared to provide training, which might be a good idea in the future.

Diana said at our last meeting, people were coming in and out and leaving for other meetings, and there was no nominee for Secretary. It is important to have candidates on the ballot. As President, she accepted nominations through the Friday following the meeting, including Huy Tran for President and Violeta Grigorescu for Secretary. When the Executive Committee was presented with all the names, three approved them and one abstained. Nominations were closed, but not at a regular meeting. On 3/22 and 4/12 in the minutes and at the meetings it was noted nominations would continue to be accepted. It is the responsibility of Council members to get the word

out. Election of officers was posted through midnight April 25. Diana worked with people on login issues. She said as president did not feel her place was getting into email. Her place is at Governing Council. Violeta said perhaps people gave up trying to vote. At least one attempt to write in a candidate was not successful.

Teeka learned from Dan Kaplan about the nomination process at Skyline. The past president sends an email to all faculty members asking for nominations for senate officers and providing a link for that purpose. That could be a model for next time for us. Teeka suggested reviving the practice of having big posters in faculty workrooms. Next year as time for nominations approaches, we could have a conversation about how to reach out to the campus, not just by email, so people know what the process is, and about specifics.

On write-in candidates, Diana said she chose not to get into the fray. Teeka said faculty members did not know the process for the David Laderman write-in. There was a total communication breakdown. Jackie said we want to know we can remedy the process.

Rosemary said it is enviable to have more than one person interested in running for president. She had incorrectly assumed the vice president would make a lockstep move to president. It seemed a fait accompli that a person who has served two or three years as vice president, without reassigned time, would become president. She was stunned to see another name. In fact, a person does not have to be vice president to move into the presidency. If we go back to the historical average of no one running, will we discourage people from wanting to be vice-president if there is no promise they will become president.

Kate urged caution in using email. There are different legal opinions, but email exchanges could be seen as a non-agendized secret meeting. They may be acceptable if fewer than a quorum participates.

Diana announced the election results:

- President: (84 votes) James Carranza 51, Huy Tran 30, others 3
- Vice President (77 votes) David Laderman 36, Chandra Vanajakshi 33, others 8
- Treasurer (75 votes) Rosemary Nurre 71, others 4
- Finding a secretary will be the new president's job.

Diana thanked Huy for his years of service to the Senate and the work he has done on our behalf.

BUDGET REDUCTIONS President Claire sent an email with his April 20 PowerPoint and the criteria brainstormed at the April 15 retreat. There was also work on criteria were by last year's Ad Hoc Steering Committee and at 5 in 5 last November. This will not be like the sacrifices made in 2009. Programs will be discontinued and/or put on hiatus. We do not know what they are yet. Kathy Blackwood spoke at DAS of a 10-14% cut. At all meetings, COI will be involved. A new COI chair, Teresa Morris, starts in the fall. Diana sees no summer surprise. Management Council meets May 10 and will work on the final criteria. Cabinet will notify affected programs so their students in the pipeline can finish the following year. Cuts will take effect in 2012-13. With email notification, summer surprises can be avoided. Teeka called shared governance a misnomer. The senate recommends, but Mike makes the decisions. Hence her question to Mike: What does consult mean to you? How much energy should we put into it?

The April 15 brainstorm list is not the final list of criteria. May 30 is the date for final agreement on process, criteria, assessment tools, but not the list. By July 1 the first recommendations of what to cut will go to the Board.

We want to think about making a formal recommendation on collaboration with Skyline and Canada. Diana has spoken with Jing about having it agendized, and will strongly urge it to the Chancellor at their monthly meeting. At district level, a statement sent out two years ago needs updating to strongly urge collaboration.

Rosemary said we have been recommending collaboration for several years. Why don't top people entertain it? What is it we or they are not seeing? It feels like there is another agenda. Points in discussion: Faculty district-wide want collaboration. Mike's explanation is that other colleges haven't gone through our cuts. We have more

cuts because of changes in the allocation model. When Susan reached out to other VPIs, there was some resistance to serious collaboration. Mike has suggested collaboration also, but encountered resistance as well.

On shared governance, Dan said when Kate Motoyama was DAS president and CSM Senate president, lots of work was done to get the Board to agree to faculty primacy on curriculum. There are two different forms of collaboration: “rely primarily” and “collegial consultation.” Kate struggled to get “rely primarily” on each item in the 10+1. Teeka said we do what we want in terms of classes, but on money – whether or not to offer courses, or get equipment – they get the last say.

SUMMER DECISIONS Two or three years ago a summer group was formed. Last summer the Executive Committee, expanded to include the COI chair and Jim Robertson, communicated by email. Laura said if we use email, we could include the whole Council. Broader inclusion is better in case something comes up about a program the summer group is not familiar with. Teeka said if we use email, why not include everybody? We could set up a WebAccess class with all CSM faculty as members, so conversation takes place through the forums. We can share documents more easily, password-protected, in a format we have more control over. By using electronics we do not have to rely on people who are on campus in summer.

Teeka asked what does Mike mean by consult and collaborate? Why pursue collaboration if there is a done deal? What is it he needs to know so we don’t do mini PIV documents that will make no difference and that no one will read? If there is no chance for a program, let us know, and we will put our energy elsewhere. In 2009, we spent lots of time negotiating with cabinet. We also got reprimanded. In the end, we shouldn’t have bothered. Make clear to Mike we don’t want to repeat that.

Our role in consultation probably depends on Mike’s feelings for particular programs. It is almost impossible to not do the work of consultation because we do not know what he will say. We cannot assume his answer is always no, or always yes. If he has made his mind up he should tell us now. That seems fair.

Dan said he has worked with Mike over the years and would like to believe that Mike can be persuaded. If you marshal enough evidence, he is open to being convinced. That is not true of all administrators. Dan expects no summer surprises. Kathy Blackwood expects no state budget until September, after the start of fall semester, so no decisions are likely until then.

Jim said Mike wants to move forward now, so next year students in programs being phased out will have time to complete them. Not all people are tech savvy. The old system, the last two summers, authorized a mini-senate, which worked pretty well. We lost a couple of battles but we fought them well. Jim suggested we do that again. Updates could be sent to everyone, say every couple of weeks. If we need faculty expertise from people not on Governing Council we could open it up to more people.

Huy said Mike feels compelled to bring something to the Board by July, and has made clear that no matter what evidence is presented, he and the vice-presidents have the right to make judgment calls. Bailey reported Mike and Kathy said the same things about budget cuts at the ASCSM meeting yesterday. Diana said ASCSM asked her to come but we don’t do things that way.

Points in discussion: Email has a Brown Act problem. WebAccess is a great tool. It has time-stamped comments and is simple to use. Our students teach themselves to use it. Library people use it as a bulletin board. We do have to be careful of quasi meetings. Conversation is OK, but taking a vote is not. WebAccess is ideal for a conversation. It might turn into a Senate organizing tool. Summer time constraints make it hard for communication back and forth among a small group, a large group, and key faculty members.

Teeka said COI and Laura have done a great job helping us stay abreast of what we need to be sure students have, to meet requirements. Between now and the end of the semester we need to work on setting up WebAccess for this, figure out how it will work, and get faculty up to speed. We have lots of lists we already made. In Foreign Language, we can’t have just Spanish because then some people could not fulfill the language requirement. We need access to such information, say in a ‘what we’ve figured out so far’ place.

Points in discussion of summer: We will know more about with whom we need communication after the May 10 meeting. We might set up subgroups consisting of responsible go to people. We could use WebAccess as a discussion forum only, with no decisions or action, but if WebAccess is just for discussion, we need to decide before summer how decisions would be made.

Laura compared preparing the April 15 brainstorm list of criteria to throwing spaghetti at the wall in the last few minutes to see what sticks. We have seen most of the ideas before. Those together with the Fall 09 criteria and ideas from last spring's Ad Hoc Steering Committee are a starting point. Points in discussion: We should have some sense of what will stay or go at the end of the May 10 meeting. It is likely BSI and CTE will be addressed first. Cabinet was asked at the April 15 retreat to keep us informed.

There will be no meeting on May 10, the date of the Retirement / Tenure Reception. Consensus emerged to meet May 17, and hold open May 24 in case a second meeting is needed, and to ask the incoming president, who is supposed to chair the last meeting, and vice president, to come to both meetings. James and David are not here today because they did not know they had won and had an important division meeting. May 24 is during finals week, so check your final exam schedules. Summer decision-making will be an action item.

SPRING PLENARY RESOLUTIONS are at <http://asccc.org/session/materials> and were emailed to all faculty April 26. 64 passed, none were deferred back to the ASCCC Executive Committee, and there were no serpentine counts (votes so close delegates had to stand and count off). Course repeatability got the most attention. Most failed resolutions and amendments were in that area, though several passed. They are under 9.0, Curriculum.

RETIREMENT/TENURE/NEW HIRE RECEPTION We have no list yet of retirees or of faculty getting tenure. Some of the eight new hires for next year will not be available. The event will be at 2:15 May 10 in a College Center conference room. Diana will send out invitations to honorees. There will be light desserts.

NEW BUSINESS

GARDEN CLUB ASCSM Senator Bailey Girard addressed the dispute in recent weeks about construction and its effects on science classes, and parking. The college wants more parking for the added floor on B10. It is not very cost efficient to move the entire garden. ASCSM voted 15-0 to prepare a resolution to keep the garden as it is for the biology and horticulture departments, which are using it now. Education needs to come before parking.

Monica Malamud attended the Board meeting and told Teeka Trustee Dave Mandelkern said future decisions will not be based on how many faculty or students show up, that students were badly led by some faculty members, that this discussion is done, and he does not want to hear any more of this in the future.

Points in discussion: Faculty deal with curriculum. Decisions about parking lots deal with facilities. Horticulture is not gone since changes to the program have not gone through COI. It is important to have that process established. If a program is not being discontinued, hiatus is a way to bring it back. We need something as a public record, to make a point. There is nothing wrong with the program. Something is wrong with the process. The students formed a group and took time to present their stand. The Trustee's remark was really offensive and tells students their opinions don't matter. The assertion the faculty is driving student protests is not correct. Students came to the faculty for support, and have found things on the district website that faculty members had not. A member of the Bond Oversight Committee was unaware of the situation and wanted a lot of detail. Violeta has talked with people in the flower industry about the importance of the program.

Laura said the Board and the state have said in times of restricted budgets, things that serve the community have lower priority than things that serve students. The constructive way to support programs is to tie them to curriculum – to transfer, CTE, and Basic Skills. The way things have been brought up in public forums has led the Board to think the program supports a community garden club, which is not the case. Be careful how we educate the Board. Huy said Mike discouraged us from talking to the Chancellor or the Board. At the end of the

semester, the Chancellor still thought we wanted a bigger greenhouse. The faculty is presented as troublemakers when in fact it has been jumping thru hoops.

More points in discussion: Trustee Mandelkern is unhappy about people going to local city councils, bypassing the college presidents. How does the Board want students to participate? We do want a voice in public meetings. We need to educate the president about how the garden connects to and is part of the curriculum, but faculty members have spent a lot of time on that already. Some things went to Mike but not beyond. It is important in the future the education happens correctly and does not give a wrong impression of the program. The PIV addresses possible future locations.

Diana said we should emphasize looking at the process. The PIV is due in June. The students have been voicing their opinions in a professional way, and were commended by the board for that.

TEXTBOOK ORDERS was postponed since Interim Bookstore Director James Peacock was unable to attend.

COMMITTEE REPORTS The Library Committee still has no chair. Teresa Morris reported the committee will meet April 27 and discuss comprehensive program review. COI reported earlier in this meeting. David Locke announced a training Friday May 6 in B10 on how to enter and access SLO information in TracDat. Faculty will soon receive an email about the May 6 TracDat training with time and place, and an email survey on faculty impressions of where we stand on SLOs. Ann Mitchell schedules B10 rooms. DGME rooms are not yet set up.

ANNOUNCEMENT Dan Kaplan reported AFT has filed an unfair labor practice with PERB about the district unilaterally saying it will use SLOs in faculty evaluation. Teeka said Harry Joel told the presidents to tell deans to include SLO work under 'other duties,' but did not contact the union about the change. Faculty evaluation is a negotiable item. Dan asked for information about any examples. For tenured faculty, they would appear in the dean's evaluation of non-teaching responsibilities, and there would be a letter or memo. Jackie said chairs of peer review committees would have assessments from the deans, and could provide any examples if they knew what to look for. A PERB hearing has not yet been scheduled. The chronology is in the PERB charge. This is a process issue. It is not clear to what extent the change has been communicated or implemented.

In discussion, Laura asked if AFT's view is that participating in development and assessment of SLOs is different enough from other responsibilities outside the classroom that it warrants separate attention. If a new committee is formed, we do not have to add the name of that committee to the list of faculty responsibilities.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS The SLOAC committee needs more members. It should have two from each division and one from the library. Lloyd joined the committee recently, making Math/Science the only division with two representatives. Business/Technology has lots of programs without full-timers. Maybe someone from a different division could work with them. Colleen Kirby has volunteered to do so. Terry Kistler represents Business/Technology. David will visit Kathy Ross to get someone else from her division. David will send out roles and responsibilities of SLOAC committee members. The committee normally meets once a month.

As Senate president, Diana has often approved committee members due to time constraints, and Lloyd has put them in the minutes. This process can be changed if desired.

ANNOUNCEMENT The **DAS/AFT Social** at Canada Vista has been moved from May 5 to May 12.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting adjourned at 4:03 pm. The next meeting will be May 17, 2011 in 12-170.