



**Governing Council Meeting**

**May 17, 2011 minutes (August 8 draft)**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

**President** Diana Bennett  
**Vice President** Huy Tran  
**Secretary** Lloyd Davis  
**Treasurer** Rosemary Nurre  
**President Elect** James Carranza  
**Vice President Elect** David Laderman  
**Business/Technology** Lilya Vorobey

**Creative Arts/  
 Social Science** Jim Robertson  
**Language Arts** Benedict Lim  
 Teeka James  
 Daniel Keller  
**Library** Teresa Morris  
**Math/Science; SLOAC** David Locke  
**P.E./Athletics** Larry Owens  
**Student Services** Kevin Sinarle

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**Math/Science** Tania Beliz

**Business/Technology** Ed Seubert  
**Student Services** Jackie Gamelin

**OTHERS ATTENDING**

**AFT** Dan Kaplan  
**ASCSM** Bailey Girard

**COI** Laura Demsetz  
**Math/Science** Charlene Frontiera

**SUMMARY**

- Governing Council discussed the summer timeline for reviewing criteria and responding to proposed program cuts, the role and composition of the summer senate, and ways to communicate with faculty, including email and WebAccess.

**CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 2:19 p.m. in the SoTL Center, 12-170, by President Diana Bennett. The agenda was approved, and the minutes of April 26, 2011, were approved.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** ASCSM representative Bailey Girard announced ASCSM election results: Paige Kupperberg will be President and Daniella Medeiro Vice President. 18 senators were also elected.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**2011/2013 BUDGET** Management Council meets May 24 to discuss criteria for program cuts. The criteria go to Cabinet for approval May 25, then to the Senate for feedback. Cuts, in the form of reduction, compression, consolidation, and discontinuance, will be recommended by Management Council based on the criteria, but will occur only after Senate review. There will be no PIV process. There will be tiers of cuts. Some areas may grow.

In developing the criteria, Management Council is looking at all documents including the work of the Spring 2010 ad hoc committee and the Fall 2010 5 in 5 group, Measure G and PRIE information, and what did and did not work in Fall 2009. We will not be surprised by the criteria since we have already seen them in different forms.

After criteria are applied and programs are identified, additional information from faculty on those programs and how they relate to the criteria will go through the senate to cabinet. There will be no bartering as occurred in 2009. Some programs will be identified immediately for Mike to take to the board this summer, along with the

criteria and process. It is urgent to determine which programs will be discontinued so we can offer the courses students need to finish degrees or certificates by Spring 12. We have no information on how many programs are in the crosshairs. The deans have been working on the criteria, not on identifying programs.

We do not know whether cabinet will use a multi-criteria approach such as we use when buying a cellphone, or whether criteria will be plugged into a single equation yielding one number. We do know that as in 2009 the senate will simply forward additional information about affected programs to cabinet. Deciding is not our job.

The summer senate needs very quick turnaround. Faculty need to be connected when information becomes available and responses are needed. Cabinet will notify people in affected programs.

Points in discussion: Even without criteria, cabinet could and should give us a heads up on who might be on the list, so we can contact people in the programs and give them time to prepare. We will give them a response mechanism to get information and ideas back to cabinet. Administration wants two semesters to wind programs down. All cuts take effect in Fall 12, not in 11-12.

We have clear deadlines, and nobody wants the process to drag. However, since the cuts are not for a year, why is it important to start reviewing them in July, when people will be on vacation and Skyline and Canada will have no such process under way, as opposed to August?

Diana said most programs in trouble have known it for years. She expects fewer than five programs will be identified this summer. More will be named in the fall. Program review is our PIV, with its color code classification: red (stop) for programs facing termination, yellow (caution) for programs that must find avenues to health, and green (go). The budget is not in our control. All three colleges are facing this, not just CSM.

No programs are officially on hiatus now, Some have been on voluntary hiatus since 2009. Rosemary expressed concern about the precedent of waiting until the end of the semester to get information for decision-making and making critical decision in summer when many are not here to analyze the information. With so little time, how does the senate have a discussion and come to agreement? On May 16 the Board approved demolishing B20. If we aren't in on decision-making, they will make decisions for us. Our issue is the summer time frame.

Points in discussion of using **WebAccess** this summer: What would web conversations accomplish? There will be no 2009-style bartering. Many people will not be available in summer. On the other hand, WebAccess would facilitate the broad faculty discussion we should have on the criteria and proposed cuts, and be an avenue to get information to cabinet and the Board.

ASCSM Senator Bailey Girard said ASCSM has heard the message from Mike Claire and Kathy Blackwood and could add to the conversation. Using WebAccess makes information more transparent. At worst it has no effect. At best it can be of real help and service to the college moving forward. It is easier than email, allows a wider, more inclusive, discussion, and archives the conversation for documentation purposes.

Teeka expressed willingness to handle WebAccess for summer discussion. It is enough to create a class pm WebAccess, then add all CSM faculty members as the faculty for the class. It should be moderated, so it is not a forum for misinformation. WebAccess has a listserv function for quick, open communication. We could have one for the entire faculty and one just for Governing Council.

**Role of the Senate** Diana expressed confidence we will give cabinet good additional information about the criteria and later about programs, and cabinet will listen and might modify the criteria or program decisions based on our input. Her confidence is based on her years of working with cabinet on budget and other issues. James predicted the criteria will be unsurprising, and likely to include technical data already used in program review.

Points in discussion: President Claire decides what to recommend to the Board, and wants information from us. In Fall 09, cabinet made a course correction when COI pointed out it couldn't leave us with Spanish as the only foreign language. We want at least to know we gave cabinet our input on what is reasonable and what are not

good ideas. Documenting our conversations and written exchanges could provide an excellent starting point for the fall. A web based exchange is not lost if someone's computer fails. Multiple people can be moderators or administrators, so the load of responsibility can be distributed.

Jim expressed concern that a set of individual reactions would not have the impetus of an organized presentation by the senate to the administration. Comments gathered in summer should be collated and organized, not just transcribed. The senate could set up a group to do this, with someone to supervise and coordinate.

Points in discussion: Our goal as a Senate is for the faculty to have a voice. We need to be proactive, not reactive, without pointing fingers or guessing, or keeping rumors alive. Management Council is also in a tough position. We need to thank them for taking the first step. The Senate was not ready to make such decisions in 2009 or even a few months ago. We want discussions about the criteria before they are approved, and later about identified programs. We need a summer senate to organize and present whatever comes up, and to discuss with President Claire the possibility of sending recommendations in August instead of July.

All feedback must be obtained, organized, and sent to cabinet before the start of fall semester, to give cabinet time to make its decisions. The faculty is involved only through the stage of setting criteria. The administration alone will make the decisions, using the criteria. All faculty members should be able to comment on criteria, for example to raise issues about class size and room size, and why fill rates are low. There is not time to go through representatives. Teeka noted WebAccess has wikis and collaborative writing features, and would allow wider participation, easing the burden on our small summer group. There will not be lots of participants.

Cabinet may use our input to adjust its criteria, then identify affected programs. Faculty members can respond through the senate to the cabinet with additional information about those programs. The Board will have a study session July 13 and may act on the cuts at its regular meeting July 27. We will get the criteria the last weekend in May. The following six weeks could be divided about two-two-two: the senate gives feedback on criteria (e.g. prioritization), cabinet uses adjusted criteria to propose cuts, and faculty provides feedback on those cuts.

Council agreed to make Saturday June 18 the close of comments on criteria. Summer school starts June 20. That gives faculty three weeks to look at criteria, and cabinet two weeks before July 4th to identify programs. The Board, not President Claire, is in charge of timelines. Diana, as DAS president, can talk to the Board. If we can't extend discussion of summer cuts into the fall semester, a shorter summer timeline might serve the college better. Most people will participate right away or not at all.

We should alert the faculty by email, personal contact, and workroom posters, about our summer work on criteria and cuts, and ask them to check their email often so they can participate and respond.

**SUMMER COUNCIL** Points in discussion: Both outgoing and incoming officers should attend meetings, for continuity. If we close input on criteria on 6/18, we could meet on 6/20, the first day of summer session.

MSP (Teeka opposed) to approve the following composition of the summer senate ad hoc committee: Executive Committee members (James Carranza, David Laderman, and Rosemary Nurre), DAS President Diana Bennett, COI past and future chairs Laura Demsetz and Teresa Morris, and James Robertson.

Jim Robertson suggested we call the group the summer ad hoc committee rather than the summer senate, and require its actions to be ratified by Governing Council at the first fall meeting. The committee will be collating information, not making decisions. Invite all ASGC members to attend summer meetings. Teeka said the point of electronic input was to have broad participation and back and forth. There is no need to restrict participation in decision making that is ratified later. If Senate members want to show up, they should.

Rosemary presented Diana with a token of appreciation for all she has done. Diana thanked Council members for their support, and added it is important they be involved with the new Executive Committee members.

**ADJOURNMENT** The meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm. The next meeting will be August 23, 2011.