

## CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Meeting Summary (8/8/2011 draft)

JULY 11, 2011 3:15 – 5 PM 15-155

### MEMBERS PRESENT

<b>President</b>	James Carranza	<b>Language Arts</b>	Teeka James
<b>Vice President</b>	David Laderman	<b>Math/Science</b>	Tania Beliz
<b>PE/Athletics</b>	Joe Mangan		
<b>Social Science</b>	Jim Robinson		

### OTHERS ATTENDING

<b>COI</b>	Laura Demsetz	<b>Language Arts</b>	Rich Castillo
<b>DAS President</b>	Diana Bennett		Tiziana Balestra
<b>Library</b>	Teresa Morris	<b>Math/Science</b>	Lin Bowie
<b>Social Science</b>	Terry Kistler	<b>Friends of CSM Gardens</b>	Liane Benedict
	Angela Stocker		Shawn Kann

**CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 3:19 p.m. Today's agenda, and the minutes from June 24, were approved. Lloyd agreed to take notes. Members agreed that in general names of speakers in discussions should not be included in minutes. A faculty-only mailing list is being prepared.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** Tiziana Balestra spoke in support of Italian, said on agenda items from persons not on summer council will be heard with those items. Liane Benedict gave James a letter from Horticulture students in support of that program and on the importance of its facilities and gardens.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RESPONSES** in three areas were discussed, and approved with revisions (to be completed by the preparers of the responses) for submission to cabinet on July 13. Discussion focused on strengths to emphasize and issues to address. President Claire has given us the decisions. Management will look at the additional information, insights, and suggestions in the responses we forward. The senate does not necessarily support those responses.

**Humanities** Three courses, each taught by a full-timer, are in question. The response proposes compression, using a rotating schedule with at most one class offered each semester. Costs are cut by discontinuing the humanities degree and major, and adjunct replacements. Points in discussion:

Why not cut?

- What is the impact to the college of not having humanities here? Other colleges offer such courses, and there are other ways to satisfy degree and transfer requirements.
- Humanities is no longer a program, but a catchall, surviving because of the interest taken by individual professors.
- If we can't get through the low hanging fruit, we'll be stymied later. Some things will have to go.

Why not keep?

- The courses are interdisciplinary, unique, transferable, give students more choices, and incur no additional expense.
- The small compression of whatever program a humanities instructor is pulled away from to teach his course could be addressed in the response.
- Cancelling humanities classes makes it harder to teach critical thinking.
- As we cut popular, transferable, well enrolled classes, other colleges are increasing their offerings.
- In consultation with deans we will have balance, and the same savings, over time.

**Foreign Language** proposed ways to do more than keeping only Spanish and Chinese, by compression, by keeping one of the languages up for discontinuance (Italian, Japanese, or ASL,) or by offering, in rotation, the beginning class of each of the other languages. Points in discussion:

- Each language should be treated as a full program.
- Cutting higher level courses will drive students away.
- We need a procedure in place to restore programs without having to start from scratch.
- In ASL, 111 and 112 fulfill the language requirement. 120 is not needed. Sandra Comerford and Marsha Ramezane have been consulting about changing course outlines in other languages to follow that model. If a one-year sequence satisfies the CSU language requirement, say so.
- This is a chance for the college to correct an accreditation deficiency, by involving faculty and administration in long-term planning.
- Lifelong learning is no longer a priority of the Board or of the state Chancellor's Office.
- Languages might be considered jewel programs.
- Italian and Japanese are not offered at Skyline or Canada.
- The classes being canceled are transferable, earn degree credit, are not low enrolled, and their teachers get excellent evaluations.
- A justification for discontinuance is people don't get certificates, but 1) the upper end of the program had been cut off and 2) the certificate was just a marketing strategy.
- Put compression front and center. Anger would be self-defeating.
- A person to whom the Board can take questions should be named in the response.

**Horticulture** produced a long response because it has so much data. Load was good until its voluntary hiatus, and the program had administration support until CPD wanted parking. It is an ideal CTE program that also transfers. The program has extensive connections with industry and the community. Master Gardeners, a UC extension program, has offered to rebuild the lath house. A lawsuit is pending, contending proper environmental reviews were not conducted for the demolition of its facilities. To decide to cancel the program before the suit is settled seems not in anyone's best interest.

Liane Benedict reported that at the National Institute of Floral Designers annual conference last week in San Francisco, two of CSM's eight competitors won national awards.

Jim Robertson advised forwarding the horticulture response as additional information, with a statement that we are not commenting on the lawsuit. Members noted the lawsuit is about the environmental report the college didn't do, not the program. Facilities and academic programs are separate issues.

Points in discussion:

- The response should mention program faculty revised the curriculum with CSM professional development money, the Board approved the new courses, and enrolment has increased, especially in distance learning classes.
- Floristry has been given two semesters to finish out the 52 students in the pipeline.
- Be sure HBA is calculated correctly. HBA rules have shifted over time.
- Our courses fit the CID course descriptions in the SB 1440 TMC under development.

**COVER LETTER** Language was developed at the meeting for a cover letter for the additional information responses. Discussion also included concerns about the summer process.

General concerns include:

- We could politely take issue on what collegial consultation does and doesn't mean. Just giving us this assignment is not effective collaboration.
- The 'criteria' used to determine these cuts are not criteria. They are values devoid of any metrics. When we apply them, we find discrepancies.
- Had the professional judgment of the faculty, not just of administration, informed these cuts, this would have been a more productive summer. Going forward we would like to be actively engaged in consultation about cuts.
- Mike's letter says the deans, in consultation with their faculty, will be primarily responsible for making scheduling decisions, decisions which may impact programs and budget cuts. The Senate is excluded from these decisions. Mike recognizes that having deans, without senate input, come up with criteria and cuts, was not such a good idea.
- We need the same information the deans used, including Hyperion access
- We should ask for better arguments for cuts, including how they will impact enrollment and transfer.
- We must clearly state we have consulted with people in the programs and have the best information, so use it genuinely and reconsider your decisions.
- We need better information about what Skyline and Canada are doing.
- What cuts are being proposed in other areas, in particular in the district office?
- Our impression is the faculty has been marginalized in the process – we want to be involved in defending the curriculum, and we want to be sure we will be listened to.
- Measure G gave us breathing room but without it we would have addressed these issues already.
- Look at what colleges around the state are doing, and what did and did not work for them.
- We need metrics at the district level.
- The \$70k package is a trial balloon. We are telegraphing how we will react to future bigger cuts.
- We are fortunate to have good relationships with our deans. We need discussions within divisions. Having the deans come to a Governing Council meeting would be really good.
- Work between now and fall to define processes for greater involvement across the faculty, deans, and senior administration.

Concerns about the summer process include:

- We do not agree this should be done over summer without full faculty participation.
- \$70k is not a legitimate level when \$2m in cuts are needed.
- Paying the senate for this work makes no sense when we are trying to save money.
- We do not agree CSM should do this in isolation, before the other colleges begin.
- The students-in-the-pipeline argument does not apply to the current list. Affected programs are already handling that, or don't have a pipeline.
- As we keep weak programs and cut healthy ones, we need to look at data on all programs.

Comments on making cuts include:

- As a faculty, are we ready to make cuts? In 2009 we were not.
- In 2009 all divisions were told how much to cut, but could not look at data from across the college, with metrics.
- We can reject the idea of cut or don't cut, and just say don't cut. As faculty we work on curriculum, not budgets. We can agree on criteria, but fight cuts.
- There are areas we know could be cut. Our never recommending a cut asks the administration to make those decisions.

Comments on communicating our concerns include:

- We can phrase our concerns positively: The Senate feels these issues need to be addressed – the pipeline as a non-issue, \$70k as a mere trial balloon, lack of full faculty participation in summer, unjustified summer expense. Now let's move forward.
- We do not want our concerns about process to be a distraction. Mike knows about them.
- We should put our concerns in writing. Resolutions would be more powerful than a letter.
- In the fall several resolutions are possible, including having no more summer discontinuance work, and for Mike to share his plans.
- Governing Council needs to define what collegial consultation means. Clarity could make it easier to get people to serve on committees.
- The role of the Board should be a separate discussion.

The cover letter for the responses will make three key points (exact wording to be determined later):

- 1) After careful consideration, and within the constraints of faculty availability during the summer, we submit these additional documents on behalf of affected programs and urge you to seriously review and incorporate the information in them in your decisions.
- 2) The senate will communicate its issues and concerns about the process under separate cover.
- 3) We look forward to more effective collaboration in the fall.

During the meeting other points were noted, including

- Why cut high enrollment courses?
- How do caps play into cuts? What about the depth and popularity of courses?
- How can we position ourselves to grow in the future?
- Discrepancies in applying criteria
- Remember our priorities: CTE, Transfer, and Basic Skills in service of CTE and Transfer.
- We need a process for reinstating discontinued programs (beyond banking or hiatus.)
- We need to consider the ripple effects of program compression.
- Cuts will be undertaken with deans and faculty together.
- The process is more accurately described as shared consultation, not shared governance.