

# CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

January 27, 2015

2:30 – 4:30 PM

## MEMBERS PRESENT

---

President	David Laderman
Vice President	Theresa Martin
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary	Vacant
Creative Arts/Social Science	Steven Lehigh
Creative Arts / Social Science	Michele Titus
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Language Arts	Kathleen Steele (absent)
Library	Stephanie Roach
Math/Science	Santiago Perez
Math/Science	Carlene Tonini-Boutacoff
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales
Physical Education / Athletics	Larry Owens
Student Services	Martin Bednarek (absent)
Student Services	Kathy Sammut

## OTHERS ATTENDING

---

Maggie Garcia, student rep.  
Teresa Morris, Library, District Curriculum Chair  
Lin Bowie, Biology  
Dan Kaplan, AFT  
Kathy Blackwood, District Office  
Rick Ambrose  
Bruce Maule  
Kate Browne (Skyline Senate President)



## **I. ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **1. Approval of the Agenda and Draft Minutes, Dec. 9, 2014**

**Agenda:** David proposed adding an item to president's report, item a : Museum of Tolerance program origination follow-up. Rosemary proposed adding an action item to add the president of academic senate as a co-signer for the checking account and adding David's name as the president to the checking account as a co-signer. Rosemary moved to approve the amended agenda, Stephanie seconded. All in favor, motion passed

**Minutes:** Rosemary moved to approve, Stephanie seconded. All in favor, motion passed.

### **2. Public Comment**

Lin Bowie, Co-Chair of CSM's Sustainability Committee and Biology Instructor announced an Earth Day celebration Wed., April 22, 2015 from 10am-2pm, the committee has reserved the quad and Bldg. 10 lobby. Student clubs and outside exhibitors are coming. Charlene Frontiera is Co-Chair also. They will come back to GC in February to say more. The theme is water conservation and biodiversity, and will have other exhibits as well, including live animals. Students will go around the tables and can pledge a sustainability action and as a reward will get free food. Student volunteers are invited, the office of Student Life is going to organize the club efforts.

Stephanie announced a Chinese New Year event in the library. The event is Feb 18, Chinese New Year is the following day. More info to come.

Carlene is bringing concerns from evening students. They need more evening sections, especially in physiology, and other biology classes. They feel their needs aren't being met and they feel like outcasts. They complained that they cannot register on their cell phones. David will make these issues a discussion item at a future meeting.

Theresa announced LINKS 11 event on Feb 27<sup>th</sup>. A California Community College Success Network (3CSN) meeting to learn about scaling successful programs. She will send out a flyer to all CSM with details and registration information.

## **II. INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **1. ASCSM Update, Maggie**

- a. Reboot Week is Feb 3, 4, 5. Lots of events and free food.

### **2. President's Report**

- a. Museum of Tolerance program information

Kate Motoyama asked David to let AS know that she originally wrote the proposal to the Board of Trustees (BOT) to fund the activity. Only two of the colleges approved it, the other college did not, but the BOT approved it allowing

all three colleges to participate. Originally it was just for faculty, but BOT included all staff. Kate wanted to let AS know that original motivations for the MOT program was to help diversify faculty hiring.

b. GC Secretary position

Kristi had to step down. Theresa is filling in today. David has been through three secretaries in his tenure. David will be looking for a new secretary to fill in until the end of the semester and would like AS's help. There is an election at the end of the semester and a new secretary will be officially elected.

c. CSM withdrawal survey

David took the AS comments to the committee that is working on this. A new draft is being made. Rosemary asked that it be called something else than the "withdrawal survey". David reported that the survey is anonymous, and optional, and each question within the survey is optional. "Taking the course at another college" is going to be an option to choose for why the student dropped. Referral to a counselor is going to be an option. The survey won't pop up if instructor drops the student. It will only pop up if the student initiates the withdrawal. And any employee names mentioned will be redacted.

d. Establishing AS scholarships

David talked to Stephani Scott at the Foundation. The mood from the last GC meeting was "let's just do it". During discussion we can talk about details. We create the scholarship, the scholarship committee will screen the candidates according the criteria we select. We need to agree on the criteria. And AS can select the recipients. The other thing we can do is create an AS award that gets given at the scholarship award ceremony. This award would go to someone we know, maybe that has overcome a hardship of some kind.

Carlene asked about students that don't get reached by using scholarship committee. David said he would follow up. Carlene mentioned how onerous the reading task is for applications, and that the CSM scholarship committee is looking for members (i.e. readers of applications).

e. CAE committee

AS has approved CAE committee for professional development for faculty and staff and administration. The committee, to be autonomous, needs to be voted on, so it will be part of the election at the end of the semester. In the meantime, the committee can meet, but will need to come back to AS for any final decisions.

David sent out an email to the deans to request representatives. Please ask your division if they would like to be involved. Spread the word. One rep from each division, one from student services, a classified, and a student or two. Tim asked

about the committee members needing to be elected, the answer is no. Kathy asked what the time commitment is. The committee will meet about once a month.

f. Future discussion items

David wanted input about future discussion items. There are next meeting's discussion items that David decides are most pressing. The second category is future discussion items. These items come from faculty coming to David with concerns. How should these be ranked? or should they be removed, or should it be left up to David.

Carlene liked the topic of science AA requirements being at the top of the list for next time. David saw this as a high priority. Rosemary said she trusts David to prioritize. David invited folks to let him know about what is important. Dan Kaplan mentioned that AFT is working on workload survey and workload issues, and will have a discussion and will be reaching out to all faculty re: reducing workload. So this topic can be removed from future discussion items.

### 3. Standing Committee Reports

a. Committee on Instruction - *Teresa Morris, Chair*

They meet on Thursday, Jan 29. No report.

b. Library Advisory Committee - *Teresa Morris, Co-Chair*

Stephanie Roach is new co-chair. Other co-chair is Roberta Reynolds.

c. Learning Support Centers Coordination Committee - *Kristi Ridgway, Co-Chair*

Ron is also co-chair, and he will come when there is something to report.

d. College Assessment Committee -- *Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Interim Chair*

Madeleine Murphy is new co-chair. She will come when there is something to report.

### III. Action Items

- a. Rosemary asks that 1) CSM AS president be added as a co-signer on the new checking account. 2) David Laderman, as our current AS president be added as the co-signer on the account. Stephanie moved, Carlene seconded. All in favor. Motion passes.
- b. Hiring committees to hire for Fall. Physics, DGME, and Kinesiology – Women's volleyball, submitted hiring committees for approval. Rosemary moved, Michelle seconded. Motion approved, all in favor.

### Hiring committees – Spring 2015

Physics

David Locke

Mohsen Janatpour

Darryl Stanford

Laura Demsetz

Charlene Frontiera (Dean)

DGME--Graphic Design

Kevin Henson (Dean)

Ed Seubert

Patti Appel

Rebecca Alex

Kinesiology--Women's Volleyball

Joe Mangan

Mikel Schmidt

Larry Owens

Andreas Wolf (Dean)

### **III. Discussion Items**

#### a. Establishing AS scholarships

Carlene asked how much we will invest in the program. Rosemary said we have \$3,000 in account. Carlene suggests \$2,000 to fund the scholarship program. David wanted to be more conservative. Rosemary suggested \$1,500. David mentioned that we need to ramp up fund-raising.

Discussion on two different ways of awarding money. Rosemary liked the idea of two separate programs. Stephanie liked the dual approach of: awards chosen by AS, and a scholarship program through the foundation. This would include people that might not otherwise get an award.

Maggie asked if the award would require an application. David says no. The AS would just choose. Maggie thinks this will make it difficult to choose.

Kathy suggested 6 scholarships with the \$1500, \$250 each. Two awards and four scholarships. She thinks the scholarship program is very easy for students to find. Teresa mentioned that just picking someone does not bring in a diverse group of students. Perhaps a nominating process might bring in more people, she doesn't think AS is representative enough to just pick.

Steven Lehigh agreed. Santiago suggests soliciting all faculty to nominate students. Carlene noted that several existing scholarships do have separate forms. Rosemary suggested that the scholarship committee come up with the

details, now that AS has had broad agreement about the main features of the awards.

Michelle would like to set something aside for vets, and Carlene said there are lots of scholarships for vets.

Kathy liked a single program approach, but if we do the separate award there should be some writing done by the student or some other evaluation process.

David suggested just moving forward with scholarships, \$250 for GPA of 3.0 and service on campus. Develop the recognition award later.

Kathy would like service on campus to be broad. Some discussion follows about what service would be appropriate. There was some agreement that academic service was preferred, i.e. tutoring or supplemental instruction

Carlene suggested it would be good to have AS representation on the scholarship committee. She has dropped off the committee.

David requested that scholarship committee come up with scholarship criteria, taking this discussion into account.

Carlene will send something to David. Following on Tim's suggestion, David asked the committee to research what service is currently awarded by current CSM scholarships

b. Accounting CPA courses

David welcomed visitors Bruce Maule and Rick Ambrose to talk about this issue. Kate Browne, Skyline AS President, was present, mainly to listen.

Bruce presented a PPT, telling about his history as a part-timer at Skyline, and the close relationships between the colleges. The Tax program started here at CSM, and was sent over to Skyline with everyone's agreement.

In 2003, CSM thought about developing CPA prep program after researching other community college (CC) programs. Our college is "mid-size" and would not offer the same number of sections as the big CC's. For example, CSM has 5 sections of financial accounting, the big colleges have 23. In order to develop, they needed highly skilled, experienced faculty to teach the advanced classes. They didn't have that at first, and over ten years they added the classes with competent instructors.

The Tax Program rolled out about the same time at CSM. They got high enrollments, and started offering classes every semester and in all formats. Rosemary pioneered the online courses to offer these classes.

CSM's accounting program is a Center of Excellence. CSM developed a series of tax courses and gave the courses to Skyline. ACTG 103 was developed by Bruce, Skyline asked for it wholesale, he let them have it.

Now enrollment is starting to slip at CSM, completion rates have also started to slip. This fall, Rick, Rosemary, Vincent Li and Bruce discussed what to do. There was suggestion to not offer every semester, not in all formats, not at all colleges. Online is 3-4 times more popular.

Skyline had promised not to copy CSM's CPA Prep Program, as recently as opening day August 14, 2014. But in September 2014 all the CPA courses went to the Skyline curriculum committee for approval to be offered online. Using Curricunet, the curriculum was literally copied from CSM. CSM was never consulted as required in the curriculum committee forms.

Skyline stated that the online delivery made it a different course. CSM's accounting dept believes that Skyline took the curriculum without permission. This was CSM faculty's intellectual property. They also believe there is only enough enrollment for one college, and having two programs will be detrimental.

Carlene commented that this silo effect is getting worse between the colleges.

Michelle asked what they want AS to do. David said that the district needs to deal with this, and district AS President Diana Bennett is working on this. Bruce says that his Dean and VP of Instruction says there is nothing they can do.

Teresa will bring this topic up at the next district curriculum committee meeting. It will also be brought up at the next DAS meeting. Teresa thinks Curricunet has changed the process, it makes it easy to copy other courses. We need to discuss the sharing of course and curriculum. Teresa thinks there may be some rules regarding this.

Kate Browne said that electronic technology has allowed 'end runs' around communication and collaboration processes. Electronics allow bypassing the needed conversations. District has been working to overcome such isolated curriculum development in the same disciplines at each college, with activities like the flex day meetings for all-campus discipline discussions. Important issues are at stake: intellectual property, faculty collegiality, professional respect. Kate mentioned this particular case needs to be addressed, but so too does the larger context.

Rick mentioned that this has blind-sided CSM, after a good rapport over the years. Going back to the idea of Centers of Excellence, if we have these two programs competing, it is not a win-win.

David thanked everyone for their presentation.

David asked for a motion to switch last two discussion items. Stephanie moved, Tim seconded. All in favor, so moved.

- c. New District allocation model/Board Reserve Policy



Kathy Blackwood gave a hand out regarding the new district allocation model. Budget is based on FTES from last year. But FTES doesn't drive revenue any more because we are community supported. The district budget office decided there needs to be a small-college site allocation for Canada.

Some other highlights of the new allocation model, which she went over with the committee, discussing the hand-out:

1. Extra revenue to Canada for being a small school
2. Allocations for fixed cost increases – central services (utilities, retiree benefits, insurance, etc)
3. Square footage change allocations
4. District office and facilities get certain percentage of overall funding
5. Allocations to allow for step increases in salary, and other compensation
6. Allocation for demonstrated need, assuming district gets 1% growth. This will be a new innovation fund. Each college can submit proposals that align with district strategic plans (which align to each college's plan). This would be ongoing money.

David asked about the innovation project proposal process, whether the proposal needs to be followed to the letter. Kathy B replied once the college has received the money, they can spend it how they see fit, even if they modify their project. Each college controls how they spend this funding. Kathy B recommended that each college report each year about what each college did, what was spent, what the successes were, etc.

Rosemary asked if personnel costs were the largest of the costs, and if the district personnel costs were the same ratio. Kathy B said that overhead costs of the district are higher than the colleges.

David asked about the status. The draft budget goes to DPGC on Monday, and then to BOT retreat. She thinks it will eventually be fully approved.

Discussion of new reserve policy 8.12.

Kathy B will write the procedure to go with this policy, but she doesn't think the policy will change much. She is not in a hurry to increase the reserves. We have been running with reserves at about 17% (about 2 months worth of total budget expenses). According to her, the average statewide reserve budget for CC's is about 17%.

David asked why each of the three reserve categories (budget stabilization, emergency disaster, working capital) needs a range of 5 to up to 10%. Kathy explained that we need substantial working capital; she has to borrow every year in July to pay the bills in before we get the property tax revenues in December. She also mentioned that a big earthquake will affect our community aid revenue, since it would cause decrease in property taxes. Same with a downturn in the economy. She also always wants budget stabilization, so that we don't have to cut midyear.

Tim asked whether in an emergency, wouldn't state and federal disaster relief cover the costs. She said that for the 1989 earthquake, it took four years to get the money. That won't work.

Rosemary asked about other community-supported districts, what their reserves are? And also when was the last time we had to utilize reserve funds? In the past few years of the state budget cuts, we ran a deficit budget, and had to use reserves then. But she agreed that it's a very rare occurrence. Steven asked about there being possibly a big surplus, how does the district decide where the excess goes, because funding the reserves will take money away from other possibilities. Kathy B said that once the reserves are met, she just needs to maintain them. She says the reserves are earning a lot of money. She thinks it will take up to 5 years to fund the reserves. And emphasized it's a one time fund. The budget does not keep paying into it, once it's achieved.

Rosemary expressed appreciation for the conservative nature of this policy, but she is concerned about faculty hiring. We have been suffering. Students require faculty. Rosemary worries that, for example, Kathy B's successor may not keep the reserves at around 17%. The proposed policy allows potentially for the reserves to go up to 30%. Faculty feel this is too high, especially given the need for being able to hire new faculty. David asked whether she would consider reducing the range of each category, of possibly 5-7%, adding up to a high potential total of 21%. Likewise, Steven suggested leaving the ranges as 5-10, but adding language that restricts the total reserve going beyond 20, or 25%. Kathy B agreed to these suggestions and will carry them forward as she revises the policy, and writes the procedure to go with the policy.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45pm. Did not get to discussion of board policies.

Date and time of next meeting: Tues., Feb 10, 2015.