

ACADEMIC SENATE
COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO
csmacademicsenate@smccd.net

Governing Council Meeting

Jan. 27, 2004

Members Present

Tom Diskin	President	Bernard Gershenson	Language Arts
Martha Tilmann	Vice President	Tim Karas	Library
Lloyd Davis	Secretary	Eileen O'Brien	Student Services
Rosemary Nurre	Treasurer	Linda Phipps	Math/Science
Rick Ambrose	Past President	Jim Robertson	Social Science
Craig Blake	Business/Creative Arts	Anne Stafford	Language Arts
Jackie Gamelin	Counseling		

Others Attending

Peter Hempel	Swinerton	Jessica Mercado	ASCSM
Aashish Jha	Student Trustee	Grace Sonner	VPI, CSM

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:20 p.m. The agenda was approved, and the minutes of Dec. 9 were corrected and approved for distribution.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT At **College Council**, Linda Scholer gave an excellent detailed presentation on the accreditation midterm report she prepared. Dr. Kelly gave a presentation about the Integrated Science Center, including architectural drawings and artists' renditions of designs. Two firms proposed designs, and one was selected. The cost of the planetarium dome, and maintaining the campus architectural style (especially archways) were major factors in the selection.

College Council will hold an open meeting in the Gallery Room, Feb. 4 at 2:15 p.m., featuring a workshop on the new **accreditation standards** by Darlene Pacheco of the Accreditation Commission. The ten standards have been reduced to four, with six "threads" running through the standards. Tom encouraged Governing Council members to attend. Martha recently led a very efficient, focused meeting on the new standards.

The **CSM Budget Committee** discussed the Governor's budget, brainstormed program review and its use in budget planning, and looked at a college organization chart and a list of classified positions. Budget discussions deal with unknowns. The May revise will provide more information, but the state budget will not be approved until mid-summer. Rather than depend on unstable numbers, we should establish priorities to prepare for whatever budget cuts are needed. CSM's share of cuts is now about \$227,000. Unanticipated retirements and other factors may change that number. Members noted that if the March 2 bond issues pass, we will be in much better shape than last year. The governor's budget should increase the District's funding.

Rosemary pointed out that enrollments drop as we cut course offerings. UC and CSU are taking fewer students, while diverting more students to community colleges. Our leaders at the state level have been formulating a strategy to push back. Tom emphasized the importance of the college setting priorities before any cuts come. We need to be ready if necessary. The governor has proposed a differential fee, charging B.A. holders far more than others. The effect is likely to be negative, but perhaps not as much as the last time a differential fee was imposed.

Martha said the budget committee is not alarmed by a possible \$200,000 shortfall. It is relatively small, and unforeseen retirements are possible. These result in savings of the retiree's salary plus 29 % of their benefits. Replacements are paid less. The District is not offering a 2+2 early retirement incentive, which awards 2 extra years service credit and 2 years age credit, because it is too expensive. Its upfront cost to the district can be as

much as \$75,000. Jackie pointed out the annual difference between the top of the part-timer pay scale and the pay of a new full-timer is only \$15- to \$20,000. Craig noted our district has been very conservative on retirement incentives, though such incentives paid off for Contra Costa. Savings occur only if incentives induce people to retire, not if they just give an extra bonus to those who would have retired anyway. Faculty who are considering retiring are waiting to see whether the district will offer an incentive. The budget committee will meet twice a month, maybe more often. Tom will keep us updated.

The budget committee is considering the date and agenda for a campus-wide meeting to disseminate information on the budget situation. If there is a serious crisis, the meeting would also hear input from all constituencies. If there is no crisis, there may be only a letter about the budget situation, not a meeting. Work continues on evaluating the hiatus programs. It seems unlikely that any more programs will face hiatus.

Bernard noted that the Sunday Chronicle's lead editorial, Jan. 2, 2004, was in support of community college funding. We are the stepchild of the California educational system, with annual per student spending 46th in the country. Wisconsin's is first at \$14,409, the national average is \$9810, and California's is \$7979.

Martha reported on the CSM Budget Committee. Two bonds are on the March 2 ballot: one to get state out of the red, the other is for capital spending. Both need to be passed for us to stay above board. We're in especially big trouble if the \$15 billion Prop 57 doesn't pass. Capital bonds, such as Prop. 55, can be resubmitted.

Eileen reported there will be a march in Sacramento, March 15 supporting community college funding. The march was scheduled long before the bond issues were placed on the March 2 ballot. Jessica said that California community colleges got permission to use lawn near the state capitol building for an art exhibit, "The Missing Students." Eileen noted the students could not get a permit for a political march, but they could get a permit for an art exhibit. Student senates are deciding how to use their fiberglass statues, which will be on display for a week before this year's march. Each campus makes its own decision. Aashish said CalSACC, the state student senate, organized the march against funding cuts. Each campus is buying statues, which cost \$400 each, and will paint them. Last year 10,000 students participated in a very productive march in Sacramento. Jessica said ASCSM is planning to get 1000 students, and wants March 15 to be an optional day for classes. Craig pointed out that we can lobby only on our own time. We must hold classes for students who want to attend. Aashish said CALSACC's president proposes auctioning the statues to raise money for lobbying. Martha suggested bringing ours back to display on campus.

INFORMATION/ANNOUNCEMENTS UCSC Karl Pister scholarship applications go to the review committee this week. Its members are Rosemary Nurre, John Hogan, and Tom Diskin. Nancy Pendergast has five applicants. One will be chosen from CSM. Dr. Kelly will meet with applicants forwarded by the committee, and will submit 2 or 3 names to UCSC, which makes the final decision. Craig Blake has volunteered to replace Tom Diskin on the **Bookstore RFP committee**, which meets once a month.

Tom distributed several general handouts:

1) Remaining spring meeting dates include April 6 (April 13 is during Spring Break, and there are five Tuesdays in March, so meetings will be every other week.)

2) Feb. 13 is the application deadline for a workshop offering a professional development opportunity for occupational education faculty. There is no charge. Send applications to the Senate office in Sacramento.

3) A news release on the new state chancellor, Dr. Mark Drummond.

4) A document on course withdrawal and repetition. Pages 3 and 4 are missing. (Tom will bring copies to our next meeting.)

NEW BUSINESS – STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE Student Trustee Aashish Jha gave some background on the draft of a Policy for Student Participation in District and College Governance he distributed. In 1989-'90, just after AB 1725 modifications to Title 5 were adopted and interpretations of it were still vague, Student Trustee Robert Clark drafted a document about student participation. It was distributed to all

constituencies and to Chancellor Lois Callahan. No action was taken, and after Callahan retired the document was lost. Aashish found it last year when he was with ASCSM. Now all three student body presidents are working on it with Aashish. They brought their new version to College Council and DSGC.

The policy draft has 19 paragraphs, listing what students think should happen in the District to give them meaningful representation in governance, especially for offering input. 15 of the 19 are in place already, but none are in writing. Students want protection from the possibility of future leaders changing these policies. Because the language of the document is not in final form, Aashish asked for feedback, not endorsement. He has spoken with Paula Anderson, who writes District Rules and Regulations, about the wording. Student leaders can use our feedback to amend the policy and bring it back for our endorsement.

Discussion followed on the 19 paragraphs. Actions students hope to see include taking student commitments into consideration when committee meetings are scheduled, assuring that students on committees have access to relevant documents, providing orientation to new student members of committees, listing district as well as college committees on the web (and informing the college community when new committees are created), listing student leaders in SMCCCD literature, and including committee service in official student files.

Craig noted the Student Development Committee (SDC) has no student members, but brings its work to the Senate, which does. The SDC has worked on the Cheating and Plagiarism Policy and the Student Equity Plan. Aashish said if the committee's work affects students, it should include students. Rick pointed out that it is hard to find students to sit on every single committee, and noted that draft reports give students as much input as faculty. It is the responsibility of faculty to assure there is shared governance.

Members noted that while such statements as "students should be treated with equal inclusion, opportunity and consideration in respect to all participatory governance" are superfluous, there is no reason not to include them, especially when they come from students themselves. Listing names of student leaders may not be practical for major college publications because of long lead times for printing, but they could be given in the San Matean.

Aashish noted that students are now represented on College Council, the college and district budget committees, and the bookstore committee, among others. Students can give fresh input. The proposed policy will be codified in District Rules and Regulations. Changes to the draft will make the language professional. He will bring the policy to DSGC and College Council. Governing Council members were invited to email responses to Tom.

NEW BUSINESS – ACCREDITATION MID-TERM REPORT Tom described the report, which is based on the ten-standard model, as very complete and very professional. Linda Scholer gave the final presentation to College Council. It will go to the Board of Trustees for approval. Martha noted we are the first of the three campuses to present it to the Board. A few minor changes need to be made, such as mentioning the Cheating and Plagiarism policy.

Linda Scholer emailed Tom her appreciation of the help of Academic Senate and faculty in meeting the eight WASC recommendations. She thanked College Council, the CSM Budget Committee, and those who prepared the Cheating and Plagiarism policy and the Technology Plan. Tim Karas and Craig Blake (named today by Tom) are among those working on the latter. Linda gathered the information for the eight recommendations resulting from the 2000-1 accreditation self-study, and put it in report form. Tom reported that Linda feels applause for her report should go to all who worked on the pieces; her role was to put it together. College Council and Academic Senate appreciate her efforts. It is very good to be able to say we're on schedule.

NEW BUSINESS – CSM JOBLINKS Eileen O'Brien reported on CSM JobLinks, in which all job listings are automated and listed on the CSM web site. JobLinks also posts events on campus. A joint volunteer and job fair event will be held on campus March 10. There are some jobs. Genentech has sent a flyer to the Math/Science division about their coop ed program for community college students. They want a first year student with algebra, chemistry, and biology. First year interns are paid \$12/hour, and are likely to stay with Genentech for five years, which is cost effective for the company. The deadline is Feb. 13. Eileen critiques resumes and coaches students on interviewing skills. Other jobs include an MIS technical services intern for the San Francisco Giants, a graphic designer for LoanUSA, and a front office dental assistant for a San Francisco dental group.

Student assistant positions are listed. Martha said it would be good to have every online class linked to this site. Martha and Bruce Maule's classes already are. Tom suggested talking to Ken Pizzi about the technology website. Eileen mentioned other internship programs: graphic design, human services (for San Mateo County), accounting; maybe CAD. Eileen has taken over the coop program.) Eileen offers a one day half-unit, credit/no credit job search class, on two different Saturdays. Located in 5-108, Eileen can come to classes for ten minute presentations about career services. Rosemary has Eileen and Mike speak to her classes every semester. Jessica suggested she come to ASCSM. Eileen is located in 5-108.

NEW BUSINESS – STUDENT EQUITY PLAN Preparation of a Student Equity Plan is a faculty led effort. The first was prepared in 1993, followed by a revised plan in '96-'97. An update of the existing plan, addressing new requirements, must be prepared this spring. Tom, Rick, and Martha have worked on it. The Student Development Committee is leading the effort. This week two students were identified to work on it. Tom is looking for four or five faculty to help. The plan should be prepared by May 2004. It is due in the State Chancellor's Office in July, and must be approved by our Board of Trustees. Tom is making this a number one priority. Tom will approach faculty who have worked on it in the past. This will be a small working committee, probably meeting twice a month. Discussion of this will continue at our next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS – RENOVATION OF FACULTY CENTER VPI Grace Sonner met with Governing Council to discuss renovation of 18-176. She observed that all the renovations we have proposed for 18-176 would cost over \$100,000. The seismic upgrade for Building 18 a few years ago was not done properly, so it needs fixes. There will be six smart classrooms, one in a language arts lab on the bottom floor, and the other five on the second and third floors. The main features of a smart classroom are an overhead projector mounted on the ceiling, and a smart lectern. Do we also want to wire all classrooms for the future?

Grace introduced Peter Hempel of Swinerton Management & Consulting, who has met with Language Arts faculty about the labs in building 18. He said cost numbers come from overall estimates for the entire project, and include seismic work, renovations, and upgrades. The total project cost for Building 18 is close to \$6 million, based on unit cost numbers from consulting engineers. Finishing (paint, new carpet and base, and window treatments) are included in the project. The paint figure did not include ceilings. New ceiling tiles may be needed. Grace said paint, blinds, and floors should be consistent throughout the building.

When the kitchen was built in the early 1960's, building codes did not include ADA provisions. To meet them, we would need to gut and redo the kitchen. Peter used cost numbers from a San Francisco project. Swinerton will go to general contractors in a public bidding process. Members asked if we could get the kitchen done cheaper, perhaps by rearranging existing features. Painting, floor covering, and replacement of the free-standing refrigerator, probably would not trigger an ADA-compliant remodel. The cook top range is illegal because it doesn't have an exhaust hood. If we start to spend money on it, or on anything built-in, we will have to take care of ADA deficiencies as well. A state architect will review the plans. One option is not to touch the kitchen. If no work is to be done on it, it will not be subject to review.

Peter said Building 18 is getting state funds for seismic retrofit, and limited state funds to bring bathrooms up to ADA code. These funds were applied for four or five years ago, and it is too late to add the kitchen to that request. Craig suggested doing some of the work now, and going for additional ADA funds in the future. Jackie said having a kitchen not up to ADA standards sends the wrong message to new faculty. It doesn't show much sensitivity not to make it accessible, even if no one here has made an issue about it. Jim agreed that it makes sense to take care of the kitchen. Maybe we could put in wiring for the projection system, but get the screen and other equipment later. Grace doesn't have a separate budget for 18-176. She has to budget furniture for classrooms. Language Arts faculty want new classroom computers rather than new furniture.

Rick said we use furniture a lot in 18-176, and we need to prioritize. Tom said we can identify what we use a lot and what we use occasionally. We haven't had constant use of a projection system. We've brought equipment in to do it. Members asked about spending Senate money on furniture. Grace said she is working with Stephanie O'Brien on furniture. Jackie suggested we leave the kitchen as is until we can afford to do it right. Bernard noted that any electrical or plumbing requires a building inspector. The kitchen isn't used much. He would prefer to see it stay as is. Maybe we can apply for other money later. Anne said having a sense of what we can spend

would help us prioritize. A ballpark estimate, and a sense of what it depends on, would be helpful. Grace said the budget for 18-176 was for finishing (sprucing up paint, carpet, and window coverings) only. Only one month is left to finalize all aspects of the design. Craig said we won't know costs until we go out to bid. Anne said that at the meeting in the staff dining room, what faculty wanted was moot. If all we can do is finishing, why bother? What do you need from us and when? CSM has \$50 million for the entire program, including the Regional Police Center and the Integrated Science Center, and we must prioritize overall. The more we spend here, the less we can do elsewhere. Martha questioned the value of sound dampening curtains. She pointed out that the proposed accordion door in 18-176 is poor as a sound transmission barrier. A high-end accordion door (with a 52 sound rating) would require a structural upgrade including a concrete ceiling, at cost of \$20,000. Martha's tentative priorities are 1) finishing, 2) computer contingencies (extra outlets, data lines), 3) projection system/infrastructure, 4) computer actual equipment 5) furniture. 6) kitchen and sound curtain.

Rick asked whether the wiring could become outdated before we could afford to buy the rest of the equipment. If we do the wiring infrastructure, should we commit to obtaining the rest ASAP? Tom said internal wiring won't change much. Jackie asked whether the idea is to settle for as little as possible. Grace said the college has timelines for scheduling the work in this building. Peter said the construction start date is this summer or fall. We want to submit design plans for architectural review by the end of February. The architects have to revise their plans first. Craig recommended we not do the kitchen now. We could use nearby smart classrooms for presentations, which would make the projection system the lowest priority. Sound curtains are also low priority. The kitchen is adequate for what we use it for: heating and cooling food. Peter said to get signoff, he needs our final answer by Thursday (Jan. 29). That was the first anyone on Governing Council had heard of that deadline.

Martha said \$20,000 would cover basics, such as outlets and data lines – at least enough to hook up to the internet. Anne asked for furniture. Jackie suggested we submit priorities, send them out for bid, and see how much we can do. \$10,000 should cover finishing (paint, carpet, and window covering.) Peter said perforated vinyl roller shades would allow light in but block glare. He said the engineering required to break out line items would create a lot of additional cost. Bernard said there is no reason for pie in the sky. No one will say this room is more important than a classroom. We want the place to look nice. Martha said we can both spruce up and upgrade. We can afford 1) basics (paint, carpet, window covering) 2) infrastructure (outlets, data lines, projection wiring) and 3) furniture (which we might pay for from Senate funds.) Equipment for a smart room, a sound curtain, and the kitchen are lower priorities. Martha will email her list to Grace. Peter said a separate furniture purchase would get us more furniture for less money. The standard district process (looking for furniture for the entire district, standardizing to realize savings), offers less flexibility. Jackie observed that faculty are willing to stay in their present offices so the college can spend its money on classrooms. In view of that sacrifice, it would not make sense to put money into making 18-176 or other non-classroom areas very plush.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m. The next meeting will be Feb. 10, 2003.