

ACADEMIC SENATE
COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO
csmacademicsenate@smccd.net

Governing Council Meeting

Mar. 23, 2004

Members Present

Tom Diskin	President	Jacqueline Gamelin	Counseling
Martha Tilmann	Vice President	Bernard Gershenson	Language Arts
Lloyd Davis	Secretary	Tim Karas	Library
Rosemary Nurre	Treasurer	Eileen O'Brien	Counseling
Rick Ambrose	Past President	John Hogan	P.E./Athletics
Craig Blake	Business/Creative Arts	Jim Robertson	Social Sciences
		Ann Stafford	Language Arts

Others Attending

Dan Kaplan AFT

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 2:20 p.m. The agenda was approved, with discussion of the retirement luncheon added to new business. The minutes of March 9, 2004 were approved.

OFFICERS' REPORTS Tom reported that District Academic Senate, District Shared Governance Council, and the Strategic Planning Committee have not met since our last meeting. Martha reported **College Council** heard at its March 17 meeting from four faculty participating in **learning communities**. The Manzanita Community didn't work out because it involved too many courses in a single curriculum that could not hold enough students. Four years ago, five years after Manzanita ended, the effort was renewed. Faculty now work in pairs, which is much more effective, and counselors are included, sometimes in the classroom. Six new sections will be offered in the fall, including the team of Anne Stafford (English 100) and Jeremy Ball (Philosophy 244.) Offering more sections will make participation seem more natural to students. Students will get the message that the courses are neither a shortcut nor extra work.

College Council also learned that CSM **enrollment** is down 404 FTES, or 3.2%, primarily due to sections cut in the evening. Some **fees** have changed. The student body fee, \$5 for decades, is now \$8. The transcript fee has risen from \$2 to \$5 (\$10 for a rush job.) The health service fee, which is set by the state, is up about \$1.

Rick reported the **CSM Budget Committee** heard from Milla McConnell-Tuite about external funding, and a report on last year's Student Services cutbacks. Virgil Stanford reported California lost its last appeal on some suits related to flooding, which increases the state deficit substantially, perhaps by several hundred million dollars. Retirements will take care of some of the budget shortfall, but not much because of replacement costs and because last year's successful retirement incentives depressed retirements from CSM this year. Discussion continues on a worst case \$2 million deficit. CSM's share would be \$780,000. There are plans to look at both Student Services and Instruction. The deans will meet with faculty to look at what's left to restructure and save on. Martha said our productivity did go up (that is, classes got bigger as we absorbed students from cancelled sections.) John noted enrollment is down only 404 FTES in spite of section cuts.

Rick listed several uncertainties. We don't know whether we will get a COLA, what will be in the May revise, or the outcome of negotiations. The best case is a \$369,000 deficit, which would not be a problem for 2004-05. As for the \$2 million worst case scenario, should we start to look at contingency plans now, or wait for the May revise? After last year's round of cuts, it came down to trying to keep jobs, so there will be no pink slips for next year. The focus will be on such areas as hourly offerings and released time. Released time for advising dropped from 80 to 60 FLC last year. The issue for the committee is to decide whether to think about possible options now, or wait for exact numbers. Martha pointed out the problem with waiting for the May revise is that faculty go away during the summer. Rick proposed getting the deans to talk to faculty now about available options. Rosemary suggested identifying faculty who will be available this summer. Tom explained that the process is not as simple as making a priority list, though doing so could be useful. The details of the cuts from the state, for example their effect on categorical funding, will affect interrelated programs. Rick will talk to Connie Beringer

and Nick Kapp about priorities. Points in discussion of the state's fiscal situation: legislation with something worse for education than the governor's present budget is unlikely. However, bad news now will be forgotten by the next election. The governor's office or the Department of Finance could come out with bad news. Rick said the last two meetings of the District Budget Committee have been about the allocation model, not the budget. The District is in wait and see mode until May, and hasn't adopted anything.

Dan reported he left the March 20 CFT convention with the impression that the number of sections cut here for fall semester, 540, is one of the highest in the state. More typical are cuts of between 100 and 200 sections. People he spoke with said they would worry about a downward spiral. Jim Keller told Dan the district doesn't know how many sections can be brought back next semester. The COLA has slipped from 1.84% to 1.83%, but it will happen. Our contract negotiations won't start until mid-May. The Board has cancelled one meeting, delaying the start of the 30 day sunshine requirement. Delays also result from the 30 day sunshine requirement. A decision must be reached on whether negotiations over the summer are agreeable to both sides. AFT had an introductory meeting with the group hired to be the management negotiating team, and had a good preliminary discussion with the two representatives of the district team. Several trustees are experienced with this group in other contexts. They are very experienced, competent people. It is hoped that this will be a quick round of negotiations. A list of what AFT is asking for is on the AFT web site.

Dan said other districts considered classrooms the last place to cut. Districts have shared the pain differently. There have been layoffs in Contra Costa, which faces an \$8 million deficit and possible state takeover. In our district, no layoff notices are going out to full time faculty. Our district has always been fiscally conservative. We need to protect our classes. As we cut sections, enrollment goes down. Dan remarked that the fact that our District Office costs as much as Cañada College is a peculiarity of this district. The next Advocate may analyze administrative vs. faculty costs. Craig asked whether the district budget committee is looking at district costs in its work on allocation models. Rick would like to know their dollars per FTES, whether it is going up or down, and whether it is out of line.

Craig reported the **Bookstore RFP Committee** met March 17. Prior to that, Craig attended a workshop in his discipline, where he met faculty from California, Arizona, and Texas and representatives of the host publisher, Thompson. He heard their concerns about noncollege management of bookstores, including Barnes & Noble and Follett. Craig asked whether he could be an impartial judge. At the last Bookstore RFP Committee meeting, Follett gave a 25 minute PowerPoint presentation, followed by an hour for questions. Follett runs 240 community college bookstores in the U.S, and 55 college bookstores of all types in California. They would integrate registration and book ordering, so students could order books from the bookstore or on line at the time of registration. Follett claims 50% or more of its texts are used, compared to a national average of 28%. They offer a faculty breakfast series to hear feedback from faculty. They say their bookstore manager should be out in the community getting feedback. They remodeled bookstores at Saddleback, MiraCosta, Irvine Valley, and Palomar colleges. When asked, they said they would find a markup lower than 25% acceptable. Asked who would pay for that, they gave three answers: they would absorb it, they would pass on the cost to the district, or the two would share the cost.

Our bookstore management also gave a presentation and answered questions. Craig asked what they found was the biggest student concern. Cañada bookstore manager Jai Kumar remarked that faculty change texts much too frequently, and specify new editions and bundled editions. Students would prefer less expensive books. Perhaps students could be offered a choice of the form of the book (e.g. hardback, bundled, black and white, e-book.) Craig heard anecdotally at the workshop that faculty often don't get what they order. For example, the bookstore operators may order a more expensive version of the text than the faculty member specifies. Our bookstore compared selling prices of three texts it sells with prices at privately run college bookstores in the Bay Area. Using figures for wholesale, retail, and online services, it showed that students paid a few dollars less at our bookstores than at the privately operated bookstores. Craig expressed concern about costs to students and flexibility to faculty, with non-institutional vendors. He would like pro and con feedback.

Barnes & Noble will give its presentation March 25. John Hogan said the text for his exercise physiology class comes bundled. He doesn't use the workbook, which is all busy work. The publisher says the workbook is free. John says that is grossly unfair; the cost of the workbook must be covered by the price of the book. Would a

private vendor be able to stop that? At Foothill, when students register online, they can place orders for new or used books. Foothill's bookstore is managed by its district. John also asked whether faculty could place book orders on line, and noted that we have used the same book order forms for years.

Craig said we lack a good management information system for ordering books that works with Banner. We have tried to introduce one. The district and colleges could handle it under certain circumstances. An outside vendor would bring its own better system, but might not provide us with the information we want about texts, except to survey other campuses to see what they are using. Follett says it will go by the numbers of students faculty specify on book orders, which members said our bookstore hasn't always done. Jim reported that the Stanford University bookstore was bought out five years ago, and faculty have been unhappy with it ever since, in part because it has cut down on the number of non-text scholarly books. Martha cautioned we should be wary about anecdotal information, because it tends to be negative. Tom replied it is valuable to put it on the table anyway when reviewing proposals. Rick said faculty need to be more aggressive in working with publishers. Rosemary observed that students have other options, including buying cheaper international editions on line. Tom said one of his students bought a set of books on line for his whole class of ten students. Rick said in the future, students may ignore bookstores.

Dan said CFT Communications Director Fred Glass, who worked with our AFT Local 1493 several years ago, has produced a new video on the false economics of contracting out. In the ten minute video, two minutes are on bookstores. It tells the story of Orange Coast Community College. One year ago they brought in Barnes & Noble, which promised to maintain wages, hours, and working conditions of current employees as long as they remained. However, employees who left were replaced by part-timers, with part-time wages and no benefits. Caps on increases in the cost of supplies in the bookstore were not honored. Also, far fewer used books are available through Barnes & Noble. Nobody is happy about the situation, but the contract is for five years.

TREASURER'S REPORT Rosemary reported a balance of \$6940.57 in the Senate checking account

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS The faculty who will attend this year's **Museum of Tolerance** visit are Kitty Brown, Marilyn Carter, Li Miao, Nancy Paolini, Tom Diskin, Sandra Raeber and Loren Barroca. In the past, names were approved by CDAC (College Diversity Advisory Committee). Tom brought the names to us because he and Connie Beringer feel this should be a Senate function. Rich Castillo, who drew the names out of a hat, and Shirley Kelly, to whom Rich reports directly on this, agree the Senate should have a role.

INFORMATION/ANNOUNCEMENTS The **ASCCC Spring Plenary Session** will be April 15-17. Tom, Martha, and Jim will attend. CSM will host the **ASCCC Area B meeting** March 26 in the Gallery Room. Governing Council members are invited to meet senate representatives from other colleges in our area. With thanks to Craig Blake, Tom distributed the final version of the **Cheating and Plagiarism Policy** as it will appear in the catalog. This is the fifth revision, and includes changes requested by the Associated Students. Jackie will inform counselors about the 2004 Community College Counselor Institute, **Ensuring Transfer Success**, cosponsored by the CCC Chancellor's Office and the UC Office of the President. Tom has registration materials for it. ASCCC is seeking a faculty member in each district to connect with a local legislator as a **legislative liaison**. Nominations are due April 7 for the **Allan R. Brown Outstanding Student Service Award**.

Tom distributed results of the **Campus Improvement Survey**, a 12 page document with a two-page summary of results and ten pages of narrative responses. John Sewart prepared the survey in cooperation with Tom and President Kelly. Due to copy machine problems, two pages were missing; members can obtain them from Tom by email. We requested the survey last year at a Governing Council meeting Shirley attended. We will discuss it at our April 6 meeting, and Tom can take our comments to Shirley and Grace. It could affect decisions about bond issue projects. It is up to us to keep it from becoming a shelf document.

Members discussed how the survey will be used. Opinions in discussion: Survey results should affect decisions about bond issue projects. It is not clear what choices we can influence. We don't want a repeat of the decision to discontinue waitlists, which seemed to have been made irrespective of our input. Lots of bond issue decisions have been made, but others are still being made. Should our advice be specific or general? Much of the survey is about the communication process, including what kind of information faculty want, and when. Faculty want to be

informed about the impact of construction: swing space, parking, dust and dirt, and noise. We do not want offhand, informal information. When Shirley and Grace joined us last fall, it was partly to help us respond to them. One issue of Shirley's was whether to do a lot to a few buildings, or a little to many.

Tom asked members to look at the survey results to see what is of value to us now, and what we would like to do with it. Maybe we'll ask for a communication structure to faculty. He said it's significant that Grace and Shirley did not say bond issue decisions are a done deal. Members disagreed on whether the survey is primarily about how the administration will communicate with us about the progress of projects – a tool to validate the communication process – or whether it is mostly about priorities for bond issue projects. More discussion points: The validation for us is that the survey is slanted the way we were. Shirley will use this to understand faculty input. New decisions will be made because of more money in the pot from Prop 55. Tom said we've gained considerably because we have this survey, Shirley feels it was valuable, and it will be on the agenda of our next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS – PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT/DISCONTINUANCE Tom reviewed the progress report given at our last meeting on the four hiatus programs, including the discontinuance of aeronautics.

NEW BUSINESS – CALIFORNIA GREAT TEACHERS SEMINAR Governing Council discussed whether to send faculty to the seminar, and if so how many, how they should be selected and funded, and what their responsibilities should be. Tom reported this year's seminar will cost \$695, including a double room and most meals. A single room would cost \$175 extra for the week. Travel costs are also extra. Information is available at www.ccleague.org/cgts. Members mentioned alternative funding sources, including professional development funds and the college budget for Academic Senate (since the seminar improves teaching), but the Senate treasury remains the most likely source. If there were AB 1725 funding, it would cover travel.

In 2002 we selected participants by pulling names from a hat. Members now favor a nonrandom procedure, considering the cost. We need to determine how to evaluate applications, which includes preparing a statement of what we want. Members discussed alternative uses of the money. What gives the greatest payoff for the college as a whole? The use of senate funds is an ongoing agenda item. Would leadership training, suggested by Kate Motoyama, be a better use? Other uses of Senate money include registration for conferences for senate leaders, vocational educators, counselors, and for ASCCC plenary sessions. These are opportunities to involve faculty at large in leadership. The Great Teachers Seminar is totally different. It focuses on improving teaching skill and emphasizes the positive.

Tom suggested promoting the seminar at the beginning of the school year, to see if there is interest. Let's not participate this year, but plan to send someone next year. The ideas of involving CTL or a subcommittee of the Committee on Instruction were floated. John Hogan suggested a partnership with AFT. Dan Kaplan said it made sense hypothetically, but AFT has too little money at this time. Anne said we should devote time in advance of a decision to discussing this philosophically. Martha suggested making it a higher priority on the agenda to talk about it. Members discussed how participants can share with colleagues what they learned. Professional development, workshops, and flex day activities are possibilities. This would make supporting participation with Senate funds more attractive. Jackie remarked that in this time of cuts and limitations, it is uplifting to be able to do something like this. Craig proposed we bring the issue back, with a written straw man proposal on how to spend the money to look at before the meeting. Anne called for a broader discussion before that. Tom will put the issue on the agenda for next time.

OLD BUSINESS – FACULTY COMPUTERS John Hogan distributed a spreadsheet showing faculty requests for computers and upgrades. John had expected faculty to provide prices for their requests, but many did not. Pricing upgrades was easy, but finding prices for new computers and printers was harder. Annette Perot did much of that work. Not all requests for new computers could be filled, but four faculty did get eMACs (same as iMACs but without the flat screen and at half the price.) All memory upgrade requests were filled. Bernard noted that his request for a memory upgrade had been overlooked; John agreed to correct that. MSU to approve the awards, and Governing Council thanked John Hogan for his work on the committee. Tom will take the updated report to Grace Sonner.

NEW BUSINESS – NOMINATIONS FOR 2004-05 Past President Rick Ambrose reported that all incumbent senate officers have agreed to stay on: President Tom Diskin, Vice President Martha Tilmann, Secretary Lloyd Davis, and Treasurer Rosemary Nurre. There were no nominations from the floor. Under the by-laws, officers must run for election every year. In recent years the vice president has been expected to serve for two years, then move into the presidency for two years. This provides for continuity in leadership as well as new leaders. Tom said he couldn't do his job without the vice president. There are too many meetings, and Martha takes a leadership role. The Senate gets only six FLC's of released time, which are used by the president. Tom also expressed appreciation for the support of all Governing Council members. David Robinson and Nancy Paolini will serve again as the Teller Committee for the election in April, after Spring Break.

Governing Council had no nominees for District Academic Senate president, which must also be on the April ballot. The DAS presidential nominee is usually either the incumbent or a college Senate president.

NEW BUSINESS – DISTRICT BUDGET REPORT Rick discussed this earlier in the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS – PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE Jim Robertson, George Kramm, and Rick Ambrose have been meeting to discuss the fourth year comprehensive program review. They were in the group that developed the current annual program review. The fourth year review adds looking at trends and where the program is heading, and, most recently, assessment. It is not yet clear how to handle assessment.

Rick indicated features of the fourth year review which are not included in the annual reviews: In the list of curricular offerings, tell how the program is connected with the district or college mission, how it relates to other programs in its division, and how changes in the discipline have driven curriculum changes. In discussion of equipment and facilities, include material and equipment needs and surpluses. A section on strategic plans for the program, and an executive summary, have been added. A section on assessment is being developed. In the past, student surveys administered in classes have given feedback about programs. The draft calls for providing evidence that students are moving through college programs and achieving their goals. Data on completion of courses, degrees, and certificates, and on graduation, transfer, and getting jobs could be used as evidence. The draft also calls for providing evidence students have achieved certain learning outcomes as a result of attending CSM. Programs need to support student learning, measure it, and take steps to improve it. Programs also need to set objectives and outcomes. How to do assessment is a big challenge. Is program review an appropriate place for it? Program Review is seen by administration as having a big role in strategic planning and budgeting, because faculty prepare them and make decisions that affect the college at large.

Jim observed that the annual and four-year program review templates are designed for departments, since program review was originally based on departments. With the new accreditation standards, the administration sees the program review concept expanding. President Kelly wants a program review of our general education program, but even COI chair George Kramm is not sure what that "general education program" is. We need to reconceptualize over time. What do we mean by a program? What are relevant ways to measure one? Not all programs are limited to one department. For example, learning communities cross department lines. How are they doing? The scope of program review will expand.

Points in discussion: Traditional programs come out of a department, and are prepared by faculty. For large areas such as general education, transfer, liberal arts, and technology, it is hard for faculty alone to know the broader picture. We need to include others in the program review effort. The College Assessment Committee was formed this year. Its work is linked to the assessment aspect of program review. John Sewart has some of the information called for in the proposed section on assessment. It is hard to find data relating getting jobs with taking particular courses. Eileen O'Brien, who also maintains the CSM Job Links data base, sends out emails to employers seeking relevant data, but few respond. This is a problem for many colleges. UC Berkeley is giving away TV sets to recent graduates who turn in such surveys. Data can't be used as an assessment tool if we can't collect it. The situation is similar in the vocational area. Most employers don't hire based on specific knowledge. They train people to do work the way they want it done.

Dan Kaplan reviewed the recent history of assessment. WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges, the accrediting agency) had its own agenda, and in its steamroller process for the adoption of new accreditation

standards, faculty were not listened to. Dan called for taking the assessment section out of program review and letting the College Assessment Committee (CAC) deal with it. If we have to include it, we should at least come up with our own language, not WASC language. Points in discussion: The goal is to have verifiable internal assessment for every class. WASC wants us to get into details, including learning objectives and whether students have met them. Shirley has said she can't figure out what's wrong with what we've been doing. Darlene Pacheco's presentation on the new standards was extremely vague. What is there to do beyond compiling data for all classes in the department, and creating new tests? In effect, we are being asked to figure out how to fudge a lot of reports. It will be a lot of work. All this could also become an incentive for grade inflation, insofar as grades are a measure of an instructor's performance. Martha, who has attended workshops on assessment, described it as more of a formalized framing of objectives and how we show they have been met, e.g. through exams, labs, and other course activities. It's the same as we've always done, but with more scaffolding to help students know what is expected of them. We are asked to provide more articulate statements of what we are already doing. Anne, noting that assessment of what we do is part of teaching, called for using CAC to figure out how to meet the WASC standards. Tom suggested we set aside the section on assessment in our program review document, and work on the rest of it. See what the CAC comes up with. Rick suggested as faculty, our concern should be with what we're doing in the classroom. We will return to this topic before the end of the semester.

OLD BUSINESS – HIRING POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS AFT has included in its negotiation package a proposal to grant interviews to adjunct faculty with satisfactory evaluations when full time positions open. DAS President Connie Beringer has asked for our reaction to including it instead in the Faculty Hiring Guidelines being prepared by Kate Motoyama's task force. Dan Kaplan gave Governing Council the AFT perspective. When AFT put its proposal together, it looked at other Bay 10 contracts. At CCSF, part time faculty who have taught at least three semesters in the district, with satisfactory evaluations, are granted the courtesy of an interview when full time positions open. This has helped part-time faculty go full time. 79% of recent new hires at CCSF were from the ranks of their part-timers. Dan said AFT didn't know until quite recently that our district's statistics are incredibly good, and is surprised that the district isn't trumpeting this. Barbara Christiansen says our hiring of part-timers has been 83% over the last three years. One year 90% of all full time hires were current part-timers in this district. At Cañada, Dick Claire sees it as a senate matter, and Connie agrees, since it is a policy issue.

Another issue is that tenure review shouldn't have to take four years when our part-timers in good standing are hired full time. Connie said this is a senate issue, according to the education code. Politically, it makes sense for AFT and the senate to work together. AFT would love senates at the three colleges to support tenure taking fewer than four years under certain conditions, and to let senates push for courtesy interviews of part-timers. The AFT would be happy to take the latter out of their package. The hiring task force has three Academic Senate representatives and three AFT representatives. It has finished its work on language for full-timers, but has not addressed part-time issues. The task force has reached agreement with the district, and closure on the document is imminent. The district will formally accept it March 24. The task force could reconvene to work on part-time issues.

Tom said DAS has asked the Governing Councils to take a position, at least on courtesy interviews. He will leave it on the agenda for our next meeting. Detailed language is being developed on what circumstances would allow a tenure process lasting fewer than four years. Dan said both AFT and the senate have an interest in this issue, and it might be easier for the senate to handle it. He does not see it as AFT abdication on a terms and condition issue. Vice Chancellor Harry Joel thought courtesy interviews were already being granted. AFT put it into its package along with a lot of non-economic issues that won't cost the district anything. With money tight, this is a good time to pursue such issues.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m. Remaining meetings this semester will be April 6, April 27, and May 11, 2004.