****

**COURSE & PROGRAM PROPOSAL FORM   
Elimination and/or Reduction**

**Approved Governing Council Executive Committee: 10/16/09**

**Purpose:** This document serves as the mechanism for proposing reduction/elimination of courses/programs in response to the Fall 2009 budget crisis. This document can also be used to comment and provide additional information on courses/programs that have been identified as “*the recommended program and/or course reductions*”by administration. Submission of this document will initiate the emergency review process to be used in Fall 2009 in place of the Program Improvement Viability (PIV) process. The information/data provided in this form is necessary to maintain uniformity and transparency in the review.

**Complete either:**

**Part A (to submit comments on existing recommendations)**

**or**

**Part B (to make a new recommendation).**

**Please use a separate form for each proposal. Submit by email no later than 4:00pm on October 30, 2009 to** [**csmacademicsenate@smccd.edu**](mailto:csmacademicsenate@smccd.edu) **and** [**csmcoi@smccd.edu**](mailto:csmcoi@smccd.edu)**.**

**Subject line: Budget Elimination/Reduction**

**Part A.**

**If you are submitting comments or providing additional information on a course/program identified as “*the recommended program and/or course reductions*” by administration, provide the following information:**

1. Describe any errors in the rationale presented by administration.

The Social Science Division proposes that before any cuts to instruction the district administration make ALL efforts to reduce administrative costs first. (We know that our local administration cannot unilaterally execute these cuts, but the proposal we received has elements which included moving some programs to Cañada without consultation with Cañada so the precedent is set.) Before cutting class sections, we want at least a non-question begging rationale for maintaining three separate colleges with three redundant sets of administrators – Presidents, Vice Presidents of Instruction, and Vice Presidents of Student Services. There also could be consolidation of Registrars, Financial Officers, Marketing and PR offices, PRIE offices, and Athletic Directors. Since none of these are central to the mission of the colleges, they should be reduced or eliminated before any instruction is sacrificed. (We could also look at smaller items which would still bring savings. For example, what about stop printing so many schedules and save the postage costs incurred in mailing them out? A smaller brochure could be used instead.)

As Ernie Rodriguez’s article in the November Advocate argues, we need second order changes, not first order cuts. Only second order change can provide the real savings that will be meaningful to the structure of the District.

1. Provide any additional supporting information.

The savings from two Presidents’ salaries alone would provide approximately 140,000 in savings to each college. That amount at CSM would go a long way to meeting the cuts proposed, for instance, to the Social Science Division. Add to that the savings from 2 VPs from each of the two colleges and we are further along to maintaining a vibrant set of college class offerings. Since the administration was willing to sacrifice whole content areas, Geography and Anthropology, rather than advocating these second order changes, it demonstrates a lack of fundamental concern for the real health of the college and therefore a lack of authentic concern for the students.

**Part B.   
If you are proposing any additional course/program reduction or elimination, provide the following information:**

1. Describe courses, programs and proposed changes in detail.

{This is a preamble to our specific comments regarding the questions below. We believe that the original list (and especially the manner in which it was created) was inappropriate. We see no overarching guideline which will produce fairness and equity. Furthermore, the decisions reflect a piecemeal approach which may be dangerous to the long-term health of college enrollments and the college’s mission proper. The $ amounts for different divisions, for example, are quite disparate. For example, the Math / Science Division was asked to reduce about $100,000, while the Creative Arts / Social Science Division was asked to find $287,000 in reduction and Physical Education was asked to cut only $59,000. Since we are not simultaneously provided total division budget totals we cannot see relative %s as to fairness or at least some overarching, principled rationale as to the choices. It looks to us that it was an ad hoc collection of easy-to-cut sections and programs: low hanging fruit, anyone? That this was our starting point begs the question of who should be doing this work. We hire well-paid managers to spend their time implementing a vision. They have access to the documents and spreadsheets that pertain to the fundamental work of the college (Educational Master Plan) educating students. With the strategy they chose, we faculty are now being asked to take time away from preparation for our work with students, to backfill what was, in our view, a poorly-managed decision. In order to do this competently, we should have at least been trained, and received release time to work with these numbers.

It is obvious to us that the Academic Senate needs to take a lead role since it has the legal charge over, and responsibility for the curriculum. This is, therefore, an excellent opportunity for the Senate to assert its right to maintain that control and wrest it away from those who have demonstrated a lack of strategic focus on teaching. We believe the Senate should have been consulted as to the decision methodology for determining how to make reductions or eliminations. Getting “The List” as it was presented put the faculty in a respond mode – and frankly a bit late in the game – but better than Cañada or Skyline, we believe. This put us on the defensive and has led, in some cases, to hard feelings between individuals within divisions as well as feelings of envy (or spite?) at the lack of cuts in larger divisions with much larger budgets. The end result is that there is unnecessary dissention among the faculty which could have been avoided. We fear that this model creates possible long-term mistrust which will last a long time. (Since administrators often come and go, while faculty generally stay at one location for a career, these impacts are felt more significantly by faculty.)

As we read the proposal in this round of cuts, the Creative Arts / Social Science Division takes a large number of reductions. Since we are very efficient, and achieve high LOAD as a division, the college runs a risk of these large reductions weakening our College LOAD goals. (Obviously the saving to 1310 funds are equal when reducing two equally-positioned part-time faculty. But the WSCH and LOAD figures will differ drastically if it’s an Ethnic Studies class with a 751 LOAD figure or an English class, with HBA and mandatory enrollment caps, at a 433 LOAD. We hope someone is paying close attention to these numbers. And now on to the specifics.}

We propose to make many changes in the specifics of “The List” which affects the Social Science side of Creative Arts / Social Science Division. We will not eliminate Anthropology or Geography, but we will eliminate Humanities (with respect to the latter we plan on rewriting several course outlines to maintain the content diversity these classes offered. The “new” course will be housed in specific departments: such as Humanities 125 “Technology / Contemporary Society / Human Values” being rewritten to be taught in Philosophy.) We approve of moving the Human Services program to Cañada, if they will take it. We will reduce SOSC (AOD) but not banish it to Cañada. There will instead be small reductions in various departments which will make up for the eliminated departments proposed on the list.

The college needs to maintain a wide array and diversity of departments and programs to inspire students. We in Social Sciences assert that for a Transfer, CTE, and Developmental Educational college to be credible, it must offer not merely some basic set of departments which meet the minimum criteria to achieve the students’ aims. We need to support a wide diversity of skill sets, including unique problem solving skills, and critical thinking with content from multiple academic discipline perspectives. We don’t want all of the students matriculating from College of San Mateo to come out with “cookie cutter” educations. We also believe that one way to achieve meaningful student educational experiences is to look at eliminating our on-line offerings. The success of students in on-line sections is so poor, and with so many students wanting space in face to face classes, we feel that offering on-line sections my no longer be appropriate.

We also propose that this current ad-hoc procedure be modified. The role of the Academic Senate is one of advisory capacity. We as faculty should be consulted to create and design a decision mechanism for making the cuts we are proposing. It is the responsibility of the administration to execute the cuts following our guidance. We are being asked to do their work for which they are paid. We are deeply offended at this choice of how to address these cuts.

1. Provide FTE, FTES, LOAD, and Fund 1 Savings information (consult instructional dean as needed and/or attach Program Review).

We have given reasonable estimates of savings\*. It’s not more detailed at this time because it will depend on who is teaching specific sections.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description (courses, program)** | **FTE** | **FTES** | **LOAD** | **Fund 1 Savings\*** | **Comments** |
| Anthropology | 0.6 | 17.2 | 861 | **8,000** | We are cutting 2 sections per year. |
| Ethnic Studies | 2.6 | 65.1 | 751 | **20,000** | We are cutting 4 sections per year. |
| Geography | 0.6 | 9.1 | 453 | **8,000** | We are cutting 2 sections per year. |
| HMSV | 0.5 | 7.7 | 497 | **21,000** | (There may be funding to allow it to stay here with no fund 1 cost.) An alternative is to move this Cañada to merge with program there. |
| Humanities | 1.2 | 23.4 | 584 | **20,000** | We will cut the part time sections - 4 per year. The full time salaries will not be saved since they will teach in their “home” departments. |
| Social Science (AOD) | 2.0 | 23.8 | 357 | **30,000** | The program will go from 8 – 5 sections per semester. The 16K for the coordinator needs to be supported by the college. |
| Political Science | 3.5 | 65.3 | 565.3 | **10,000** | We are cutting 2 sections per year. |
| Psychology | 3.9 | 128.5 | 982.3 | **20,000** | We are cutting 4 for sections per year. |
| Sociology | 2.1 | 57.1 | 815 | **15,000** | We are cutting 3 sections per year |
| History | 3.9 | 57.1 | 439 | **5,000** | We are cutting 1 section per year. |
| Economics | 2.3 | 38.4 | 507.4 | **10,000** | We are cutting 2 sections per year. |
| Philosophy | 2.4 | 56.1 | 697.4 | **10,000** | We are cutting 2 sections per year. |
| Total |  |  |  | **177,000** |  |

3. Summarize the current impact of this course/program. Whom does it serve? How does it prepare students for other more advanced courses, for employment, or for transfer? What benefits does it provide to the community? How does it align with the Educational Master Plan? How does this course/program address enrollment, retention, and student success?

The Social Science faculty proposes to keep a wide set of course offerings in our division. We believe that it is essential to not only offer classes that meet the basic transfer needs of our students, but that the students ought to have more than merely a few classes to select from when planning their education. Thus we opted to reduce some larger departments rather than eliminate programs.

The programs and departments in the Social Sciences serve a wide range of students who are planning on transferring, and those who are earning AS/AA degrees. We also have, with the AOD program, a program which directly leads to careers and employment in the mental health field. Our departments and programs are consistently running at very high loads. It is one of the cash cows for the college. Our relatively low cost (other than faculty salary) departments and programs allow for the support of departments and programs which run at lower levels of LOAD efficiency due to enrollment constraints, such as in Composition.

Social Science is directly in line with the EMP’s stated goals. We have high LOAD, high retention and excellent success rates.

4. Discuss the educational impact of elimination or reduction of this course/program.

Discuss the program’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Where else can students obtain what has been provided through this course or program? Is it available at other campuses? Would it be beneficial to consolidate with other campuses? Could it be offered through community education or another provider?

“The List” greatly weakened the students’ ability to receive a wide range of educational experiences. It may still be possible to take Geography classes at Skyline and Cañada, but their programs are far from robust. The same is true of Anthropology. We believe that if these two, for example, were to be cut at CSM, it would be a long stride towards no longer being a full-service college. Anthropology, for example – the study of man (person) – is inherently relevant to a college curriculum.

The problem with our process here (and we are not blaming the individuals in the Senate dealing with a vision-impaired administration) is that, without full disclosure of what our sister colleges, in this “dysfunctional district family”, are doing, we cannot make wise decisions about certain programs and departments. Until there is a directive to think at a district level, as long as our decisions are being made in the dark, we risk our integrity, as one of the other colleges could be poised to swoop in and purge or poach faculty.

Regarding the AOD program, we believe it is vital to the mission of the College. We think the College needs to support the program and should bear the cost of the director. We will reduce the number of offerings from 8 to 5 per semester and at the same time look for outside, recurrent funding. But the program needs time to develop this funding. (Angela Stocker made an excellent and well-received presentation to the board on 10/28/09. Board members indicated a desire to support AOD.) We propose the college keep this vital program for the community, since it is clearly an important CTE program. As well, it serves an incredibly diverse population of students. We believe, however, that Human Services could be combined with Cañada’s program. (Although there are possible new funding sources recently identified to keep it at CSM.) Such a consolidation is reasonable due to funding sources that support the allied health program at Cañada.

5. Discuss the financial impact of elimination or reduction of this course/program. What are the savings in salary, equipment, materials? What costs may have to be absorbed by other programs at CSM and across the district that share equipment or lab space? Discuss the number of full-time and adjunct faculty, overload and reassigned FTEF, and the effect of these factors. What are the savings associated with the proposed reductions or eliminations?

We have found an almost equivalent amount of savings in selective reductions in many departments in order to keep Anthropology and Geography at a reduced number of sections. Since almost the entire cost of Social Science programs are faculty salary, we don’t have much wiggle room regarding any other savings. It means we are reducing the FTE in many departments to maintain breadth of offerings for THE STUDENTS, whom we serve.

Submitted by (individual or group):

The unified Social Science faculty 10/30/09

Faculty Date

In consultation with (e.g., Dean for FTE/FTES/LOAD/Savings):

Kevin Henson 10/30/09

Dean Date

Key documents online at the PRIE site at <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie>  
They include:   
Mission, Values, Diversity, Vision Statement  
Educational Master Plan, 2008  
Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011  
Program Reviews for Instruction, Student Services, and Labs and Centers