

College of San Mateo Starting Points Poll

Please indicate your primary role at CSM.

	Response Percent	Response Count
Student	10.9%	14
Staff	21.1%	27
Faculty	60.2%	77
Administrator	7.8%	10

Principles (see also comments attached)

P1. Students are our first priority. College of San Mateo “is an open-access, student-focused, teaching and learning institution” [Mission Statement] that must “build on our strengths to provide an educational experience that, within College of San Mateo's mission, is appropriate to the needs of our students” [Vision Statement]. All decisions must first and foremost take into the consideration the needs of students.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	95	13	0	0	0		108
	Percent	88%	12%	0%	0%	0%		
Students	Number	9	2	0	0	0		11
Staff	Number	15	3	0	0	0		18
Faculty	Number	61	8	0	0	0		69
Administrator	Number	10	0	0	0	0		10

P2. Communication, collaboration, and cooperation across the district are essential to addressing students' needs in a time of scarce resources.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	88	12	7	0	1		108
	Percent	81%	11%	6%	0%	1%		
Students	Number	9	1	1	0	0		11
Staff	Number	17	1	0	0	0		18
Faculty	Number	54	8	6	0	1		69
Administrator	Number	8	2	0	0	0		10

P3. The college's offerings, as a whole, must result in instructional workload measures that meet or exceed college, district, and state targets.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	67	18	17	2	1		105
	Percent	64%	17%	16%	2%	1%		
Students	Number	7	2	2	0	0		11
Staff	Number	12	4	1	0	0		17
Faculty	Number	40	10	14	2	1		67
Administrator	Number	8	2	0	0	0		10

P4. There must be sufficient staff support for the college's instructional programs and student services.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	95	5	6	2	0		108
	Percent	88%	5%	6%	2%	0%		
Students	Number	11	0	0	0	0		11
Staff	Number	17	0	0	0	0		17
Faculty	Number	57	5	6	2	0		70
Administrator	Number	10	0	0	0	0		10

Talking Points (see also comments attached)

T1. Flat changes

T1a. Uniform changes across the budget As funding is reduced, make uniform cuts across the budget (administration, staff, faculty, and instructional supplies). When funding is increased, allow uniform growth across the budget.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	17	10	13	13	48		101
	Percent	17%	10%	13%	13%	48%		
Students	Number	3	1	1	3	1		9
Staff	Number	2	1	5	3	5		16
Faculty	Number	12	7	5	7	35		66
Administrator	Number	0	1	2	0	7		10

T1b. Uniform changes across divisions As funding is reduced, make uniform cuts across divisions but allow non-uniform cuts within divisions. Decision-making takes place at the division level. This is essentially what evolved in Fall 2009. When funding is increased, allow uniform growth at the division level but allow non-uniform growth within divisions.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	35	14	14	15	25	103	
	Percent	34%	14%	14%	15%	24%		
Students	Number	2	2	3	1	1	9	
Staff	Number	6	4	2	4	0	16	
Faculty	Number	25	8	7	8	20	68	
Administrator	Number	2	0	2	2	4	10	

T2. Focus on courses that serve multiple student goals. Goals include transfer (courses required as transfer major preparation; courses that satisfy the CSU-GE and IGETC general education transfer patterns), associate degree (courses that satisfy associate degree major requirements; courses that satisfy associate degree general education requirements), employment (courses that satisfy career/technical certificate requirements), and preparation (courses that are prerequisites for those retained for transfer, associate degree, or employment).

T2a. Retain courses that serve multiple goals.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	65	18	10	2	5	100	
	Percent	65%	18%	10%	2%	5%		
Students	Number	8	1	0	0	0	9	
Staff	Number	10	2	4	0	0	16	
Faculty	Number	41	13	5	2	5	66	
Administrator	Number	6	2	1	0	0	9	

T2b. Reserve a specific percentage of the instructional budget for courses that serve multiple goals.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	36	24	23	4	9	96	
	Percent	38%	25%	24%	4%	9%		
Students	Number	5	3	1	0	0	9	
Staff	Number	4	4	7	1	0	16	
Faculty	Number	24	14	15	3	7	63	
Administrator	Number	3	3	0	0	2	8	

T3. Focus on the most frequently pursued paths to student goals

T3a. Retain courses required for the most frequently pursued associate degrees.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	53	24	13	7	6		103
	Percent	51%	23%	13%	7%	6%		
Students	Number	7	1	1	0	0		9
Staff	Number	8	5	2	1	0		16
Faculty	Number	33	16	8	6	5		68
Administrator	Number	5	2	2	0	1		10

T3b. Retain courses required for the most frequently pursued certificates.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	52	26	13	5	6		102
	Percent	51%	25%	13%	5%	6%		
Students	Number	8	1	0	0	0		9
Staff	Number	6	9	1	0	0		16
Faculty	Number	32	14	12	4	5		67
Administrator	Number	6	2	0	1	1		10

T3c. Retain courses required for the most frequently pursued transfer programs.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	60	22	10	2	6		100
	Percent	60%	22%	10%	2%	6%		
Students	Number	8	0	0	0	0		8
Staff	Number	9	5	2	0	0		16
Faculty	Number	36	15	8	2	5		66
Administrator	Number	7	2	0	0	1		10

T3d. Re-examine and consider for hiatus associate degree programs and transfer paths that serve few students.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	42	20	20	9	12		103
	Percent	41%	19%	19%	9%	12%		
Students	Number	2	3	2	1	1		9

Staff	Number	7	3	4	2	0	16
Faculty	Number	27	14	12	6	9	68
Administrator	Number	6	0	2	0	2	10

T3e. Retain courses that provide access, equity, and support for basic skills students.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	52	26	16	3	5	102
	Percent	51%	25%	16%	3%	5%	
Students	Number	5	2	2	0	0	9
Staff	Number	5	9	1	1	0	16
Faculty	Number	36	13	11	2	5	67
Administrator	Number	6	2	2	0	0	10

T4. Focus on areas with demonstrated success

T4a. Retain courses and programs with strong records of retention, persistence, and goal attainment.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	61	22	12	4	3	102
	Percent	60%	22%	12%	4%	3%	
Students	Number	7	1	1	0	0	9
Staff	Number	9	6	1	0	0	16
Faculty	Number	39	11	10	4	3	67
Administrator	Number	6	4	0	0	0	10

T4b. Limit funding for courses and programs with poor records of retention, persistence, and goal attainment. Apply available resources in a more focused manner to improve outcomes. This could include early assessment, paired basic skills/study skills courses, and other approaches.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	38	21	25	10	7	101
	Percent	38%	21%	25%	10%	7%	
Students	Number	2	5	2	0	0	9
Staff	Number	6	4	5	0	1	16
Faculty	Number	25	9	17	9	6	66
Administrator	Number	5	3	1	1	0	10

T4c. Consider other venues such as community education or adult education for courses and programs without demonstrated success including lower levels of basic skills courses

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	30	17	20	14	22	103	
	Percent	29%	17%	19%	14%	21%		
Students	Number	1	2	3	3	0	9	
Staff	Number	4	4	4	2	2	16	
Faculty	Number	19	11	11	9	18	68	
Administrator	Number	6	0	2	0	2	10	

T5. Focus on associate/transfer core pathway Preserve gateway courses at specified levels. Achieve budget reduction through across the board cuts to remaining areas.

T5a. Identify and preserve an appropriate number of English, ESL, reading, and math sections at each of the levels below AA competency.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	49	27	15	5	5	101	
	Percent	49%	27%	15%	5%	5%		
Students	Number	6	2	1	0	0	9	
Staff	Number	9	4	1	2	0	16	
Faculty	Number	27	20	12	2	5	66	
Administrator	Number	7	1	1	1	0	10	

T5b. Identify and preserve an appropriate number of English and Math sections at AA competency levels (ENGL 100, MATH 120).

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	60	28	10	1	2	101	
	Percent	59%	28%	10%	1%	2%		
Students	Number	7	1	1	0	0	9	
Staff	Number	10	5	1	0	0	16	
Faculty	Number	37	18	8	1	2	66	
Administrator	Number	6	4	0	0	0	10	

T5c. Identify and preserve an appropriate number of courses that satisfy the mandatory requirements for transfer to CSU and UC: English Composition/Written Communication, Oral Communication, Critical Thinking, and Mathematics. See CSU-GE and IGETC worksheets for specific courses (CSU-GE Areas A and B3; IGETC Area 1 and 2).

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	74	17	7	0	3	101
	Percent	73%	17%	7%	0%	3%	
Students	Number	8	0	1	0	0	9
Staff	Number	12	3	1	0	0	16
Faculty	Number	46	13	4	0	3	66
Administrator	Number	8	1	1	0	0	10

T5d. Identify and preserve an appropriate number of courses that satisfy each of the associate degree, CSU-GE, and IGETC areas beyond those covered in T5c. See AA/AS, CSU-GE, and IGETC general education worksheets for areas.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	64	20	12	0	5	101
	Percent	63%	20%	12%	0%	5%	
Students	Number	8	0	1	0	0	9
Staff	Number	6	7	3	0	0	16
Faculty	Number	44	11	7	0	4	66
Administrator	Number	6	2	1	0	1	10

T6. Focus on programs that are or that can develop into “gems.”

T6a. Retain programs that are unique within the region or within the district.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	59	21	18	2	2	102
	Percent	58%	21%	18%	2%	2%	
Students	Number	6	2	1	0	0	9
Staff	Number	9	5	2	0	0	16
Faculty	Number	38	11	15	1	2	67
Administrator	Number	6	3	0	1	0	10

T6b. Retain and build programs that use unique facilities (e.g. planetarium; KCSM)

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	61	15	17	3	6	102
	Percent	60%	15%	17%	3%	6%	
Students	Number	7	2	0	0	0	9
Staff	Number	9	5	2	0	0	16
Faculty	Number	38	6	15	2	6	67
Administrator	Number	7	2	0	1	0	10

T6c. Consider consolidation across the district to build “gems” at each campus. (This is also included as A1).

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	44	15	22	8	12	101
	Percent	44%	15%	22%	8%	12%	
Students	Number	2	2	4	1	0	9
Staff	Number	8	3	4	1	0	16
Faculty	Number	27	9	13	6	11	66
Administrator	Number	7	1	1	0	1	10

T6d. Retain a portion of instructional resources to allow the college to respond to current trends in demand.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	37	26	26	5	6	100
	Percent	37%	26%	26%	5%	6%	
Students	Number	3	2	3	1	0	9
Staff	Number	4	9	3	0	0	16
Faculty	Number	25	11	19	4	6	65
Administrator	Number	5	4	1	0	0	10

T7. Campus Vision/Identity As reaffirmed by the board, the College’s core mission is to provide transfer preparation and career/technical education (CTE). Within this constraint, the college could develop a vision or identity that focuses on a particular theme. For example, a focus on “Health and Wellness” could build on our Nursing, Dental Assisting, and Adaptive PE programs and take advantage of new or unique facilities such as Building 5N. Courses and programs in other areas would still be offered, but a greater portion of resources would be allocated to programs and majors related to the theme.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	30	8	18	11	34	101

	Percent	30%	8%	18%	11%	34%	
Students	Number	2	1	3	1	1	8
Staff	Number	3	3	5	2	3	16
Faculty	Number	21	2	9	7	28	67
Administrator	Number	4	2	1	1	2	10

T8. Make decisions based on a combination of the following: Focus on courses that serve multiple student goals, Focus on areas with demonstrated success, and Focus on associate/transfer core pathway.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	60	19	14	4	4	101
	Percent	59%	19%	14%	4%	4%	
Students	Number	5	4	0	0	0	9
Staff	Number	10	2	2	2	0	16
Faculty	Number	39	12	10	1	4	66
Administrator	Number	6	1	2	1	0	10

Strategies (see also comments attached)

S1. Preserve student access to courses through creative scheduling.

S1a. Alternate advanced or specialized courses (some classes fall only; some spring only) with coordination across the campus and the district.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	55	23	12	2	9	101
	Percent	54%	23%	12%	2%	9%	
Students	Number	4	1	0	1	3	9
Staff	Number	7	5	3	0	1	16
Faculty	Number	37	16	7	1	5	66
Administrator	Number	7	1	2	0	0	10

S1b. Focus on cohorts of students for whom courses could be sequenced on a publicized cycle.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	44	22	25	2	6	99
	Percent	44%	22%	25%	2%	6%	
Students	Number	2	2	3	0	1	8

Staff	Number	6	6	3	1	0	16
Faculty	Number	30	12	18	1	4	65
Administrator	Number	6	2	1	0	1	10

S2. Revisit course prerequisites, corequisites, and recommended preparation to promote student success.

S2a. Implement computerized prerequisite checking so that students who are not adequately prepared for a course do not displace those who are.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	74	15	6	1	7	103
	Percent	72%	15%	6%	1%	7%	
Students	Number	4	2	0	1	2	9
Staff	Number	10	3	3	0	0	16
Faculty	Number	52	8	3	0	5	68
Administrator	Number	8	2	0	0	0	10

S2b. Consider whether existing prerequisites, corequisites, and recommended preparation should be tightened to promote student success (for example, consider whether a specific recommended preparation should be changed to a prerequisite).

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	55	23	13	2	10	103
	Percent	53%	22%	13%	2%	10%	
Students	Number	3	2	0	0	4	9
Staff	Number	3	6	6	1	0	16
Faculty	Number	45	10	7	0	6	68
Administrator	Number	4	5	0	1	0	10

S3. Reconfigure summer offerings at the campus and district levels to focus on serving continuing students.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	53	22	21	1	6	103
	Percent	51%	21%	20%	1%	6%	
Students	Number	5	3	1	0	0	9
Staff	Number	8	3	3	1	1	16
Faculty	Number	35	12	16	0	5	68

Administrator	Number	5	4	1	0	0	10
---------------	--------	---	---	---	---	---	----

S4. Streamline the associate degree by removing requirements not mandated by Title 5 or accreditation standards.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	57	11	15	3	16	102
	Percent	56%	11%	15%	3%	16%	
Students	Number	3	1	4	0	1	9
Staff	Number	8	3	3	1	1	16
Faculty	Number	39	6	7	2	13	67
Administrator	Number	7	1	1	0	1	10

S5. Modify registration priorities so that students with a history of completing the courses they start receive higher priority than those with a history of

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	63	12	12	2	12	101
	Percent	62%	12%	12%	2%	12%	
Students	Number	7	0	2	0	0	9
Staff	Number	8	2	4	0	2	16
Faculty	Number	42	9	4	2	9	66
Administrator	Number	6	1	2	0	1	10

Additional Ideas (see also comments attached)

A1. Consider consolidation across the district to reduce the number of low enrolled programs and build "gems" at each campus.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	39	20	25	6	13	103
	Percent	38%	19%	24%	6%	13%	
Students	Number	2	2	5	1	0	10
Staff	Number	7	2	7	0	0	16
Faculty	Number	24	14	13	5	12	68
Administrator	Number	6	2	0	0	1	9

A2. Revise the processes for program development, improvement, and elimination.

A2a. Create a program improvement and viability process that makes it easier to eliminate programs which have become outdated or too expensive to maintain.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	50	22	23	4	6	105	
	Percent	48%	21%	22%	4%	6%		
Students	Number	3	4	2	0	1	10	
Staff	Number	7	4	3	1	1	16	
Faculty	Number	32	12	18	3	4	69	
Administrator	Number	8	2	0	0	0	10	

A2b. Create a program development process that closely examines longer-term trends and avoids “flavor of the month” decisions.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	61	23	17	2	1	104	
	Percent	59%	22%	16%	2%	1%		
Students	Number	4	2	4	0	0	10	
Staff	Number	7	4	5	0	0	16	
Faculty	Number	42	17	6	2	1	68	
Administrator	Number	8	0	2	0	0	10	

A3. Review the relative budget allocations to staff, administration, instruction, and student services.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	61	19	20	2	1	103	
	Percent	59%	18%	19%	2%	1%		
Students	Number	5	3	2	0	0	10	
Staff	Number	5	5	5	1	0	16	
Faculty	Number	44	11	10	1	1	67	
Administrator	Number	7	0	3	0	0	10	

A4. Consider temporary freezes or reductions in salaries as a way to accomplish part or all of any budget reduction. Explore creative ways of preserving projected retirement benefits at non-freeze levels.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support		Response Count
All repondents	Number	29	18	19	9	29	104	
	Percent	28%	17%	18%	9%	28%		
Students	Number	1	3	2	1	2	9	

Staff	Number	1	8	2	3	2	16
Faculty	Number	24	6	11	4	24	69
Administrator	Number	3	1	4	1	1	10

A5. Before considering pay freezes or reductions, offer the option to work less than full time for a commensurate reduction in pay for a specified number of semesters.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	56	23	14	4	6	103
	Percent	54%	22%	14%	4%	6%	
Students	Number	3	4	2	0	0	9
Staff	Number	7	6	2	0	1	16
Faculty	Number	39	11	9	4	5	68
Administrator	Number	7	2	1	0	0	10

A6. Before providing overload to full time faculty, consider staffing courses with adjunct faculty.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	55	14	15	1	18	103
	Percent	53%	14%	15%	1%	17%	
Students	Number	3	2	3	0	1	9
Staff	Number	6	6	3	0	1	16
Faculty	Number	42	6	7	0	13	68
Administrator	Number	4	0	2	1	3	10

A7. Consider reconfiguring the district from three separate colleges to one college with three campuses.

		Support		Neutral		Do Not Support	Response Count
All repondents	Number	44	10	19	6	24	103
	Percent	43%	10%	18%	6%	23%	
Students	Number	2	1	4	1	1	9
Staff	Number	3	2	3	3	5	16
Faculty	Number	35	7	9	2	15	68
Administrator	Number	4	0	3	0	3	10

Comments related to principles (20):

Student: These are all "all apple pie and mom" principles....

Staff: Although student support should be our primary focus, we, as a college do have to make sure that we balance adequate staff and resources to meet those needs as well.

p4. If we expect the college vocational programs to grow (in the incredible new facilities that have been built) we need to make sure we have enough Instructors and support Staff to enable these programs to provide the level of education CSM promises.

" he college's offerings, as a whole, must result in instructional workload measures that meet or exceed college, district, and state targets"

Faculty: If teaching load increases for some faculty, then less committee work should be expected.

As several people mentioned in the first survey, P1 is of course to be supported but almost any decisions that are made can be expressed as being in the best interests of our students. Who defines who our students are and what their needs are?

P2 This is vitally important and the least likely to actually occur. The college and district administrators do not make decisions in a transparent manner. Participation in this survey feels a lot like multiple other time-consuming processes that faculty have participated in in the past in good faith. After much thoughtful consideration of the issues and promises from administrators, decisions were made that were not what was agreed to. I suspect that the chancellor and other administrators have already made decisions about the future of the colleges and that this is yet another waste of time that I don't have when I have grading and finals to prepare for.

Cooperation and coordination across the district regarding curriculum should also be a priority. Although this has worked to some extent in the past there have been instances when a department at another college has agreed that a course "belongs" to CSM and would not be taught there. CSM faculty then agreed not to offer a course that "belongs" to the other college (even though all of these courses were initially developed by faculty at CSM). The next year, the other college started offering "our" course. There is also a question of academic integrity between the campuses in certain areas.

P3. I only partially agree with this. There are courses (especially lab courses) that must have lower class sizes for safety issues, availability of equipment, room considerations, and the need for all students to participate in experiments or other

I agree with the students being the first priority. I think we say that is what we want but many times i don't see that focus being on the students. One of the things that we lack is a Team Concept to help the students complete our Mission Statement. If we are not all on the same page and have other agenda's then we can't help our students be what they came here for and that should be a complete education program.

I believe that the college should be primarily an education facility but there are also other aspects of college life that enhance and enrich everyone in the community. The students, faculty and staff all make the college. Without one part of this triangle the others won't exist.

Isn't all that obvious? Doesn't the State of California have such a generalized mission statement for education?

P3 - "Instructional workload measures" - not clear to me what this means exactly

P3. Unclear. If this means high load for the college, yes. If it means the same load cutoff for each course, no. There needs to be flexibility to allow students to complete degree and transfer requirements.

P4. Cuts to services have disparate impacts on students and programs. For example, some services are more valuable for basic skills students, others for transfer students. Decide on the mix of students we will be serving, then provide services accordingly.

P3: don't understand the statement. It may be due to my own lack of familiarity with the relevant jargon, but "offerings" (do you mean classes?), "instructional workload measures" and "targets" are just not clear to me.

Regarding P2, the administration must be involved and encourage collaboration and communication. The top administrators are currently failing to do this. Top administrators need to rise to the leadership requirements of the current times. In the end, I expect that there will be no communication or collaboration. The status quo will continue to the detriment of students.

Student services need to be in line with course offerings. To offer courses without the support of student services will effect the most educationally disadvantaged students the most.

Tenure is not successful at this level of college. There are a lot of long term teachers who continue to use the same syllabus and course outline that they have used since they began teaching 15- 20-30 years ago. There has to be a way to hold people accountable for staying up to date. Peer reviews are useless. The faculty review one another with the highest rating EVERY TIME. There needs to be mandatory classroom skill reviews. People need to learn new ways of teaching.

The tripartite mission of the community colleges has been subverted. The emphasis is on job training to the detriment of academics and of continuing education.

There is a disconnect: instruction workload is supposed to meet or exceed specific standard, but nothing is said about student services workload--although there is an assertion about staff support that equates instructional programs and student services without a demonstration that student services meet any standard at all.

There must be open, honest communication across the district to be able to make the best decisions for the students.

While the principle of students' needs is basically sound, ultimately, they are passing through, and their needs change with shifting demographics, the general economy, etc. The faculty (i.e., the permanent faculty), is not passing through, and are at the heart of any good academic institution. CSM was once one of the best junior colleges in the country. It is no longer anywhere near that ranking. One of the reasons for that is the shift in standards; another is the underprepared quality of the students when they come to CSM. Finally, the concern for diverse faculty, rather than truly academic, has been a part of that problem.

Student access and success should be at the forefront of the institutions purpose. Access must be accompanied by support services that assists students in achieving their educational goals. While the three colleges can maintain their own autonomy it is essential that there be open communication and collaborative planning in order to best serve students, faculty and staff.

Administrator:

We cannot serve the students without staff support. Staff support the faculty and students and have a direct impact on the classroom and the student experience. We need to consider if we have already cut too deep on staffing.

Comments related to talking points (23):

Student: I strongly believe that the science departments should get a larger amount of allocated funds because materials are more expensive and essential for proper instruction and learning than in some other departments.

Staff: Making us a "theme" school takes away from the core idea of "community" college.

I would have a concern if we restricted lower level basic skills instruction to community or adult ed. I think the quality of instruction would go down for these students, making it very hard for them once they get to CSM. I think we would lose more students.

T1a-b: Budgetary changes should be made to reflect the Mission Statements and Goals of the Programs, Division, School, and District

T4b: If funding is the reason for poor program performance, then cutting funds will only ensure it's continued failure.

Faculty:

1. The funding should follow the student. Higher enrollment courses should get more funding to add more sections; lower enrolled section should be cut.
2. Administrators and faculty should NOT be the arbiter of which classes we offer; there is too much opportunity for self-serving decisions. Therefore there should NOT any "set asides" for any reason, such as basic skills or AA or transfer. The funding should follow the student.
3. Over the long run, CSM's transfer program will continue to decline because our transfer population is shrinking due to demographics and the increased wealth of our local service area (wealthier families send their kids to Yale, not CSM).
4. We need to identify areas that promise enrollment growth over the long run, and help those programs grow.

CSM, and possibly the other campuses, has "gems" that seem to be unidentified: courses, programs, and teachers. CSM's creative writing program, particularly the Thursday night class and its teacher, has been producing published writers for years. The professor received an award from the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors in September 2008, yet the President's Newsletter never mentioned it. (The student newspaper did.) The film department has had its offerings reduced, in spite of David Laderman's published work, and the large number of students who wish to take his classes. I could go on, but it seems pointless.

I am not comfortable with this overall approach, frankly. We are being asked to rate these statements that might become rules without knowing what the specifics would be. This "gem" idea is irritating. The question is, who decides what has potential to become a gem? I do not at all support T7-- there's no way I will ever believe that we aren't letting the buildings determine our programs if we end up being a "health and wellness" school.

It is essential that if T3d is pursued we have communication across the district. We should not eliminate programs at all three campuses that students in our county want to pursue.

T4c should apply to any courses, regardless of success and retention. If a course/program can go to community ed, why not move it. Especially in corporate programs Real Estate, Taxes, and Computer Skills.

T7 is not something a COMMUNITY COLLEGE should pursue. We are here for the community we serve. We are not a university which specializes in a few fields. I think this is a terrible vision for any community college. It is anti-diversity. T6b has similar problems. I would not support special treatment for these programs. There should be equal treatment of programs, so there is equal treatment of student goals.

Focusing on areas with demonstrated success has the danger of meaning a program which is needing support (perhaps needing a full time faculty member) may be eliminated instead of supported to make it more successful.

It is extremely frustrating to try to evaluate any and all of these points without context, detail, or vision. The lack of any kind of comprehensive view make the process seem like a sifting through a pile of broken pieces of furniture, trying to decide what to keep, without even knowing what we are trying to build. I know this process is supposed to lead to that vision, but I feel as if we could end up with a bunch of broken lumber and still no idea of what we are trying to build.

My main concern is that we lose sight of the fact that approximately 70% of our students come in at below transfer-level writing. We can't afford to cut basic skills classes that serve these students as they are the backbone of our student body.

Not at the expense of Basic Skills and ESL courses and support services.

Resources should be cut from programs that operate at a loss and/or provide the lowest net revenue (revenue from student fees and other sources minus costs of running the program). Possible measures to increase net revenue to be considered should be increasing the enrollment cap on sections with lower than average enrollment caps, even if this requires renegotiating contracts. This approach would minimize the number of students, faculty and staff affected by budget cuts.

In addition, we should consider salary reduction, even if this requires renegotiating contracts. Cuts should be made in a progressive fashion that requires those paid the most to suffer the largest cuts. For example, the first \$50,000 would not be cut, the next \$50,000 would be cut by 10%, the next \$50,000 cut by 20%, etc.

T1 This might be the easiest approach but it also the worst choice and would not serve the best interests of our students, faculty or staff. This is especially worrisome as some groups have already been disproportionately affected by cuts made over the last several years. Classified staff have gone through "managed hiring". Middle level administrators have been cut while higher level administrators continue to do little work for their excessive salaries. Faculty have had no salary increases and have been asked to take on more and more administrative tasks. When faculty retire or leave CSM for other reasons, they are rarely replaced; this increases the workload for the remaining full-time faculty in the departments.

T2 I mainly support this but with noting that the courses that serve for transfer GE are meaningless if the courses that students need for their major preparation are not also offered.

T3 We need to be careful with this. Does this mean we cater only to the "average" student and don't fulfill the educational needs of either the students who come to CSM with gaps in their educational background that they hope to fill here on their way to pursuing a career or transfer goal? Do we ignore our "advanced" students pursuing transfer programs that have high academic demands on the students?

T4 Similar concerns as for T3. Who decides what is successful? Should not be criteria used if high retention is due to easy courses that demand no work from students and leads to elimination of programs where academic standards are upheld so that students who pass those courses are actually ready for the following courses and ready to be successful after transfer?

T5 Who determines what are an "appropriate number" of courses in each area? There are many courses required as major preparation that do not fall into any of these categories; satisfying transfer GEs without major prep will not allow students to transfer.

T6 I have major objections to letting facilities drive education instead of the other way around. Just because we have KCSM do we keep it even it does not directly serve students? Just because we have a planetarium does not mean that we should become the "astronomy" school. Just because the chancellor pushed a "fitness center/wellness building" on us does not mean we should become the "PE" campus. I fear that a lot of the planning on administrators part had some long-range plans behind them that were NEVER part of any public discussion. I don't think that these decisions should be forced on us like the buildings were.

Programs unique to CSM (like welding) have already been cut. So is it only "unique" programs that Mike and Ron like that will be kept and expanded? Again, who decides what programs are "gems"? Is this based on the high success rates of students like science and engineering students after they are accepted at four year schools. Or is it PE courses because they have large enrollments and easy grades?

T7 Aren't we supposed to be a college? A college offers a wide array of courses that develop students awareness of the world around them and ability to participate fully and intelligently in the life of their community and nation. A narrow focus like "Health and Wellness" does not really fit the model of a COLLEGE. If we were to have a focus, why not build on our ACADEMC strengths like our science, math, engineering, and technology programs? This include programs like nursing, dental assisting, and electronics as well as computer sciences. These programs will be in high demand in the future as well as now and have the flexibility to focus on and adapt to changing demands by transfer schools and employers. But we also need to have a range of other courses available to students to broaden their perspectives on the world.

T8 I support this somewhat with a lot of concerns about exactly what it means and who will make the decisions. I do not trust either of these to our current administrators.

T1. Decide what student needs have priority and provide the instructional and support services to meet them. T2, serving multiple goals, is a plus, but avoid rigidity. Some courses essential to pathways serve single goals. An a priori proportion for multiple goals courses is just silly. T3. Basic Skills are essential for all students who lack them. T4. Some necessary courses have low success rates. Redesign courses and programs to get higher success rates, but offer the courses that are needed. T5. Keep the transfer function healthy. T6,T7. Don't go boutiquey or put too many eggs in one basket, but do take advantage of what we have, and coordinate to preserve programs in the district. Point with pride at what we do, but don't change what we do just to have something to point to. Public relations is secondary to evidence-based planning. T8. Those are good criteria, but remember "focus on" should not mean "limit ourselves to." What about certificate programs?

T1a: I support this, but think there should be some "sliding scale" built into "across the board," so that highest paid salaries take more of a cut than lower paid salaries.

T1b: I support this too, but just for the record, in the Fall 09 round, my division made concrete readjustments in the schedule to recommend my program be taken off reduction status. Admin said no. So "decision-making takes place at the division level" needs to be an honest and accurate description.

T7 - I could support the "theme" idea in general, but CSM was forced into a "Health and Wellness" path by the Chancellor and Board. For years resources have been funneled into this area (dental assisting - PE - sports) with out campus consultation.

The "bottom line" focus is leading to admitting incompetent students (high school students lacking in the maturity to succeed in a true college-level course, and cutting out highly motivated students whose only goal is self-improvement (seniors, for example). We need to support courses which entail a sequence, where the higher levels naturally have fewer enrollees, but which enhance our reputation as an institution offering quality education.

The college needs to get rid of journalism, and similar areas with so few transfer students, and so few total students. Put more resources in the Bio Sciences and related CTE areas that have a future in our society, and the strong transfer requirements. It is time that we put resources in areas where we have long waiting lists, and cut off areas that drag college productivity.

We have to remain flexible in order to quickly provide education that the community needs. Most students aren't transfer students. Cannot dedicate one facility to one program. Must run marketing and needs surveys on the immediate community.

We need to make decisions across the district. Each campus may not be able to be all things to all students.

Administrator:

Recommend conversation with BSI committee regarding recently received data-- a large number of AA/AS degree, certificate and transfer ready students took at least one basic skills course. Numbers are jaw dropping!

CSM can continue to maintain a broad array of courses and programs to meet multiple student goals but must strategically identify those academic programs that have been successful as determined by sustained enrollment, degrees, certificates and that fulfill transfer requirements. Based on a reveiw of data, traditionally low enrolled courses and programs need to be eliminated.

Would like to have faith that programs could be built across the district, but the lack of cooperation this past academic year, suggest our sister colleges are not ready to come to the table for useful discussions.

Comments related to strategies (23):

Staff: I would be concerned with restricting registration priorities to those who have histories of completing classes only because there could be many reasons why students don't complete their courses. They could really be struggling with their course and are not getting enough support. I would be afraid we would be excluding lots of students who are struggling but deserve an education and will be deterred from getting it. We have to keep in mind what impact this will have on our society in years to come.

A teacher can only be called a "teacher" when his students have learned the material.

Faculty: Prerequisites for same/similar classes should be the same across the DISTRICT. Without this students will simply go to the college that is most lax.

Again, my knowing more about the specifics and context could lead to very different answers.

As a person who teaches some courses with computer-checked prerequisites, I know that they often result in mistakes. In the courses that don't have computer checked prerequisites, I check. That seems to work. If it's a recommended placement, I am able to tell from the students' work whether or not they belong in a particular course. If a student who shouldn't be there insists on staying, I make it clear the student may fail the course. Few stay in that case.

Computerized prerequisite checking must be implemented only when the faculty in that program request computerized prerequisite checking.

DO NOT IMPLEMENT computerized prerequisite checking FOR ALL COURSES AT CSM; ONLY FOR COURSES IN WHICH THE FACULTY REQUEST IT.

CSM's AA degree requirements currently include 2 barriers for students with transfer as their primary goal: 2 physical education classes - get rid of this and American history/California govt. - allow courses in this requirement to be used for social sciences G.E., and match CSU requirements.

Many of these strategies do not seem to have a logical connection to reducing costs, other than perhaps making it harder for students to enroll in the courses they want. I only indicated support for those that seem to be common sense regardless of the budgetary situation.

Please remove PE from the AA/AS degree requirement. Let Physical Ed be all electives. If the program is strong, students will flock to PE. Stop giving PE preferential treatment.

Prioritizing registration for students who complete courses ensures serious students can graduate/complete a program without having to compete with others not intending to finish an entire training or goal.

Re S1A, alternating specialized courses: Specialized courses are often taken by students majoring in a particular field. If there is, for example, a four-semester cycle of courses, as there is in Lit at CSM, in order to take all the courses for an English major, the student has to know s/he is going to be an English major from day one (assuming the student wants to transfer/graduate in four semesters). First semester freshmen, even those who do not need courses below transfer level, rarely know what they will eventually major in. I appreciate that specialized courses may have low enrollments, but if they're needed for students' majors, they should be offered at least once an academic year.

Re: S5...if this costs a lot of money to implement, don't bother redesigning the programming. If it will save money sooner rather than later- Do it!

S1 Support somewhat as long as enough sections are offered for students to be able to complete courses and their goals in a reasonable period of time. Students do not all arrive at CSM with the same level of preparation so only offering courses once a year may mean that we lose students if this will extend their time at CSM. Math/science/engineering departments have struggled with this for years. It can be very hard to schedule courses so all students who need them can get the classes they need in a given semester. There are restrictions on scheduling that could make it very hard for students to finish a course of study in a reasonable time if too many courses are only offered once a year.

S2 seems like a reasonable goal; but how can it be implemented if all campuses don't agree or if they agree on paper but not in practice? If Canada and Skyline agree on a set of prerequisites that CSM disagrees with will we be forced to abide by "majority rule"? What if a department at CSM has a prerequisite course that the other campuses don't offer but that we feel is important for student success? Will we be forced to drop it as a prerequisite?

S3 Should we consider eliminating summer classes for the short term? Are we using our limited resources to provide courses for students from other districts like CCSF that have eliminated summer school?

S4 YES!!! Our goal should be to make the associate degree accessible to students as long as they meet minimum ACADEMIC standards. While PE courses may be good things to offer, they should not be required of all students. Students should not have to retake courses like US History and Government that they already had to take to graduate from high school. These should still be offered and satisfy GE areas but should be required of all students.

S1a - So long as student goals/requirements are still met.

S1b is great, but very difficult in some areas like the sciences where students enter with varying math skills and begin at varying levels.

S2a points out the problem with "focusing on programs with demonstrated success". Without computerized prerequisite checking, success and retention rates are lowered.

I strongly support S4. Why cut other courses so that we can retain our specialty requirements?

S1a is working now, Based on our experience with learning communities, S1b would be hard to implement in large numbers. S2a is working now. Related to S2b: maintain adequate counseling. S3: Priority registration for continuing students, and offering sections of courses which turned away large numbers of students in fall and spring, seems fair. S4: Consistency across the district and removing pointless hurdles is desirable. Dumbing down degrees is not. Proceed with caution. S5 is well-intentioned but may come across as punitive and elitist. How do we distinguish students who withdraw for legitimate reasons from those who just don't study? Can we put more effort into monitoring and counseling students?

S4: I support this if these changes are district-wide.

S5 sounds good, but would chase away students who probably need extra attention. It would hurt enrollments.

S5 would receive full support if combined with a provision for students who "finally" appear to be pursuing a defined track (a defined pathway) to not be prevented from pursuing that track

Students who fail to complete their associate degree are not hindered by the requirements that you are suggesting removing; they fail at the major requirements. As a liberal arts institution, it is our responsibility to provide a well-rounded education. Those additional requirements are often the part of collegiate life that encourages low-income and minority students to pursue higher education at all; removing them would essentially be closing the gateway to the diversity of our student body.

We should not Streamline the associate degree by removing requirements not mandated by Title 5 or accreditation standards because CSM is better than Title 5 and we know what is best for our degree requirements.

Administrator:

Most of what is presented above can be considered a strategic component of enrollment management. Courses should be sequentially scheduled to meet student needs not a faculty member's preference for days and time of day. Hard to believe that this practice is still allowed at CSM. Presently CSM graduates just over 400 students per year, however, that number will be reduced by 40 percent as the Liberal Studies major which accounts for about 40% of degrees due to Title 5 regulations is no longer offered. The College should consider significantly eliminating degree requirements that are not required by Title 5.

Regarding S4-- campus should also consider institutional SLOs not just what is mandated. For example civility; computer literacy etc.

S5-- community college's mission is to provide access for students who otherwise may not attempt/attain higher education. This means that a number of students will come in with fewer skills and may not know how to be a successful student. There is a learning curve. Shouldn't penalize students for that phase anymore than we do instructors who 'pass' rates or outcomes are low. Doesn't encourage good teaching or learning. Need to build 'nudges' into system that create; encourage; the behavior that leads to success as educators and students.

The single most simple thing that can be done quickly is to remove obsitcales, unique to CSM, for the associate degree. Specifically rethink P.E. and history requirements.

Comments related to additional ideas (21):

Staff:

1. I would argue that pay freezes have been in affect for several years now!
2. Before considering pay freezes or reductions, offer the option of employees to pay a larger share of their benefits.

Although I may support a temporary freeze on salaray increases I am not supportive on a reduction. I feel that by not getting a consistent cost-of living increase/raise on a yearly basis over teh past several years has already constituted a salary reduction of sorts.

Also, in regards to overload, consider offering "comp time" to faculty as opposed to overtime pay. Comp time could be not having to hold office hours and come in strictly for teaching assignments.

Who would then be in charge of the three campuses? There would have to be instruction and administrative experts at the district in order to effectively manage this new entity.

Faculty:

A5 - Isn't this option already provided in our contract?

A1 and A7 are closely related. You cannot "consolidate" programs when we are three separate colleges. You are eliminating them from some campus and allowing them to be offered at others.

A3 and A7 are also related. One advantage of reconfiguring the district would be to reduce the over-inflated adminisitrative costs.

I do have concerns about how reconfiguring the district would be implemented. Not all of our students can easily move from campus to campus to take classes. Students (and faculty and staff) who take public transportation would have a hard time, especially as Canada and Skyline are not easily accessed by public transportation. We would still need to offer a wide range of courses at each campus to allow students to achieve their goals in a reasonable time frame.

A4 and A5 You cannot balance the budget on the backs of the employees who have already been losing real money over the last several years. Offering some kind of "creative scheduling" might work but would be unacceptable if it affects health coverage or retirement benefits.

A1. Consolidating to get adequate enrollment, yes. Gems are great if they occur, but don't count on that. A2a: the process should be expedited but remain under faculty control. A2b: this will require preserving adjuncts. A3 should be a natural consequence of student-need based budgeting. A4: Pay cuts are a risky precedent. In effect a COLA freeze is in effect. A freeze on step increases would impact junior faculty. Retirement benefits should be protected. A5 is sensible, and A6 is just. A7 is worth considering but not in haste. It involves larger issues, and is probably not a realistic plan for 2011-12 savings.

A2B: program development should be as mobile as program elimination.

A4 - Faculty have already been passed over on COLA for several years. A pay cut to faculty is unfair before a rollback of pay raises to administrators.

A7 may be nearly impossible at this point.

A7 should be actively pursued

I do NOT support freezes and/or reductions in faculty or staff salaries. I DO support freezes and/or reductions for administrative salaries. And there should be NO OVERLOAD courses taught by any faculty member during a time of budget reductions. All additional courses that are over-and-above a full-time faculty load should be offered to adjunct faculty in order to maintain work force retention and reduce regional job loss. Full-time faculty do NOT deserve to displace others in the work force through what is essentially "overtime" work. This is a patently unfair practice. I cannot emphasize this last point enough.

If individuals want to take a pay cut, they should simply donate that percentage of their salary back to the district.

I think the administration could be a little tighter with the release time, frankly.

In other districts, the people at the top of the pay scale have accepted across the board cuts in salary to permit adjuncts to remain employed. In this district the people at the top are making the decision, and protecting their own privileges to the detriment of the programs and of the adjuncts.

Let administrators reduced their salary before faculty or staff do so.

Not all adjunct are good teachers. Some have been around for too long and were never properly evaluated before obtaining seniority. It would be a big mistake to prevent great teachers that are F/T and like teaching and treat students like they are welcome in our classrooms to give more units that abuse our students, and treat them like they are doing us a favor, not a service. We have some REALLY BAD adjuncts that should be let go, and now is the time.

Overload is more cost efficient than part-time faculty. Full-time faculty teaching overload are only paid for the extra class or classes. Adjuncts receive paid office hours for every class they teach. Full-time faculty who teach Summer Session do not receive pay for office hours, but are paid the same as hourly faculty. Adjuncts who teach Summer Session receive pay for office hours.

It doesn't take higher-level math skills to see that overload saves money.

Re A2a: Yes, obviously there should be a process, but don't make it a shared governance contrivance in which faculty and staff have to spend many hours meeting just to put a stamp of approval on what the administration wants to do anyway.

Re A2b: I don't know what this means.

Re A7: It's impossible to comment on this proposal without a lot of information regarding how a reconfiguration would affect faculty and students.

Regarding A5, it make sense to offer this as something voluntary, in that some might prefer this to working full-time. But requiring this wouldn't be in the students' best interest, in that it would just make it that much harder for large numbers of students to get the classes they want.

Salary cuts will hurt lower paid employees more than our bloated administrator salaries.

Save administration costs by avoiding duplication across campuses.

Statements by current administrators across District are false when they imply the 3 colleges are already working together. They are not. The CSM Academic Senate is already on record as calling for more coordination across district. This will only be accomplished by creating one college with 3 campuses. Financial savings will be marginal, but coordination of offerings can become more coherent, to the benefit of students.

Administrator:

The ideas presented above present the beginnings of a strategic framework rather than a "flavor of the month" type approach. Similarly, while a more strategic approach has been implemented for reviewing the College's budget, the current plan still lacks a thorough assessment of the annual allocations. That is, for the most part divisions are provided the same funding each year without questioning if the funding level should be increased or decreased. For example, when a program is eliminated, is the division budget reduced to reflect the eliminated costs that include faculty, staff and or operations? I don't believe so.
