

**CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES**  
**February 26, 2013**  
**2:30 p.m.—4:10 p.m.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

President	James Carranza
Vice President	David Laderman
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary	Lee Miller
Creative Arts/Social Science	Jim Robertson
Language Arts	Amy Sobel
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Library	Stephanie Alexander
Math/Science	Kathy Diamond
Math/Science (& SLOAC Chair)	David Locke
Physical Education/Athletics	Larry Owens
Student Services	Kathleen Sammut
Student Services	Kevin Sinarle

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Immediate Past President	Diana Bennett
Business/Technology	Darrel Dorsett
Business/Technology	Lilya Vorobey
Creative Arts/Social Science	Michele Titus
COI Chair	Teresa Morris

**NON-VOTING REPRESENTATIVES**

ASCSM Secretary	Can John Kilic
-----------------	----------------

**OTHERS ATTENDING**

Charlene Frontiera, Dean of Math/Science  
Dan Kaplan, AFT  
Grace Noland, Student Assistant

**I. ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Agenda:**

Amended to add Vice President's Report as item 2.

Approved without objection as amended.

**Minutes:**

2/12/2012 minutes approved without objection with the following correction:

- II.4(b) Rosemary Nurre indicated that if student success is measured by the percentage of students who transfer, it's not necessarily the best measure because many students come to CSM with no intention to transfer.

**Public Comment:**

Dan Kaplan asked faculty to complete the AFT faculty workload survey.

**II. Information Items**

**1. ASCSM Update:** John Kilic, ASCSM Secretary

Sending six Advocacy Board members to FACCC conference, and then to Washington DC, to advocate for bills in Congress.

**2. Vice President's Report:** David Laderman

At Deans meeting, a detailed report on distance education was unveiled, "Substantive Change Report: Distance Education." Preparation of this report was required for the process of accreditation.

**3. President's Report:** James Carranza

**(a) College Council Update**

No report.

**(b) Institutional Planning Committee Update**

No report.

**(c) Update: Massive Open Online Courses**

No agreements between the District and Udacity has been signed.

Dan Kaplan said that the Board retreat minutes indicate that Chancellor Galatolo urged the Board to establish a formal relationship with Udacity. Dan expects this to occur sometime in the next semester.

**(d) SoTL Center Update:**

Jeremy Wallace is working on a website for the SoTL Center.

**(e) Postponed: Governance Orientation previously scheduled for 3/1**

**3. Standing Committee Reports**

**(a) Basic Skills Initiative:** James Carranza, Co-Chair

Looked at four proposals. Forwarded three to CSM Vice President of Instruction Susan Estes and Jennifer Hughes, VPSS, for approval. One was for basic skills in Math. James explained that BSI has agreed to fund Supplemental Instruction at \$50,000 for the year but budget-wise would not be able to sustain that investment long-term. If the project continues to

demonstrate effectiveness we hope to institutionalize it. He also reported that the Math 811 Study Group received BSI funding for their 811 curriculum and pedagogy innovations. They are also working on making available a free textbook costing only \$20 to download. The committee sent back a Reading Apprenticeship proposal for clarification. He's confident the committee will support it with revisions.

Kathy Diamond said that Chemistry plans to submit an RA proposal to BSI.

**(b) College Assessment:** David Locke, Chair

No report.

**(c) Committee on Instruction:** Teresa Morris, Chair

No report.

**(d) Library Advisory Committee:** Stephanie Alexander

The library is doing a series of workshops on using mobile devices over the next few weeks.

The committee sent out a survey to faculty. Lee Miller said that the survey was confusing: the indicator scale didn't seem to match the things measured, and the survey asked you to refer to documents for which there was no link.

**III: Action Items:** none

#### **IV. Discussion Items**

##### **1. Accreditation Self-Study, 2<sup>nd</sup> draft**

ASGC discussed the Self-Study timeline and plan for making suggestions. James Carranza requested we read the whole thing carefully and provide feedback to Laura. Susan Estes and Laura Demsetz, the 2013 Institutional Self Evaluation Co-chairs, will be visiting ASGC on March 12 to solicit feedback. The third draft of the Self Evaluation report is to be completed in May and the final draft is to be submitted during summer. Our site visit takes place in October.

##### **2. Academic Senate Goals for 2013-2014**

- Professional Development
- Professional Engagement
- Cross-Campus Communication: Breaking down the silos
- Addressing Student Success Task Force Recommendations

ASGC refined goals in order to begin planning specific initiatives:

#### Professional Development

- Revitalizing SoTL Center
- Scheduling campus activities

#### Cross-Campus Communication

- “Division jig-saw” (going to another Division’s meeting)
- Open houses in Divisions during Flex Day

Kathy Diamond suggested joint division meetings including multiple divisions.

Rosemary Nurre said she used to meet new people at committee meetings. But in recent years she sees the same faculty members on committees. She thinks that we need to find a way to get more faculty members to serve on committees.

James Carranza noted that faculty rotating off committees at the end of their term will open up space for new members and create opportunities for faculty to both meet new people and gain valuable experience about how the college works.

Tim Maxwell suggested that faculty can meet one another through the Honors Project.

David Laderman suggested organizing a meeting on a particular subject with faculty from all divisions. Kathy Diamond said that faculty inquiry groups are similar to this: faculty work on a project together.

Kathleen Sammut suggested brown bag events.

Dan Kaplan said that in the past, the library had organized talks by faculty authors. Dan suggested that we could also invite authors who are not faculty. He suggested that this be scheduled for a Friday evening and be advertised heavily.

### **3. Revisit and Update, March 8, Flex Day Planning**

ASGC considered activities to include in the Flex Schedule for March 8.

#### **Items on the schedule so far include:**

11:00 to 1:30: Online Workshop and Lunch

10:00 to 12:00: BSI Spring Celebration/Information Session and Luncheon

12:00 to 2:00: Documentary Screening: *Vincent Who?* Discussion with writer/producer Curtis Chin

No additions were brought forward. James will finalize the schedule and send out an all faculty announcement.

#### **4. Program Review**

ASGC considered the Institutional Planning Committee's proposed process for integrating program review "themes" into the institutional planning process, specifically with regard to SLO assessment and student learning outcomes. ASGC reviewed the draft rubric that IPC will use to provide departments feedback on the program reviews they submit.

Divisions are to look at departmental program reviews to find common issues, challenges or themes in student learning and department planning that are in multiple department program reviews. These will inform IPC's review, institutional planning, and institutional initiatives.

Jim Robertson said that the Creative Arts and Social Sciences Division has 15 departments; it is unreasonable to ask faculty in that Division to read all 15 program reviews.

James Carranza said that faculty wouldn't necessarily have to read the entirety of each program review, only certain key sections pertaining to student learning and planning.

Several speakers suggested a Division meeting at which each department would give a brief summary (5 minutes) of their program review, in order to facilitate the identification of common issues/themes. Kathy Diamond and others suggested it would be helpful to know what other departments are doing.

Jim Robertson cautioned that doing this will increase the already overloaded faculty workload.

David Laderman asked, if IPC gets Division reports, will they really read all the individual departmental program reviews?

Laura Demsetz mentioned that a division might devise any number of ways to share PR. Reading certain sections and looking for commonalities doesn't have to be labor intensive.

James Carranza replied that IPC will look primarily (based on their rubric) at sections II, IV, and V. James mentioned that currently, we complete our program reviews and neither our colleagues nor the planning committee as a whole reviews them. They may be reviewed sporadically at best. He knows college administrators read them carefully, and that's a good thing, but faculty and IPC at least must take a more coordinated approach in the process to make our PR meaningful. We are the professionals directly in charge of student learning. We need our assessments and planning to be front and center in IPC planning discussions. Divisions could not tell IPC what they think, but then we're simply allowing them to read our PRs and decide what to focus on. He's not comfortable with that.

Amy Sobel requested that IPC provide constructive feedback to the faculty on their departmental program reviews, so that faculty can improve their program reviews next time.

Rosemary Nurre suggested that despite all the information requested, program reviews will continue to be used primarily for faculty and equipment requests.

James pointed out that this is what we've become accustomed to because we don't really have a formal process for integrating PR in the planning process.

Jim Robertson suggested that the rest of the information in the program reviews is requested to satisfy ACCJC for accreditation.

James Carranza disagreed indicating that program review is the single most constructive way faculty can influence the direction of CSM. It isn't just about requests. He said that he feels very strongly about the important role program review must play in college planning. And we need a visible process to build transparency in the administration.

1<sup>st</sup> "study session," to help faculty complete their program reviews, will be held this Thursday, 2:15-4:15. Bring drafts and questions. Future "study sessions" will be Wednesday, March 13 and Friday, March 22.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm.**