

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES
March 12, 2013
2:30 p.m.—4:15 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	James Carranza
Vice President	David Laderman
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary	Lee Miller
Business/Technology	Darrel Dorsett
Creative Arts/Social Science	Jim Robertson
Language Arts	Amy Sobel
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Library	Stephanie Alexander
Math/Science	Darryl Stanford
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	Lilya Vorobey
Creative Arts/Social Science	Michele Titus
COI Chair	Teresa Morris

NON-VOTING REPRESENTATIVES

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

OTHERS ATTENDING

Tania Beliz, Biology
Laura Demsetz, Engineering
Charlene Frontiera, Dean of Math/Science
Grace Noland, Student Assistant
Jeremy Wallace, SoTL

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

Agenda:

Added as item (h) in President's Report an update on District Academic Senate Resolutions 6.13 and 6.35.

Approved without objection as amended.

Minutes:

2/26/2012 minutes approved without objection with the following correction:

Final Sentence in IV.1.: “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.”

Public Comment:

Tania Beliz asked for faculty to respond to the Performance Evaluation Task Force survey. James Carranza agreed to place this item on the agenda for next ASGC meeting.

Dental Assisting & Nursing Open House to be held 3/26, 3:00-6:00 pm on the 3rd floor of Building 5.

II. Information Items

1. ASCSM Update: Can John Kilic, ASCSM Secretary
Members going to Washington, DC to meet with congressional representatives.
Students have submitted films to be considered for inclusion in a film festival.
ASCSM seeks faculty to serve as judges. Informational meeting to be held on 3/13.
Spring Fling will occur April 16, 17, 18. Activities planned include a car show and student bands.

Can John Kilic will continue to represent ASCSM at ASGC for the rest of the semester.

2. President’s Report: James Carranza

(a) College Council Update

James Carranza indicated that the requests for funding from the Instructional Administrator’s Council (Deans’ meeting) were approved. Projects will be funded by bond money that must be spent. Details to be posted online.

(b) Institutional Planning Committee Update

No report.

(c) Learning Center Update

No report.

(d) Program Review Study Sessions

- Wednesday, March 13, 2:15 to 4:15, 18-206
- Friday, March 22, 2:15 to 4:15, DGME Computer Lab, Bldg. 10

(e) Retiree’s Reception, Tuesday, May 14, 2:30 to 4:30

(f) SoTL Center Update: Jeramy Wallace

Jeremy Wallace showed ASGC the draft SoTL web page on the CSM website. It listed the goals and mission of the SoTL Center. The website will also include a list of upcoming professional development opportunities, as well as information on the Community College Teaching and Learning Program, which pays for tenure-track faculty to go to conferences, and Reading Apprenticeship, a professional enrichment program. Both programs are key initiatives in support of our ASGC goals for professional development and communication for next year.

(g) Transfer Tribute Event: David Laderman
Scheduled for May 23, 4-7 pm in the Bayview Dining Room in College Center. ASCSM is the primary funder for the event.

(h) District Academic Senate Resolutions 6.13 and 6.35

On 3/5/2013, James Carranza had emailed the ASGC members and officers, requesting feedback on District Academic Senate draft resolutions 6.13 and 6.35. James's email indicated that the DAS would vote on the resolutions prior to the next scheduled ASGC meeting.

James indicated that 6.13 had been tabled by DAS. James apologized that he had failed to mention at DAS the amendments to draft resolution 6.35 that had been proposed by Jim Robertson and endorsed without objection by the ASGC on 9/25/2012 and Lee Miller's response to his 3/5/2013 email to ASGC requesting feedback. James indicated that resolution 6.35 passed DAS unanimously without the changes recommended by ASGC at the 9/25/2012 meeting or those in Lee's 3/5/2013 email.

Lee Miller (Professor of Political Science) read his 3/5/2013 email:

We already discussed 6.35 and agreed that the second sentence in paragraph 2 is problematical. The consensus was that "professional competence" be replaced by "professional integrity." See attached ASGC minutes.

As for me personally, I object to that sentence in its entirety, as well as part of the first sentence in paragraph 3. Faculty should be free to "say whatever they want" except in the narrow circumstances identified in Supreme Court rulings on this topic; the comments of faculty should NOT be limited to topics related to their "professional competence" or "professional activities." That sort of limitation represents a novel reinterpretation of the 1st Amendment, "... no law abridging freedom of speech."

We should not relinquish our 1st Amendment rights as condition of employment in this District. Moreover, we are a state institution, meaning that the District can get sued for violations of the 1st Amendment more easily than private employers, because the 1st

Amendment directly limits the power of the government (the District) to limit freedom of speech.

See attachment for my proposed revisions.

James projected on a video screen the revisions that Lee had proposed as an attachment to the 3/5/2013 email:

1. Academic freedom encompasses the freedom to study, teach, and express ideas, including unpopular or controversial ones, without censorship or political restraint. ~~Academic freedom, rather than being a license to do or say whatever one wishes, requires professional competence, open inquiry and rigorous attention to the pursuit of truth.~~
2. The District's faculty have the right to express their ~~informed~~ ~~which relate, directly or indirectly, to their professional activities,~~ whether these opinions are expressed in the classroom, elsewhere on campus or at college-related functions. In a search for truth and in a context of reasoned academic debate, students also have the right to express their opinions and to question those presented by others.

Lee moved the following motion:

The CSM Academic Senate Governing Council requests that the District Academic Senate make the following changes to resolution 6.35:

1. Academic freedom encompasses the freedom to study, teach, and express ideas, including unpopular or controversial ones, without censorship or political restraint. ~~Academic freedom, rather than being a license to do or say whatever one wishes, requires professional competence, open inquiry and rigorous attention to the pursuit of truth.~~
2. The District's faculty have the right to express their ~~informed~~ ~~which relate, directly or indirectly, to their professional activities,~~ whether these opinions are expressed in the classroom, elsewhere on campus or at college-related functions. In a search for truth and in a context of reasoned academic debate, students also have the right to express their opinions and to question those presented by others.

After Lee's motion was moved and seconded, ASGC voted to declare it an emergency motion by a vote of 11 to 3. By declaring it an emergency motion, ASGC was able to vote on the motion at the meeting in progress, rather than waiting until the following meeting.

3. Jim Robertson spoke against the motion, asserting that paragraph 4 covers the issues Lee had brought up by stating: "Employment by the District does not in any way restrict or

limit the rights enjoyed by faculty under the California and United States Constitutions. Faculty members are free to speak and write publicly on any issue, as long as they do not indicate they are speaking for the institution.”

Lee disagreed, asserting that if this were so, then there is no point for the contradictory language in paragraphs 2 & 3.

The motion failed by a tie vote, 7 in favor and 7 against. In other words, ASGC did not urge DAS to make any changes to Resolution 6.35.

3. Standing Committee Reports

(a) Basic Skills Initiative: James Carranza, Co-Chair
No report

(b) College Assessment: David Locke, Chair
The committee is discussing GE SLOs and assessment philosophy. James Carranza agreed to make this a Discussion item at next ASGC meeting.

(c) Committee on Instruction: Teresa Morris, Chair
No report

(d) Library Advisory Committee: Stephanie Alexander
No report

III: Action Items: none

IV. Discussion Items

1. Program Review, Division Theme Identification

ASGC discussed the rationale for identifying division themes in program reviews and considered options for how to do this. ASGC discussed the categories in the Outline of Division Trends and Themes, focusing on the highlighted areas on which IPC will provide feedback.

Laura Demsetz and others suggested that faculty identifying common themes is very helpful to the planning process.

James Carranza asked whether it would be helpful to forward to IPC the results of previous plans. Jim Robertson said this would be helpful to the extent that a department has asked for something that was not granted, and therefore could mention that the request is the 2nd request. David Locke suggested that the results of previous plans and initiatives would be helpful to other divisions who would like to make similar requests.

How can faculty identify common themes? ASGC endorsed Kathy Diamond's suggestion from previous ASGC meeting: a Division meeting at which a representative from each department summarizes that department's program review, facilitating the process of identifying common themes. This faculty-driven process was unanimously preferred over the dean unilaterally identifying common themes.

James Carranza introduced a draft motion, to be placed on the agenda for the 3/26/2013 ASGC meeting as an Action Item:

To better inform college planning processes and decision making, specifically with regard to student learning and program planning, the Academic Senate recommends that divisions identify program review themes to be incorporated into the Institutional Planning Committee's processes. (Sections of the program review form under consideration are II.A., II.B., IV., and V.)

Suggestions:

Lee suggested that "Academic Senate" be followed by the words "Governing Council of College of San Mateo."

Jim Robertson Kathy Sammut suggested replacing the word "divisions" with "the faculty and others involved in program review."

Laura Demsetz suggested replacing "IPC" with "the institutional planning process."

James agreed to incorporate these changes. The 3/26 Action Item will read:

To better inform college planning processes and decision making, specifically with regard to student learning and program planning, the Academic Senate Governing Council of College of San Mateo recommends that the faculty and others involved in program review identify program review themes to be incorporated into the institutional planning process. (Sections of the program review form under consideration are II.A., II.B., IV., and V.)

2. Academic Senate Election Timeline and Procedure

Tania Beliz, former ASGC president.

Rosemary Nurre asserted that she is the senior member of ASGC, having served for the past 13 years, and presented her historical perspective on the process of ASGC elections. Rosemary indicated it has often been hard

to recruit people to run for president and vice president. Many of those who volunteered as candidates saw this service as a rite of passage for academic advancement; many administrators are former ASGC presidents and vice presidents. Most officers have provided outstanding service. Commonly, the outgoing ASGC vice president is elected to succeed the outgoing ASGC president. 3 years ago, this pattern changed: no Nominating Committee was convened, and therefore, no nomination for president was made. The assumption was that the vice president would succeed the president, as had become established protocol. But additional candidates nominated themselves and the outgoing vice president was not elected president. Rosemary expressed concern that we need to make clear the process of nomination and election of officers. There should not be an assumption that the current president is automatically re-nominated for another term, or if s/he doesn't want another term, that the vice president automatically gets nominated to serve as president.

ASGC President James Carranza said that he had originally volunteered to be a candidate for president because no Nominating Committee had been convened, and he was concerned that there would be no candidate on the ballot for ASGC president. He had not expected to be running in a contested election. James urged faculty to nominate candidates for officer positions.

David Locke suggested that an email be sent to all faculty to explain the nomination process and election calendar.

Lee Miller suggested that the By-Laws be amended to specify who is supposed to convene the Nominating Committee, because the ASGC almost forgot to convene the Nominating Committee last year, and did not follow the timeline in the By-Laws. Lee suggested that it be specified as the duty of the immediate past president to convene the Nominating Committee.

James said he will call a special meeting of the ASGC Executive Committee to discuss the nomination and election process, and will send an email to faculty soliciting nominations for officer candidates.

James proposed the following timeline and ballot procedures for the spring election.

- Now to April 9, submit nominations for ASGC Officers to the Nominating Committee Chair Tania Beliz, ASGC Past President.
- Nominating Committee Report, Beliz: ASGC, Tuesday, April 9.

- Ballot Open: Tuesday, April 23 through Friday, April 26.
- New officers and council members take office at the 5/14 ASGC meeting.

Nominations may be made from the floor at the Tuesday, April 9 ASGC meeting.

According to our Bylaws, the Nominating Committee reports Officer nominations to ASGC two weeks prior to the election, April 9. Election of officers and representatives must be completed four weeks prior to the end of the semester, in this case, April 26. The last day of the semester is May 24. The president gives notice of the election “ten instructional days” prior to the election, April 9. New officers and council members take office at the final council meeting of the semester.

3. Accreditation Self-Study, 2nd Draft (30 minute Review Session)

Susan Estes, VPI, and Laura Demsetz, the 2013 Institutional Self Evaluation Co-chairs, visited ASGC to solicit feedback on the 2nd draft. Not much feedback was given and they urged faculty members to provide feedback ASAP. Laura Demsetz emphasized that next year’s ASGC officers should be knowledgeable about the report because they need to be available to discuss the report intelligently with the site visit team.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm.