

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

January 28, 2014
2:30pm – 4:30pm

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	David Laderman
Vice President	Theresa Martin
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary	Stephanie Alexander
Business / Technology	Darrel Dorset
Business / Technology	Steve Gonzales
Creative Arts / Social Science	Jim Robertson
Creative Arts / Social Science	Michele Titus
Language Arts	Merle Cutler
Language Arts	Kathleen Steele
Library	Stephanie Alexander
Math / Science	Carlene Tonini-Boutacoff
Math / Science	Santiago Perez
Student Services	Martin Bednarek
Student Services	Kathleen Sammut

MEMBERS ABSENT

Immediate Past President	James Carranza
Physical Education / Athletics	Larry Owens

NON-VOTING REPRESENTATIVES

ASCSM President	Hayley Sharpe
COI Chair	Teresa Morris
LAC Committee Co-Chair(s)	Stephanie Alexander
LSC3 Committee Co-Chair(s)	Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza
SoTL Coordinator(s)	Jeremy Wallace

OTHERS ATTENDING

Catherine Firpo, Psychology
Marsha Ramezane, Counseling
Tim Maxwell, English

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

1) Approval of the Agenda; Approval of Draft Minutes from November 26, 2013 and December 10, 2013; Announcement of Timekeeper

Agenda: Two additional Action Items were added to the meeting agenda: Action Item D - the appointment of Stephanie Alexander as Secretary and Action Item E - the appointment of Jim Robertson as Parliamentarian. Discussion Item C (Faculty purview in curriculum development) was withdrawn and removed from the agenda.

Minutes: Former Secretary Lee Miller revised the minutes from November 26th and December 10th. David Laderman and Theresa Martin made additional revisions. Minutes were provided from the meeting of the Executive Committee on January 14th.

Requested Corrections to the Minutes:

November 26th, Section 2d (Faculty Scheduling Survey): Correct to reflect that CASS representative Michele Titus did query the division and email a report to President Laderman that was not received; Correct to reflect that Counseling reported the process for scheduling classes in their division without indicating faculty dissatisfaction.

December 10th, Section 1 (Public Comment): Correct spelling of Michele Titus' name.

January 14th: Identify members of the Executive Committee and guests in attendance. Note that James Carranza can no longer be a member of the Executive Committee (as Immediate Past President) because of his new role as interim Dean of Language Arts.

Approval of the Agenda / Minutes: Motion passed without opposition or abstentions.

Timekeeper: Rosemary Nurre has agreed to serve as timekeeper for the meeting to help ensure that the group follows the time allotments listed on the agenda for each item.

2) Public Comment

Merle Cutler requested more information on what is permissible and what is not under the Brown Act regarding electronic communication between members of the body outside of regularly scheduled meetings. Jim Robertson will look into it and report back to the group.

Jim Robertson suggested the body may want to prepare a resolution to acknowledge Audrey Behran's passing, as she was an active member of the Academic Senate for many years. David Laderman will look into it and report back to the group.

Catherine Firpo shared information about upcoming CSM Cares events and encouraged students and faculty to participate in upcoming Kognito trainings (more information available here: <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/csmcares/kognito.asp>). The CSM Cares Annual Spring Conference will be March 13-15 and will include speakers, Art with Impact, a film night, and a Mental Health First Aid event. On the March 5th Flex Day CSM Cares will be providing two workshops: one on LGBTQ Issues, the other on helping suicidal students.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1) **Associated Students of College of San Mateo (ASCSM) Update** (*Hayley Sharpe*)

The Associated Students group is starting the election process. The group recently appointed three new senators, bringing the group to full participation. Other appointments were made to the Programming Board and the Cultural Awareness Board. The timeline has been finalized for the Student Trustee election. The Student Trustee position represents the student groups of all three colleges to the Board, and the group would like to encourage many students to run for this position.

ASCSM is holding Reboot Week activities the week of 1/27 – 1/31. There will be a variety of activities in front of Building 10 between 11:30am – 2pm. Students will need a Student ID to participate. ASCSM will be going on a DC advocacy trip, and may send student representatives to the FACCC Advocacy and Policy Conference in Sacramento in early March. The report to the Board of Trustees on the activities of ASCSM in December went very well.

2) **President's Report** (*David Laderman*)

- a. **Welcome to new interim Secretary, Stephanie Alexander:** Stephanie has agreed to serve as Secretary throughout the remainder of the academic year.
- b. **IPBC Update:** The group held its first meeting of the semester on Friday, January 24, 2014. The group decided to change its name back to the IPC (Institutional Planning Committee). IPC is planning to conduct focus groups to delve deeper into areas of concern from the Campus Climate Survey data. IPC discussed the funding and expansion of the Supplemental Instruction initiative beyond math classes. IPC is working to develop an initiative assessment tool to assess existing programs. More information will be shared on the assessment tool as it develops. Kathy Blackwood gave a presentation on the new District Allocation Model. Kathy and CSM's new Vice President of Administrative Services, Jan Roecks, will give a similar presentation to the Academic Senate at a future meeting.
- c. **Program Review Online:** The online format for Program Review will be implemented this spring. The online format has several benefits: you can print entered data as a PDF, links are built into the online version, and you can now copy and paste from your previous program review. Training sessions to help guide folks through the process will happen in late February / early March; the details will be shared once available.
- d. **Leading from the Middle Academy:** A group from CSM will be participating in the Academy; several people from CSM and the district have participated in the past. The goal is to train college leaders to help them implement new student success initiatives across campus. The particular focus is on the theory of "habits of mind" / critical thinking. The first conference is in mid-February; the attendees will be reporting back to this body and the campus as a whole.
- e. **January 14 Special Meeting of the Executive Committee:** Minutes from that meeting were distributed to the body, as well as a document summarizing the main points from the meeting (see Appendix I). Discussion of the summary notes from the meeting included questions about what "10+1" is and what the difference is between action and discussion items. David will send the 10+1 definition out to the body and Jim Robertson

provided an explanation of the first reading / second reading procedures used by Governing Council and most Academic Senates across the state.

3) Standing Committee Reports

- a. **College Assessment Committee** (*David Locke*) – No report.
- b. **Committee on Instruction** (*Teresa Morris*) – No report; Rosemary Nurre gave Teresa Morris accolades for her chairship of COI, stating that the COI meetings she has attended have been “painless and easy.”
- c. **Library Advisory Committee** (*Stephanie Alexander*) – No report; first meeting in February.
- d. **Learning Support Centers Coordination Committee** (*Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza*) – Someone will be identified as the new co-chair of LSC3 with Jennifer’s appointment to the interim Dean of Academic Support and Learning Technologies position. There was discussion about whether or not the new co-chair has to be a faculty member. David will follow up and report back to the group.

III. ACTION ITEMS

- a. **Faculty Hiring Committees: Winter Break Approvals**
- b. **Faculty Hiring Committee: Librarian**

A document with the makeup of Faculty Hiring Committees (from the winter break approvals + Librarian committee) were distributed to the body (see Appendix II)
Discussion: Action Items A and B were discussed and voted on together; Request to correct Lorrita Ford’s title from Dean to Director.
Motion passed without opposition and one abstention.
- c. **Senate Funding for Flex Day Breakfast**

Discussion: Request for approval for Academic Senate funding for Flex Day breakfast on January 14, 2014 (Total \$242.54). There was a request for information on the approximate total of Senate Treasury; Rosemary estimated the Senate Treasury is around \$1200, before payment for the Flex Day Breakfast.
Motion passed without opposition and no abstentions.
- d. **Appointment of Stephanie Alexander as Interim Secretary**

Motion passed without opposition and no abstentions.
- e. **Appointment of Jim Robertson as Parliamentarian**

Motion passed without opposition and one abstention.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. **Academic Renewal Policy** (*Martha Ramezane, Kathleen Sammut, Martin Bednarek*)

The current Board Policy on Academic Renewal (6.22, revised 10/12) was distributed to the group, along with a side by side comparison of the old policy (prior to Fall 2014), current published policy, and the proposal for an updated policy. There was a big movement to update District policies and procedures in Spring 2013, but this policy was not updated. The intention of the Academic Renewal Policy is to allow students who may have slipped off track to come back and alleviate past substandard grades (Ds, Fs; does not apply to Ws). The limit on the number of times a course can be repeated still applies. The old Academic Renewal policy had a unit cap of 36 units that could be alleviated; current policy has no cap. The old policy had a maximum number of terms where academic renewal can be applied (2 semesters +

1 summer term); current policy has no maximum number of terms. The proposal is to revise the current policy to reinstate the 36 unit cap for the total number of units that can be alleviated and retain the unlimited number of terms where Academic Renewal can be applied.

Discussion: Many questions about the Academic Renewal Policy were raised, and the following information was shared: Students can pick the 36 units they want to repeat; the Academic Renewal Policy has been around a long time at CSM and other colleges, and the UCs honor it; the 36 unit cap comes from the old policy's limit on the maximum number of terms where Academic Renewal can be applied (2 semesters + 1 summer session – 15 + 15 + 6 = 36); to be eligible for Academic Renewal, a course needs to be at least a year old; the goal for Academic Renewal is to facilitate the student's ability to apply for scholarships, transfer, selective majors, etc.

Action: The policy will be revised and presented at the next Academic Senate meeting for voting; it will then move on to the District Senate.

b) Honors Project (Merle Cutler)

Note: Theresa Martin (Senate Vice President) facilitated the discussion of the Honors Project

Merle shared two concerns she has about the Honors project. Her first concern is the structure of the program, with its two course model (a three unit foundation course and a two unit seminar course) where a student earns five units of honors credit. Currently, the seminar course does not transfer. The foundation course does not have honors content / enhanced curriculum – so two students can be in the same foundation course, graded on the same standard, but one receives honors for working on a research paper and the other student does not. Concerned that the system does not provide students what is usually in honors courses (harder texts, higher grading standards, etc.). Her second concern is the number of honors units awarded to students participating in the program is too high for the amount of work they are required to do.

David shared background information on the Honors Project with the group. The Committee on Instruction (COI) approved the seminar courses in 2012. The course outlines explain the awarding of honors credit for the seminar and foundation course. It is an enhanced contract model – there is an agreement between the student and the instructor to get honors credit for a course for doing something above and beyond, and the seminar is there to provide support for the student to complete the research project. The seminar has several assignments that students complete for the honors credit. The research paper is what counts for the honors credit in the foundation course. The seminar course is transferrable if the student petitions for it to transfer after they arrive at their four-year institution. The Honors Project has plans to make them more transferrable, and is applying for TAP certification in the spring. Those faculty involved with the Honors Project have held many meetings, visited divisions, and gotten a lot of input from faculty, and would like to keep improving the project. Both David and Tim Maxwell shared that as coordinators of the Project they are open to questions and feedback on the particulars of the program and how it works.

Discussion: Several questions about the Honors Project were raised, and the following information was shared: There is more than one Honors Seminar for students to choose from; the Honors Project is becoming institutionalized; after working with the student periodically through the semester, the faculty member from the foundation course is the one who approves the research paper and awards credit for fulfilling the research process; there are some shared standards for acceptable topics / level of research

expected to receive honors credit. A couple of faculty members shared concerns about the variation in quality of the final student projects.

Requests: Clarify the transfer process for the seminar courses, since some faculty may be hesitant to recommend the classes to students without knowing if they can transfer; clarify the communication process between the seminar and foundation courses; offer additional open forums or feedback sessions for faculty to give input on how the project can better meet the needs of students.

Action: Teresa Morris shared that it may be possible for COI to offer an open forum later in the semester for faculty to give input on the Honors Project; Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza shared that in her new role as interim Dean of Academic Support and Learning Technologies she is aware of the concerns raised and will be looking into ways to gather additional feedback and input.

c) **SoTL Committee** (*David Laderman*)

Professional development is an institutional priority at CSM and there is funding available to expand upon what is currently available for faculty. There are two coordinators for professional development on campus, but it may be helpful to form a committee (at first an ad hoc committee, with the possibility of becoming permanent later) to explore options related to professional development. The committee can then report to the Academic Senate with ideas, opportunities and recommendations regarding what we want to do as a faculty to expand professional development opportunities on campus. This group could provide a bridge between the current short/long term professional opportunities available with the flex day and other campus initiatives and critical areas of focus (Reading Apprenticeship, Leading from the Middle, pedagogy, etc.).

Discussion: Several faculty members indicated an interest in more support for grant writing on campus, noting that both Canada and Skyline have individuals who are available to help win grants for the campus; it was also noted that it is important to build bridges between different parts of the campus community.

Action: Steve Gonzales, Michele Titus, Kathleen Steele, David Laderman, Theresa Martin and Jeramy Wallace will get together for an initial meeting of the ad hoc committee and report back to the larger group.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm. Next meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 11th from 2:30-4:30pm in 18-206.

APPENDIX I: Summary from Governing Council Executive Committee Meeting 1/14/14

Special exec meeting:

1. The President creates a proposed agenda, and sends it out 72 hours prior to the meeting, for review by GC members. The agenda is subject to approval by the GC body. GC members may move to modify the agenda, and if such a motion is approved by a majority, the agenda is modified.
2. In an effort to facilitate input on creating the agenda, the President will “test” the following categories at the end of each agenda:

- Next meeting, discussion items
- Future topics (pressing business)
- Upcoming reports
- Future topics (non-urgent)

GC members are invited to communicate their input, preferences, and suggestions to the President regarding prioritizing topics under any of these categories (and across categories). The President will take such comments into account as best he can. The President may decide to discuss particular cases of agenda items at a given meeting. Likewise, any GC member may move to discuss a particular case of agenda items at a given meeting. If approved by the majority, it will be discussed.

3. GC members are reminded, however, that the President is in the best position to create an effective agenda, because most all requests from the campus community go to him, and because he attends various college and district meetings where issues relevant to the Academic Senate are raised.

The basic criteria that the President, and the body, should adhere to are:

- topics should be 10+1 issues within faculty purview
- the time-sensitive nature of topics should be considered
- topics should be relevant to Senate goals
- the urgency of topics should be considered
- the order in which topics come forward should be considered

Thus, “Next meeting, discussion items” topics may need to be modified by the President in certain “emergency” situations. On the other hand, those items have been given priority for various reasons, and so should be “left alone” as much as possible.

4. The body will try timekeeping, for public comment and for discussion items.
5. Division reps need to field, filter and bring forward concerns from the division. They also need to represent the concerns of the division as a whole.

APPENDIX I (cont.): Summary from Governing Council Executive Committee Meeting 1/14/14

Tips from Robert's Rules of Order:

1. One of the first "rules" of Robert's Rules is that they are to be *interpreted, modified and applied* according to the needs, wishes and overall identity of the governing body.

So, for example, the RR instructions on taking minutes are not necessarily to be obeyed to the letter; rather, they are a guideline for us to modify as we see fit.

2. GC members should be aware of their prerogative to make a motion. Only GC members may make a motion, or vote on a motion. Any member may make a motion to revise the proposed agenda; or to have a discussion; or to end a discussion.

Once the motion is made, it needs to be seconded. If it is seconded, the motion is discussed. If a member wants to end the discussion of the motion, s/he may "call the question," which requires an immediate vote on whether to end the discussion of the motion or not.

Once the discussion of the motion has ended, there is a vote on the motion. If the motion gets a majority in favor, then it passes. If not, then it fails.

3. The President has the authority to rule a discussion or motion to be "out of order," meaning it is not germane to the purview of the body. If the President rules a motion or discussion "out of order with prejudice," it means the item cannot be revisited.

The body may challenge such a ruling with a motion that, if seconded, can be voted on. If the motion passes, the ruling is overturned.

4. The President may invite others attending the meeting to address one or more issues, if the President deems that person to have information particularly relevant to the issue at hand.

APPENDIX II: Faculty Hiring Committees, Spring 2014

English (President approved, winter break)

Daniel Keller, Faculty (Chair)

Teeka James, Faculty

Jon Kitamura, Faculty

Kathleen Steele, Faculty

James Carranza, Dean

Counseling (President approved, winter break)

Kevin Sinarle, Faculty

Kathleen Sammut, Faculty (Chair)

Ruth Turner, Faculty

Mike Mitchell, Transfer Program Supervisor, Classified

Marsha Ramezane, Dean

Librarian (for 1/28 GC approval)

Teresa Morris, Faculty (Chair)

Laura Demsetz, Faculty

Martha Menendez, Library Support Specialist, Classified

Tom Hewitt, Discipline Expert, Skyline College

John Boggs, Peninsula Library System

Lorrita Ford, Director of Library and Learning Services