

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

December 9, 2014

2:30pm – 4:30

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	David Laderman
Vice President	Theresa Martin
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary	Kristi Ridgway
Creative Arts/Social Science	Steven Lehigh
Creative Arts / Social Science	Michele Titus
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Language Arts	Kathleen Steele
Library	Stephanie Roach
Math/Science	Santiago Perez
Math/Science	Carlene Tonini-Boutacoff
Math/Science	Steve Gonzales
Physical Education / Athletics	Joe Mangan
Student Services	Martin Bednarek
Student Services	Kathy Sammut-absent

OTHERS ATTENDING

James Roe, student rep.
Teresa Morris, Library
Catherine Firpo, CSM Cares

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of the Agenda and Draft Minutes, Nov. 25, 2014

Agenda: David proposed deleting two Discussion Items, a & b, because the speakers are absent. Martin made a motion to approve the agenda as amended; Tim seconded the motion. The motion carried with no objections or abstentions.

Minutes: A suggestion was made to clarify which session for FLEX Day was cancelled: only Outlook for PC Users. Rosemary made a motion to approve the minutes as amended; Michele seconded the motion. The motion carried with no objections; Steven Lehigh and Kathy abstained because they were not present at the last meeting.

2. Public Comment

Catherine Firpo from CSM Cares came to announce a FLEX Day Activity on Jan. 20, the showing of "Facing Fear." She is asking for RSVPs because they are expecting a full theater. Both the filmmaker and the two actors in the film will be present. See flyer and information sheet. Sponsored by DIAG, Gay Straight Alliance, CSM Cares and Vending Funds. There is no other event at the same time to compete with this on FLEX Day.

David's announcements: 1) The Holiday reception is Thurs., 1-3 pm, Student Life Center. 2) He invited faculty and staff to the Honors Project Final Forum Presentations, mostly video presentations and Q&A, on Fri. 3pm in College Heights (4th floor, Bldg 10). 3) The new issue of the Labyrinth, formerly a newsletter but now a sampler academic journal format, is available and will be distributed soon. In the Spring, it will be expanded by those involved with the Writer's Project, including a lot of the Honors Project students. The PDF is already posted on the Honors Project website. Stephanie suggested that the periodical be available in the library, and David will follow up. 4) David requested that Michele, Steve, Santiago and Kathy and Kathleen send David a head shot for the Website.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. ASCSM Update, James Roe newly-appointed student senator

- a. James reported on the last senate meeting, which reviewed successful semester activities, including nighttime events, volunteer work. He was happy to report that this semester there were more clubs and increased student involvement.

2. President's Report

- a. DPGC update

David advised the Council that we will be looking at some board policies for the next meeting.

- b. DAS Update

David said that Kathy Blackwood discussed the Reserve Policy, which was rejected by Canada. She said her goal is to get 15% total reserve, but David said that it is still not clear why the proposal allows for a potential maximum of 30%. Faculty expressed concern about this. David will get clarification on why the policy, as written, has the potential for 30%.

Highlights from the meeting: 1) Kathy authored the policy; there is none now. Based on comments from senate presidents at DAS, Kathy will write a procedure to accompany the policy, specifying the details and restrictions of implementation. Regularly, the ending General Fund balance is approximately 15% of annual budget, and only 5-7% of this is available for reserve. She wants to supplement to really have 15%. 2) Best Practice = no less than two months in reserve. 3) There were questions about “working capital” category, which is to be used to fill the gap when state money is not paid out between July-Nov. 4) Enrollment can affect FTES and therefore the budget.

David proposed: 1) Make language more explicit: Restricting increasing the reserve to increases in revenue; only increased if there’s a matching increase in how much the district is getting. (Aligned) 2) Include more concrete language about increasing the reserve amount within the range. We want it articulated in writing to demonstrate the discrepancy between her desire to have 15-17% and why the three categories.

Carlene asked about the timing of implementation. Kathy said the plan is to fund the increase over a 5 year-period. The Council discussed the timing of the funding and how discretionary funds are spent.

Questions raised by Council members: What has the policy/practice been for reserve and capital funding? How often have they had to go in and take from it? If they have had to go in regularly, it is suggested that these funds be introduced into the operating budget. Is it a categorical issue that restricts use of reserve funds? Why is this happening now? Are there cuts being made to other areas to fund this reserve, or is this extra funding that goes into the fund? What happens if the following year, the budget is less? Faculty are concerned that programs or instruction could be cut because this new policy is mandated. What happens to the money made on investments?

Other news: The Board Policy for screening, equivalency and hiring procedures were discussed and are being drafted for review in the Spring. The local minimum qualifications for Psychology and Reading have been eliminated; faculty thought they were too restrictive. David will be sharing the Study Abroad oversight committee bylaws with the Council next semester. A new position, International Education Director to be located at Skyline, is coming in Spring.

Resolutions coming forward: proposal to separate funding for sabbaticals from the general professional development fund; assessing part-time faculty salaries to pay into the AFT13 Prof Development Fund since adjuncts also use the funds; have the state help rectify the discrepancy between part- and full-time compensation (which the Board has already approved).

c. Program Review update

New Instructional SLO Program Review questions have already been approved. SLO Assessment Language for the Learning Centers and the Student Services areas has been drafted (see attached). The Council has been asked for comments. Kristi, Co-lead for LSC3, has not seen the proposed language yet, nor have the Learning Center faculty leads, so she asked that proper vetting take place with faculty before the Learning Centers language is adopted. Aside from this issue of process, the Council members thought that the language was agreeable. David will take this back to the Deans.

d. IPC update

Items on the agenda tomorrow, 2-3pm: 1) Milla will report on the Compendium of Committees and Committee practices (participatory governance); 2) update on the withdrawal survey (see later item on today's agenda); 3) Kathy Blackwood will report on the Resource Allocation Model; 4) Rick Vorhees, consultant, will speak about the data informing the new District Strategic Plan. The New Faculty Institute Meeting, which was scheduled at the same time, was cancelled to allow faculty to attend the Strategic Planning Meeting.

3. Standing Committee Reports

a. Committee on Instruction - *Teresa Morris, Chair*

No report.

b. Library Advisory Committee - *Teresa Morris, Co-Chair*

Co-chair is Roberta Reynolds.

c. Learning Support Centers Coordination Committee – *Kristi Ridgway, Co-Chair*

Kristi reported that Sandra Comerford, VPI, came to the last LSC3 meeting to announce that she is investigating whether TBA could be eliminated, and if and how this may affect funding and LOAD. She said that it appears that funding would not be much affected, but LOAD could be. She is doing more research and will return to the LSC3 in the Spring with more information and discuss this further.

Kathleen Steele mentioned that Centers and Labs coordinators are concerned, especially regarding how the formula for funding Centers (staff, faculty FLCs, etc.) will be determined if the state TBA formula disappears.

Faculty have expressed concern that this seems like a top-down process and should, instead, be faculty-driven. One faculty member, specifically, spoke to David about this as a 10+1 issue -- that the discussion should have been initiated through Academic Senate and Faculty, so he will be following up on this. Teresa reminded the Council that TBA is attached to Course Outlines/courses, and therefore any curricular change of this sort can only be initiated by faculty.

d. College Assessment Committee -- *Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Interim Chair*

No report.

III. Discussion Items

a. CSM Withdrawal Survey

David presented the draft of the Student Withdrawal Survey for discussion. Questions raised: Could questions 2 & 3 be combined? Is this anonymous? Is this linked to student G#s record? Is it an administrative drop (an instructor drops them) or student-initiated drop? Question #2 wording (that indicates two choices) does not seem to match the three responses given below it. Could we add to Question #1: Are we losing them to Canada or Skyline? Kathy suggested adding an offer for help at the bottom: "If you would like to discuss anything regarding your experience with this course or at CSM, please contact xxx." Question #1: Can this be shortened? Long surveys may not get any response. Could Question #11 be moved to after Question#2? What is "withdrawal" – anything after census? What about introducing something that says something about financial aid status? What happens if in an "Other" field, name, such as a faculty member, for example, shows up? Is it redacted? What actions can you take with the answers? Does the course live up to my expectations – is this a course or professor question? What is the return rate and action from the online student withdrawal survey? Who will see the results? Can it be shared with faculty with respect to a particular course? E-mail additional questions/concerns to David.

b. Establishing AS scholarships:

David spoke with Stephani Scott and mentioned that the Council is debating whether to host the scholarship with the foundation or not. She reminded David that there is a lot of work, and the foundation already functions to do this, so it would make it a lot easier to have them handle it.

Carlene has worked with the foundation before. She brought up that we could start it in-house and as it grows, move it to the foundation. Math/Science has run scholarships without the foundation before. The foundation would allow students to participate in the CSM Scholarship Awards Ceremony. According to

the schedule, we would have to wait to work with the foundation. Do we give scholarships out once or twice a year? Can they be awarded twice a year but participate in the ceremony once a year?

The Council debated various approaches. What about fewer but larger scholarship amounts? Maybe a middle ground? Should faculty nominate rather than take applications to recognize “unsung heroes” (ex: volunteers in the lab, SI students, student government)? If the amount is larger, it might get more attention. Carlene would rather use it to honor more students that don’t get attention. She thinks that we are going to get more students taking on leadership roles, and we need to help motivate them to get involved. James said that the wider the net you cast, the more students you can recognize. Others asked: What about silent students that aren’t already in things like SI? What about students who are dedicated to learning and working but not involved because they can’t be due to their obligations? Shouldn’t GPA be put voluntarily by a student on an application, not looked up by a dean? What is the purpose of the scholarship? Academic? Service? What about two different but related scholarships? One scholar/service, and one honoring dedication/character/learning with “heart?” What about rotating our area of initiative, one year Project Change, one year Honors, etc? What about the AGS model, which has three awards: 1) service, 2) academics, 2) crown: combines the two?

David said that in early spring the Council needs to start the marketing campaign to get faculty to contribute. The foundation can help with marketing. We could ask at the faculty service awards: Would you rather have a gift or donate to the scholarship fund? We pay union dues, what about the union contributing? What about the asking for donations for pointsettias?

Rosemary advocated for doing something small in the spring to get it going and we can always change it in the future. David suggested that we start with the foundation to get it going in spring. This discussion will be continued.

The Council thanked Joe for his service. Larry will replace him on the Council next semester.

c. January Flex Planning – cont.

Theresa announced the draft schedule for Jan. 20 & 21. Programming is on both days, including Facing Fear film, All College Forum on GE SLOs, First Year Initiative Kick-off. Each morning there are breakout sessions: Be a New Student Experience and Enrollment Process First Hand, Umoja Student Panel, WebAccess 2.4 Training, and a MakerSpace Activity. Other activities will still be added. See draft. Theresa asked: Could ASGC sponsor a continental breakfast each day? The Council agreed to ask AFT to sponsor one day, and the Council will agree to do the other.

David asked what the Council prefers: One session without choice for everyone vs. multiple choices? The majority preferred multiple choices.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35pm.
Date and time of next meeting: Tues., Jan. 27.