

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

February 10, 2015

2:30 – 4:30 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

OTHERS ATTENDING

Maggie Garcia, student rep.
Charlene Frontiera
Sandra Stephani Comerford
Diana Bennett, District Academic Senate President
Johns Sewart, PRIE office

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of the Agenda and Draft Minutes, Dec. 9, 2014

Agenda: 2:35 PM David called meeting to order, approval of agenda and draft minutes:

David requested Discussion Item C, since no new draft ready, to be struck from discussion items, amendment to agenda.

Motion to approve, seconded, amended agenda approved.

Minutes: David has some minor revisions from guests at the last meeting. Kathy Sammut requested a comment attributed to her be struck. Steve Gonzalez clarified his division association was incorrect. Rosemary moved to approve, Steve seconded. All in favor, motion passed.

2. Public Comment

Theresa announced travel funding is coming for faculty, short -term professional development.

David reported that Roberta Reynolds offered a deal on a Keurig coffee machine. It was pointed out that there are already two coffee makers in the kitchen so we gratefully decline.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. ASCSM Update, Maggie

- a. Valentine's Day event is happening with give-aways, etc.

2. President's Report

- a. IPC Report – IPC is working on the course withdrawal survey. “Course Withdrawal Survey” was recommended as a name, instead of just “withdrawal,” Kathy Blackwood was to make a report on the Reserve Board policy, but could not attend. Our Senate Faculty gave good feedback on the Course W survey. Jan and Mike spoke about the hiring of classified positions. We don't have much extra money to hire new classified. They want to make the budget process more transparent, they will work with IPC to show how decisions are made about spending. Another item discussed was interest in scaling back the printed course schedule to just basic class information, a simple pamphlet, in order to save money and be able to print later for better accuracy, and less effort. Steven suggested just eliminating paper version. Kathleen was concerned that this could restrict access to students without a computer. Discussion followed about equity and access. Maggie stated that students have spoken about wanting some

kind of printed schedule. Kathy Sammut mentioned that counseling helps many students navigate the registration process online. Tim mentioned that the printing costs would get shifted to students if the schedule were 100% online, meaning they would have to print the PDF. David clarified that some PDF's would be printed by the college, for distribution to students.

b. District Participatory Governance

At the most recent meeting, the committee discussed Board policies, some of which will be looked at today. David will present these and other noncontroversial items as action items. He mentioned that today we also vote on new hiring committees.

c. DAS update

Board retreat happened – discussing strategic plan, Board goals, professional development, etc.

A new Faculty Screening Procedure is coming from district and the Board. It will include new information about equivalency.

d. Study Abroad by-laws

David passed these out as as an information item (as advised by the DAS president), to take a look. If there are any concerns, let him know.

3. Standing Committee Reports

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

Not here

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

Not here

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

Ron is also co-chair, and he reported that the most recent meeting LSC3 agreed on best practices. These are very broad. They are on the website under the meeting minutes. There is no Feb. meeting, and the first meeting in March will focus on program review.

d. College Assessment Committee -- *Madeleine Murphy, Chair*

David reported that Madeleine Murphy is the new Chair. Their first meeting is next week. She will come when there is something to report.

III. Action Items

- a. Board Policies 1.35, 2.29, 6.87, 8.80. Rosemary moved, Kathleen seconded, all in favor
- b. Hiring Committees - History, Counselor (2 positions), Learning Disabilities Specialist hiring committee lists were distributed. Rosemary moved to approve the committees, Steven Lehigh seconded. All in favor, motion passed. *See list:*

History

Kevin Henson (Dean)

Jim Robertson

Frederick Gaines

Laura Demsetz

Counselor (2 positions)

Sylvia Aguirre-Alberto

Lorena Gonzalez

Kathleen Sammut

Marsha Ramezane (Dean)

Learning Disability Specialist

Krystal Romero

Kevin Sinarle

Lynne Douglas

Laura Skaff

Marsha Ramezane (Dean)

- c. AS Scholarship – An Agreement between Fund Donor (Academic Senate) and the SMCCCD Foundation has been set up. AS needs to approve the agreement in order to fund the scholarships. Carlene said that we still need to decide how to do the selection. David said we can get a pre-screened list of applicants to select from. An AS task force would select four scholars from list. Tim asked about the criterion for the scholarship being a role in academic support on campus. He said that he advises

the AGS club on campus, and they do academic support in ways different from the listed criteria. Is there room for these students in this scholarship? His students participate in Student Success Day, and other events. Rosemary said that Kathy Sammut also had spoken about expanding the scholarship to students who do other community service besides academic support. David responded by saying that this opens up the pool to all clubs, who could claim they engage student academic support, and many of these already have club scholarships. He also emphasized that we had an interest in supporting and rewarding students that do community service, and that we had discussed a second reward program for those other students who may not fall in the category of meeting the AS scholarship requirements. Discussion followed about criteria limits being too narrow, and wanting to support a broader pool of candidates. Kathy Sammut wants to see scholarships in general be promoted by faculty, so that more students know about it. Suggestions for amendments to the criteria were made. However, the basic gist of awarding students who work in some way on campus to promote student success, remains the criteria. For now. We can always modify in the future.

Rosemary moved to approve the AS scholarship agreement, Santiago seconded, one abstention, Kathy Sammut. Motion passed.

David wrapped up by stating that AS will follow up with a community service award and more promotion of the scholarship to potential donors and students.

III. Discussion Items

a. Program Review, data collection/assessment (John Sewart) (20 min)

Santiago asked about how faculty should respond to program review prompts asking about conclusions from data, when some of the data quality is insufficient. John explained that previously program SLO assessment used only a voluntary survey, and those data sets may have small response numbers. However last semester we aligned course SLO's to program SLO's, so that we can have another mode of assessment of program SLO's by looking at the assessment for course SLO's that align to the program SLO's. The surveys go to degree and certificate earnings. These are voluntary, and sent as they register to get the degree. This data is illustrative and informative, but not of high value, but it's all we have. Colleges across the state are grappling with this. John could include a cautionary note with this data. Discussion followed: The pool of survey responders is self-selected, so the meaning of the data is limited. Overall completion rate of the survey is 20-25%. Now we have an additional source of quantitative data by looking at the course SLO's that are mapped to program SLOs. Multiple modes of assessment are required by ACCJC. About 2500 students get certificates or degrees. Steven Lehigh asked how to know if the data is statistically significant or not. John suggested the following rule of thumb – any cell size (n) less than 50, the data is not reliable for making conclusions. Do not use the data. More discussion: This is good to know when looking at success of students disaggregated by demographics. For the aligned course SLO's to

program SLOs: each SLO success rate methodology may be different. So that makes it difficult or even impossible to draw conclusions for program SLO's. Rosemary pointed out that the program review and SLO data is supposed to inform planning efforts for the college. John responded that the data is used to inform faculty and programs. The college can interpret the data and use it as a piece of evidence to help planning efforts. Discussion followed about purpose and process. The number of variables that go into a student's success is high and we don't measure all of those variables.

- b. Course Withdrawal - struck from agenda

- c. TBA student contact hours (Sandra Comerford)

Sandra and Charlene came in to talk about the issues around TBA – To Be Arranged student contact hours. Sandra explained TBA is an extra hour assigned to students each week for a course (all sections), under supervision of the instructor, a total of 16 hours per semester. Title V says the work must be evaluated. Current departments with TBA courses include Math, English, ESL, and others. TBA hours and procedures for each course are described in course outlines. Sandra stated that she would like to keep TBA or remove it. The reporting requirements and paperwork accompanying TBA hours is quite onerous. If faculty choose to remove TBA from their course(s), Sandra's office will take care of it, so faculty doesn't have to. However she noted that if TBA is removed from courses supported by Labs or Centers, the pay for faculty who staff the Lab or Center will also be removed. If TBA is kept, faculty will need to supply documentation of TBA's for the auditors. Auditors want to know which students have attended TBA before census. Anything less than 100% attendance has negative consequences: we lose money from the state. The TBA requirement must be stated on each course syllabus. Official course outlines with TBA must be reviewed to be sure they support the current standard of information about the TBAs. When a course has TBA it improves the LOAD for the course. Large departments can absorb the impact of losing TBAs. Small departments will see a larger reduction in LOAD. FTES is also impacted. TBA must be face-to-face, but if there are face-to-face and online sections, we can only claim TBA hours for the face-to-face sections.

Kathleen Steele submitted that the English Writing Center does not want to get rid of TBA. The center is a huge support center for its students, with faculty directly helping students. When asked about faculty reporting requirements, Sandra stated that her office needs to know which students from the roll sheet have NOT attended.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

Date and time of next meeting: Tues., Feb 24, 2015.