

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

September 8, 2015

2:30 – 4:30 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	David Laderman
Vice President	Kathleen Sammut
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary	Vincent Li
Creative Arts/Social Science	Steven Lehigh
Creative Arts / Social Science	Michele Titus
Language Arts	Jon Kitamura (Absent)
Language Arts	Kathleen Steele
Library	Stephanie Roach
Math/Science	Santiago Perez
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales
Physical Education / Athletics	Larry Owens (Absent)
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin

OTHERS ATTENDING

Sandra Comerford, Vice President of Instruction
Charlene Frontiera, Math/Science
Sennai Kaffl, student representative
Dan Kaplan, AFT
David Locke, Math/Science
Theresa Martin, Math/Science
Jamillah Moore, Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Planning

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of the Agenda and Draft Minutes, August 25, 2015

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

David proposed changes to initial agenda to move discussion item b (SLO Handbook draft) to next meeting, and replace it with the President's Report item e (Diversity and faculty hiring/tenure committees) as the new discussion item b.

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve, Stephanie Roach seconded. All in favor, agenda approved.

Minutes: Approval of August 25, 2015 minutes tabled for next meeting as there are corrections. Additional corrections will be provided to Vincent prior to next meeting.

2. Public Comment (2 minutes per)

Rosemary asked if the GC could write some letter of support for the CCSF faculty with regard to their struggle for fair compensation, and if it can be moved to an item of discussion for a later meeting. David said yes.

Dan Kaplan responded that the AFT will be meeting tomorrow (September 9, 2015) at CSM to support CCSF by passing resolution to support the granting of full accreditation to the college.

Theresa Martin stated that the DIAG committee met today and they have been put in charge of revising our student equity plan. The committee is working on a new draft plan that is expected to come to the Academic Senate in early October; we will be asked to provide our input on it.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. President's Report

a. IPC update

David said the IPC had a meeting last Friday (September 4, 2015) and he will bring forth the main points. They discussed the game plan for the themes and trend feedback loop. They revised the program review theme questions to make it less cumbersome and they also received feedback from the deans. They asked the deans to distribute the questions to the program review authors. The program review authors will return their theme responses to their deans and forward to IPC for review/discussion and incorporate into the planning process. David reminded GC

that the theme/trend questions were faculty driven, part of the dynamic dialog between us doing the program review and it being read and acted upon at IPC.

Towards the end of the meeting, an idea was brought up in relation to accreditation that all committees on campus at the end of spring semester complete some short form about goals at the start of the year, noting which were achieved and what assessment was done. IPC is still discussing this and David will keep us posted on this topic. He gave an example: goals of last year for AS and most of them were achieved and some are still ongoing.

b. Program Review

David went over the process – at IPC they wanted to come up with a system for alternating submission every other year and possibly move the submission date closer to the data, either early spring or late fall. They talked about changing from the submission date from March 25 to an earlier date. There was a lot of interest in doing it but it will not be effective for this next cycle. The submission date for the next cycle will remain at March 25th. There will be further discussions to move the submission date closer to the data for the following cycle. David Locke chimed in that the rotations will begin this year with half of the submissions in Fall semester and the other half in the Spring semester. Deans from each division in consultation with faculty will decide on how to divide PR submission in half based on issues within each division – who will submit which year, which should be half and half. It is an ongoing process and there will be many more meetings. Kathleen Steele said it is important that faculty be consulted in division as it has huge impact on workload. She also asked about the equipment and position requests, and also how does a division submit responses to improve on the form. David said to submit changes to him for the program review, equipment and position form. When David was at a program review meeting, Deans came forth and said they needed to discuss changes with faculty within their division and how to make it work for all programs. David Locke discussed that programs linked to the Learning Center may want to do the program review in the same year and this will need to be reviewed with Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza and in conjunction with the deans. David said the goal is to get the system in place as soon as possible and bring drafts to GC and IPC. Another meeting will happen this Thursday (September 10, 2015). There was a suggestion that the themes question be put at the end of program review.

c. District Strategic Plan

David said that district participatory governance meeting is happening on Monday (September 21, 2015), a day before our AS meeting on September 22, 2015. He asked the AS to review the document and provide David with any feedback prior to the meeting. David summarized the plan to 5 pages. It is an information item here.

David presented his “take” on it and went on to describe the content of the 5 pages. He went over the 4 main goals of the strategic plan – a reflection of his reading and discussions with other faculty. 1st paragraph discusses equity and social justice for our students and college, which is not discussed in the 90 pages. He also felt it was important that the definition of student success has some minimal recognition of students for other kinds of success, for community and other activities that should be acknowledged here. With regards to the 1st goal, there was language to the effect of eliminating certain programs; he did not feel comfortable about using the word “eliminate” so upfront. He plans to bring this up again in the next discussion. Regarding the 3rd goal, there was a term “digital natives” that appeared to indicate students are tech savvy, which is not true for many students in CSM. A question was raised on the meaning and relevance of “online retailers” as a model for education delivery.

d. DIAG events, co-sponsorship

David said that the DIAG has requested AS support by co-sponsoring several events:
September 18, 2015 - For Hispanic Heritage month, Dolores Huerta has been invited to speak about the rights of farmworkers and women
October 1, 2015 - For LGBTQ history month, there will be a documentary, “Letter to Anita” by Dr Ronnie Sanlow
October 15, 2015 - For LGBTQ there is a repeat screening of “Facing Fear”, which Catherine Firpo referred to at the last meeting.

No funds involved and no volunteers are required by AS. They just need an endorsement of AS. Basic skills is co-sponsoring these. Kathleen Steele stated that support of these events goes in line with support for student equity.

e. Professional Development funding

David said there was a mis-communication with regards to the CAE minutes that there will be no more funding, which is not accurate. He has been told that there is still opportunity for professional development funding for the CAE fund. Over next month, we will get more concrete word about CAE professional development funding. Dan asked why last year there was promised a big sum of funding, and what happened with that. At this time, David does not know the answer and will get the updates. Stephanie Roach asked if the allocation is from a revenue stream that is not fixed every year. David said yes, it is partly coming from facilities rental and parking lot rental, which are unstable sources. David said we will “keep our teeth in the issue”.

2. ASCSM Update, Sennai Kaffl, President, ASCSM

ASCSM has approved a \$5,000 petition to maintain the presence of the mental health tutors, which another \$5,000 was given half last semester. They train students to be able to talk to other students who may have depression and mental issues. They are not counselors but peers and are more to help direct students to the appropriate resource. There are paid trained counselors through CSM CARES. Kathleen Steele said peer tutors gave a good presentation in her class and they were very approachable. Sennai suggested we talk to Tim Exner, a student assistant, at building 17 and is the lead peer tutor and mediates/controls the whole situation.

Last week on Tues-Thus, 10-2pm they had Welcome Week. They handed out pizzas on first day and also gave away canteens, staplers, pens, notebooks and car chargers. This is part of their meeting their goal to increase student activism and involvement in clubs. For all the various committees we have, ASCSM has appointed student senators as liaisons between the student government and committees.

Stephanie Roach asked who the student senators are. Sennai has a list and asked us to email him at sennaikaffl@my.smccd.edu.

3. Standing Committee Reports

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

No report.

b. Library Advisory Committee, *Stephanie Roach, Co-Chair*

They will be having their first meeting tomorrow (September 9, 2015).

c. Learning Support Centers Coordination Committee, *Ron Andrade, Co-Chair*

Kathleen Steele said they had a meeting last week and talked about whether the committee should be AS committee or an institutional committee. The labs report to two different deans and Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza made it clear what areas which dean was responsible for. They came to the conclusion to take it slowly and have ongoing discussion whether to stay as AS committee or an institutional committee. If it is AS committee, they will need a representative from each division, which doesn't work well since not all divisions have support centers. David said the committee established some new co-chairs: Ron Andrade and two faculty members, Kate Motoyama in fall and Yaping Li in spring. The split classified chair and faculty chair reflects the identity of the committee.

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

No report.

e. Center for Academic Excellence Committee, *Theresa Martin, Chair*

Committee has not met since last AS meeting. Meetings are on 4th Monday of each month.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Introducing Jamillah Moore, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Planning

Sandra introduced Jamillah Moore, interim Vice Chancellor; they both thought it a good idea for her to meet AS. Jamillah shared what she is working on:

Her office is at the district room 212, she started on July 13th.

She is tasked with assisting in implementation of the new strategic plan. She has extracted certain parts of the strategic plan for discussion. The strategic plan was written based on the existing plans at each college, student success plans, and student equity plans. She agreed that “social justice” is treated broadly in the current draft plan. Her approach is to enhance and support the plan by identifying as many of the programs as possible. Her plan is to work with VP Student Services and VP Instruction on some of programs. She related that her personal experience has helped her with this position: she has several years teaching experience, as well as administrative experience. She handed out a document with 12 pages that talked about the four goals and she went over the document. There is a need to increase program delivery option. Goal is to connect the programs with the strategic plan. She is reviewing the plan and wishes to continue dialogue with AS. She highlighted that the Board of Trustees are not trying to make decisions on items with which they are not familiar. She is open to suggestions and feedback.

David asked if Kathy Blackwood is in a rush to approve the plan. She explained that the allocation model is connected to funding which is part of the reason for the urgency. Once they can get to the operational portion after initial approval, then they have more time for feedback. She said there is a need for a district wide researcher for grants, international students – there is some money available for it. Kathleen Steele said it is nice to know that Jamillah has a teaching background and wants to strengthen ties between the college and district. Dan Kaplan asked about her background prior to coming to this position. Dan also asked who were the principal authors of the strategic plan, which she said she did not know but will find out. Rosemary asked Jamillah to comment on goals for distance education and consolidation of online programs. Jamillah said they are in the early stages of discussion in this area and there is no decision at this time.

b. Diversity and faculty hiring/tenure committee

David sent email with questions about consent calendar and diversity committee issue and goals. He received 5-6 responses. All were in favor of pursuing a consent calendar. David will pursue how to do it if AS interested.

Regarding the diversity issue, the emailed responses were split, some in favor, some against, some unsure. David will be at the dean’s meeting to share concerns about tenure/hiring committees and more diversity in committees. He will present two ideas, based on the last GC discussion:

- i. having some form or method for documenting the formation of each committee and how diverse it is;
- ii. going outside of divisions to make committees more diverse. He received 2 yes, 2 no, 2 maybe. Thus this needs more discussion. Rosemary said it is not

practical due to limited manpower. Theresa Martin raised the issue about operational definition of diversity. What is district definition of diversity? Santiago asked about including people from other campuses, which David suggested would be very difficult and unrealistic. Stephanie Roach said her tenure committee includes people from other divisions, and even some off campus. Kathy Sammut supports diversity from another discipline to have cross communication and technique sharing. Her concern regarding the consent calendar is an item may appear to be a small issue, but is actually a big, important issue. David said consent calendar puts more responsibility on GC to look at what's on the consent calendar. Steve Gonzales shared that tenure committee input should be to help the faculty become a better teacher. Steve Lehigh shared about his hiring/tenure committee and asked if the committees were usually made up from all disciplines within the division, or more cross pollination between disciplines. Kathleen Steele said the hiring committee should be different from tenure; e.g., for tenure committees, the focus should be training them to be good teachers. David Locke said committees have changed from 3 persons to 4 persons. David Laderman asked if he should be going to deans to suggest that at least 3 persons should be within the department or division for tenure committee, and going outside the division for the fourth faculty member, with diversity in mind. Most GC members seemed to agree with this approach, at least to start.

c. ASGC Goals for 15-16

David reviewed the draft GC goals. First we reviewed the primary and secondary goals from last year. He started a draft list of goals for this year, which was sent out via email for input and commentary. He emphasized that the primary goals should be easy to achieve -- they should be short term and manageable:

1. Establish a 2nd scholarship
2. Work with ASLT division on getting the funding process to finalize it more
3. Further revising and improving program review
4. Three Academic Senate subcommittees are rebooting, redefining and refocusing.
5. Establishing tribute event for CTE completers

Some GC members suggested secondary goals be related to student equity, coordination and collaboration between faculty and student services. David could wordsmith secondary goals. Theresa Martin clarified that one of goals of CAE could be in line with AS. Rosemary suggested moving secondary goal #4, on DE and the OEI, to be a primary goal. Santiago suggested goals should have more tangible outcomes. David suggested a goal having our people keep tabs of the OEI progress. David will incorporate all suggestions, redraft the goals, and bring them back as an action item, for any further discussion, word-smithing, and hopefully approval.

Meeting adjourned at 4:27pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, September 22, 2015.

Minutes prepared by Vincent Li, with assistance from David Laderman

Appendix

Primary Goals (14-15)

1. Establish Center for Academic Excellence as permanent Academic Senate committee. [done]
2. Work with the division of Academic Support and Learning Technologies to establish professional development proposal and funding process. [ongoing]
3. Further revise and improve program review. [done;ongoing]
4. Establish Academic Senate student scholarships. [done]

Secondary Goals

1. Through forums, workshops and other activities, support instructional disciplines, student services and learning communities working together for student success.
2. Work with the division of Academic Support and Learning Technologies to revitalize the College Assessment Committee and facilitate meaningful faculty SLO assessment.
3. Work toward increasing faculty participation in college-wide initiatives and programs.

Primary Goals (15-16)

1. Establish second Academic Senate student scholarship (community service).
2. Work with the division of Academic Support and Learning Technologies to establish professional development proposal and funding process.
3. Further revise and improve program review.
4. Redefine and refocus LSC3, CAC and LAC committees.
5. Move toward establishing CTE Certificate completion event.

Secondary Goals

1. Through forums, workshops and other activities, support instructional disciplines, student services and learning communities working together for student success. [lose this? Too vague?]
2. Work toward increasing more broad and diverse faculty participation, while addressing fair compensation, in college-wide committees and initiatives.
3. Explore and support professional development opportunities for faculty, in collaboration with other college staff.
4. Critically investigate and research the OEI initiative, and make efforts to ensure Distance Education is pedagogically sound and substantial.