

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

September 22, 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
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

Laura Demsetz, Creative Arts and Social Science
Charlene Frontiera, Math/Science
Jennifer Hughes, Vice President of Student Services
Teresa Morris, Library
Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Academic Support and Learning Technologies
Andreas Wolf, Kinesiology, Athletics and Dance

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of the Agenda and Draft Minutes, August 25, 2015 & September 8, 2015

Agenda: 2:34 PM David Laderman called meeting to order, approval of agenda and draft minutes:

David proposed changes to initial agenda to add to President's Report "item a" to include a DPGC update to the DAS update. Madeleine Murphy could not be present and thus we will postpone discussion "item c" (SLO handbook draft) to a later meeting. He also proposed that if we had time, we can include the "open forum discussion" in the discussion items. For the discussion items at the next meeting, we will have a special guest from Skyline College to talk about adult education, thus he will likely be postponing the "internationalizing the campus culture" discussion to a later meeting. Rosemary inquired if the speaker will be relating the discussion to the international students that we have currently enrolled in the district. She was also curious about the statistics of the international students if they resulted in more classes and faculty added. David said yes, and also took the opportunity to remind all that the next GC meeting (October 13, 2015) is three weeks and not two weeks from today (September 22, 2015).

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

Minutes: August 25, 2015 Rosemary moved to approve, Stephanie seconded. All in favor, minutes approved.

September 8, 2015 Rosemary moved to approve, Jackie seconded. All in favor, minutes approved.

2. Public Comment (2 minutes per)

Stephanie said next week is "banned books" week and the library will be displaying "banned books" and helping people take book face selfies. She then explained how book face selfies is done. She brought flyers for all to pass around in departments. Starting next Tuesday (September 29, 2015), they will be featuring wearable electronics e.g., using EL wires to hook it to a costume. They will also have a 3D printer going.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. President's Report

a. DAS update

David said DAS met last Monday (September 14, 2015) and he highlighted a forum to be held on October 16, 2015 at 1pm in the district office about the online education initiative and Canvas (CMS - Course Management System) -- more information going out soon. Distance education team would like to have more discussions with faculty and get more in depth with the OEI initiative, which relates to one of our AS goals, to be discussed shortly. David continued that we can adopt

Canvas but do not have to be part of OEI. David repeated what Jamillah Moore said at the meeting that “the train has already left the station and we are not on that train.” David said that, nevertheless, there seem to be many advantages to Canvas and that there is the timeline for getting Canvas for free but it involves a whole transition.

DAS reported AFT is still working on the sabbatical resolution, and revisions to other district procedures and policies, an ongoing process. This ties in to district participatory meeting where there are some board policies for which the district is soliciting feedback from the local academic senate. David will send us documents to have us review the policies and will provide some explanation and context. To comply with the Brown Act, David asked that we reply directly to him with any questions and concerns. An example of one of the policies is curriculum development policy, which David rewrote to make it more clear how curriculum development should occur between the colleges in the district in terms of communication and collaboration. Other policies involve equivalency and distance education contact hours to satisfy accreditation requirements.

At the district governance meeting yesterday, David said the district is moving forward with the new ID cards and showed us an example. Teeka James and David have written a letter to all faculty that will go out in a couple of days, emphasizing that this is happening and they will start taking photos as this will roll out in Spring. If you have any concerns about the cards and room access, he said they seem open to pursuing letting us keep the fob and/or to get an ID card to fit keychains -- please let them (district) know. District (facilities and human resources) (Eugene Whitlock) needs to hear from faculty. Why are we having this? We did receive two emails from Eugene Whitlock regarding these new ID cards that elaborated on the change of the ID cards. The district’s rationale includes: they get calls very often to let people into rooms, and ID would help; and there have been instances of faculty loaning out fobs; also, in a disaster, it helps with identification. The district also says this helps build a sense of community. David said there are pros and cons with these new ID cards. Kathleen Steele asked if ID card shows you are teacher or faculty for educator discounts. David believes it will show the identification of the place of employment and recommended contacting Eugene re smaller ID. Wendy Whyte says you don’t need photo ID to obtain AFT discount. Steve Gonzales said the small IDs can break easily and more people have lost them, whereas the bigger IDs are sturdier. Kathleen Sammut inquired about the actual size.

Kathy Blackwood at the district meeting said that the Strategic Plan is moving forward.

b. CASS dean hire committee

David said committee does not need AS approval. Sandra Comerford asked in the spirit of congeniality to share this with AS. Laura Demsetz was hired as the interim

dean of CASS over the summer, and David was notified of the committee make up. They are starting the search for the permanent position.

c. Tenure/hire committees and diversity

David said he went to instructional administrators council meeting with the deans and they had a good discussion. The council suggested that the AS prepare a general statement for recommendation regarding the formation of tenure and hiring committees and defining diversity and we may want to look to Title 5's definition to include in statement. This will not be anything formal or prescriptive but more of something on record with our academic senate. Deans are in favor and would like to make the committees as diverse as possible. There were a lot of discussions about emerging cross discipline and cross college interaction. David conveyed very strongly that we still would like to have discipline experts from within the division as much as possible on the committees, but that there is no law for going out of division in the spirit of diversity. He added that we need to not only address race and ethnicity, but also issues related to professional experience. David said he would start the write up of a draft of the statement and bring it to GC.

d. District budget committee update

David said that Steve Lehigh was there as AFT representative and unofficially as CSM AS faculty representative, doing double duty. Steve began by stating that the total budget grew by 7% even as enrollment numbers are down slightly, which puts us in a relatively positive situation. In terms of his analysis, discussion at the district level is very aggregated and is not campus oriented. So, he does not know how much trickles down to CSM. He was curious about the international students enrollment impact on the budget; however, Kathy said there is no documentation beyond the basic math of the average students' use of the domestic resources. For hiring, it is not treated separately. International students grew by 40% but in total it is still not that big. They are paying full price and help offset some fixed costs. Having more students helps a little to defray the costs. The revenue from these international students is not tracked separately and is just added to the general pot. His take is that hiring is tied more to LOAD ratio. As the student population decreases, the pressure to hire more full-time faculty is less and more duties are allocated to remaining full-time faculty. Direct portion of the budget spent in class is less this year compared to last year in terms of percentage. The student success goal is what they are using as a guide, to allocate budget and funds. There seemed to be urgent interest on the part of GC members to discuss this further, so David said he would make this topic a discussion item at an upcoming meeting, given the current time constraint. Please email Steve with questions.

2. ASCSM Update, Sennai Kaffl, President, ASCSM

No report.

3. Standing Committee Reports

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

No report.

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

Committee had first meeting. The focus was on goals/objectives for the coming year and making sure programs that the library is offering is aligned to what faculty wants. They still need members for the committee.

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

No report.

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

No report.

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

No report.

III. ACTION ITEMS

- a. ASGC Goals for 15-16

David previously emailed GC members revised draft for review and input. He went ahead and presented them for discussion and approval. He emphasized in email that the primary goals are the ones with tangible outcomes that can be fulfilled in a year where secondary goals more general and ongoing. Kathleen Sammut asked about the first secondary goal, why it was secondary even though it was important, to which David responded that there was no tangible outcome for the first secondary goal and it was the spirit of the work we do. There were suggestions to change "secondary" to "ongoing" goals, "values" or "themes." GC settled with "themes." For secondary item #5, Rosemary suggested having an action plan for OEI research, and David said we would develop one as we get more info on OEI, and that we don't need to specify here. David said he will rename the first five as goals and the next two as themes. He will post it on our website, after approval. Rosemary moved to approve and Jackie seconded. All approved.

- b. Tenure committees

There were three tenure committees for approval, from Bus/Tech. One new committee, the other two, changes to the committees. Rosemary moved to approve, Michelle seconded. All approved except for abstention by Steve Gonzales, Rosemary and Vincent, since all three are involved in the tenure committees.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Program Review changes

David started and introduced the proposed changes. Laura Demsetz and David prepared the handouts used for the discussions. David asked Laura, Jennifer Hughes and Andreas Wolf to sit in for this discussion, since they have been very helpful in working through some of the changes we had talking about at the meetings; many faculty including Santiago and David Locke have been at these meetings. David said that GC has already approved to have program review submitted every other year. Resource and faculty position requests can still be submitted every year. General consensus at the PR meetings was that everybody should do the program review at the same time in the same year, and the benefits are listed on the handout. David underscored that we only voted and approved for program review to be submitted every two years—not on the process for that to occur, which we are currently working out. The deans suggested that we all submit the program reviews at same time as it will be easier and more organized, and David liked the idea. The 3rd item was moving PR submission date to fall, which means we do not have to do program review this Spring 2016. The benefit again is that the program review is being submitted closer to the data available and the resource/faculty requests would be more timely. David then turned the discussion over to Laura. Laura said the current program review's timing of requests for equipment and faculty was not as good and related to the current situation. The proposal is to have data by September 1st and program review due by November 1st. We can then get the faculty position requests prioritized for the Spring semester to start the hire search earlier, and closer to the year in question (the year being "reviewed" by the PR). The new proposal would shorten the process by one year – making it more efficient. David reiterated that this will occur every other year. Kathleen Steele thinks it is a good idea for timeliness, except her department is very busy in fall and they would feel overwhelmed. Jon Kitamura said that tenure review and program review will all occur in the fall semester, and asked how important is the PRIE data for decision making, and if it is not critical whether program review can be done in spring. David pointed out that adjunct faculty evaluation happens all year round and tenured faculty reviews occur in the spring. Andreas Wolf responded by saying the PRIE data is used for faculty hiring decisions. He continued that if program review continues to be due in March, then by the time the job announcements go out, we may have lost the opportunity to hire good faculty, who have already taken positions elsewhere. Thus, we are trying have the process started early. Teresa Morris asked how off year requests for equipment and faculty will be made. Laura said it will be the same process, with supplemental info on the request forms. Santiago asked if data for PR now will be for the last two years, and the response was affirmative. Kathleen Sammut recognized that the fall semester will be very busy during the proposed program review November deadline; however, the benefits of hiring quality faculty sooner would outweigh the costs and cited a recent experience in her department that other colleges beat them to the hiring of faculty.

There was more discussion about possible ways to make PR due in fall work for people, either shifting the due date back, or starting earlier on most of the doc the previous spring, etc. Kathleen Steele suggested having a PR work timeline plan. David asked division representatives to go back to division and discuss with them to obtain feedback and we will revisit this topic again at next meeting. David also said that the sooner we can make a decision on the change in submission date, the better. Once the submission timeline is settled, David committed to creating a task force of deans/faculty to change the form further streamlining, simplifying, and shortening it.

b. CTE “completion tribute” event

Jennifer Hughes said the college has always wanted to have a CTE event that recognizes CTE recipients. The issue was the size of gymnasium; they were trying to avoid having to issue tickets limiting the size of family members to attend. Some departments already have own ceremonies for CTE recipients. They are hoping to use the Bayview dining area in same week as commencement, although they don't know how many students/family members will show up. They issue about 1100 CTEs per year but many of them are duplicates as recipients are taking courses leading to as many as four to five certificates. They are open to ideas. Steve Gonzales said a student in his department asked about it, as the student's family did not go college except the student. He thinks not to do it during same week as commencement, perhaps the week before. He feels strongly since this may be the students' only college experience, so some recognition is important. Kathleen Sammut asked if other departments, like nursing and cosmetology who have their own recognition event will still want to be a part of this CTE event. Jennifer said they will likely still go through their own celebration even though they may join this main CTE event. Santiago asked about the percentage and how many associate degree holders come along with families to the ceremonies. Jennifer said the whole auditorium is filled. Teresa said that Saturday is a good day and probably best day. Steve Gonzales agreed and said also that Friday evening the week before actual commencement may be good. Jennifer said Friday may encourage more faculty attendance and it may be better for facilities crew. There is general support for this event to happen this Spring 2016. Jennifer continued that it would be more than just reception, there will be recognition by calling the names of recipients, similar to commencement.

c. Distance Ed update

Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza gave us an update on the instructional designer position at 0.48, but it ended as a failed search. They have “pulled” the position and are re-examining the position to move forward with a 1.0, and revamping and making it also a Distance Ed coordinator position. Please contact her directly with questions. Jennifer explained what an instructional designer does. Alexis Alexander's former position was switched from faculty to classified. Rosemary said that position is very important. Kathleen Steele asked if WebAccess goes away and we use Canvas, what will designer do. Jennifer said person will have same role. Jennifer said they are requesting that the position be a full-time coordinator to ensure courses are

available for the students planning to obtain certificates using courses online. Steve Lehigh asked if a course was offered in at a sister college, would it qualify? Jennifer said "yes" and this person will co-ordinate with colleges in district regarding the online courses and review of them. Last April, she met with Peter Bruni, Diana Bennett, the VPs and others regarding distance education for the district. Canvas is currently being offered to the district for free. Our current DE infrastructure is not established to support the district strategic goals. They came to consensus that there is a need for one full-time coordinator, instructional designer/distance education, for each campus. Distance education is a district issue and we need to be united. Rosemary asked if there is coordination for the same class to be offered online within the district; otherwise if all colleges offer the same class, it could end up getting cancelled due to low enrollment in each class. Jennifer said that Jamillah Moore is aware there is no coordination between all three colleges in district regarding on line learning classes. Steve Lehigh wondered how we will coordinate with OEI (with 40 campuses) when we are not currently coordinating amongst the three colleges within the district. Jennifer said the district is currently trying to figure out what needs to be coordinated at the district level versus at the campus level. At this time, Jennifer said they are focusing on the resources of OEI and focusing on student readiness surveys, and Canvas as potentially our new CMS. Current assessment of OEI is that Canvas is the best platform for online education and NetTutor is the best platform for online tutoring. We can adopt Canvas without participating with OEI; however, we need to decide by next April. One question is whether we want to adopt the OEI rubric to model our distant education. Ultimately, student success and completion is of great importance. Current focus is on resources at this time. Wendy asked if you can cherry pick classes from various colleges to obtain online degree. Teresa Morris clarified that Title 5 requires that residence requirements must be met regarding how many units completed from a particular college. More info and input at the upcoming OEI/Canvas forum.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, October 13, 2015.

Minutes prepared by Vincent Li, with assistance from David Laderman

Goals (15-16)

1. Establish second Academic Senate student scholarship (community service).
2. Further revise and improve program review.
3. Redefine and refocus LSC3, CAC and LAC committees.
4. Move toward establishing CTE Certificate completion event.
5. Stay abreast of the OEI initiative as it develops, with the aim of producing, by the end of the year, a statement of our findings and concerns.

Themes

1. Support and coordinate collaboration between instructional disciplines, student services and learning communities, so as to increase student equity and student success.
2. Work toward increasing more broad and diverse faculty participation, while addressing fair compensation, in divisional and college-wide committees and initiatives.

Program Review: Proposed Changes:

1. Already approved by faculty:

Submit program review once every two years

Resource requests able to be submitted every year, including Faculty, Instructional Equipment, Instructional Materials

2. Proposal: ALL program reviews be submitted together, on even years

(starting fall 16).

Benefits:

--all programs will be on the same cycle, overall coherence, less confusion, easier to manage, college PR culture entirely in sync.

3. Proposal: Move PR submission date to fall, Nov 1 (starting fall 16).

Benefits:

- no program review due this spring 15
- early spring start on faculty searches
- data will be more timely and relevant; content of the PR will be closer to the data being analyzed (analysis done on immediately previous academic year)
- data available September 1st from PRIE
- resource requests will be more timely
- faculty position requests will be prioritized by Deans in November, for spring job announcements
- program planning more effective, immediate and logical
- CTE course updates, due every two years, would fall on the off PR year if we start fall 16

4. Next steps:

- Division reps consult with departments/divisions for feedback
- Governing Council to vote at next scheduled meeting
- Governing Council appoints a task force to further streamline and improve the PR document