

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

October 13, 2015

2:30 – 4:30 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	David Laderman
Vice President	Kathleen Sammut
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary (Interim)	Stephanie Roach
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 (Absent)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales
Business/Tech	Vincent Li (Absent)
Physical Education / Athletics	Larry Owens (Absent)
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin

OTHERS ATTENDING

Janet Black, Creative Arts/Social Science Division

James Carranza, Language Arts Division

Dan Kaplan, AFT

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:34 pm

1. Approval of the Agenda (October 13, 2015) and Draft Minutes (September 22, 2015)

Agenda

Policies 6.13 and 6.13.1 were pulled from the action item list by David Laderman. Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the amended agenda, Jackie Gamelin seconded. All in favor, no abstentions, agenda approved.

Minutes:

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve, Steve Gonzales seconded. All in favor, no abstentions, agenda approved.

2. Public Comment (2 minutes per)

No comments.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. President's Report

a. Interim Secretary Appointment: Stephanie Roach

Vincent Li resigns as secretary and will continue on as Business/Technology representative. Stephanie Roach has volunteered to step in as Interim Secretary for the rest of the semester. The Executive Committee approved the appointment.

b. Remembering George Kramm

George Kramm of Language Arts passed away suddenly last week in an accident. The ASGC takes a moment to honor and remember him today. His memory was celebrated with a candle lighting and chocolate. Memories of him were shared by many members of Senate. David Laderman remembered encountering George during a shopping outing, and shared the humor of the moment. Kathleen Steele shared her memory of his smile, and as a gentle soul who loved dogs. He was remembered for particular qualities such as his willingness and generosity in helping students, his positive outlook, and his focus and hard work. Teresa Morris remembered his generosity working with the librarians. Jon Kitamura remarked on George's way of taking particular notice of each individual he greeted. James Carranza remembered how George took time to beautify the campus by planting flowers. Shock and sorrow at the tragedy was expressed. George will be greatly missed by our community.

Rosemary Nurre suggested setting up a scholarship in his name.

James Carranza provided an update regarding the transition after George's death, and the impact on his students. There will be a memorial on Sunday. Details to come through official channels. Students are looking to remember him in some way. There is a temporary memorial across the hall from George's office (15-105). An adjunct professor has taken on his classes to make the transition as smooth as possible.

c. Committee updates (IPC, DPGC, DAS)

IPC: Program review themes are being synthesized into a user friendly document which will be shared with ASGC. Dominant themes can be addressed as part of college planning. The submission cycle and timeline was also discussed.

DPGC: Faculty and staff ID cards are moving forward. The OEI forum is coming on Friday, October 16, 2015, 1:00 pm-3:00 pm. The focus will be on the Canvas course management system, which would replace Moodle. Placement testing for International Students was also discussed, including how placement is determined district wide across campuses.

DAS: There was continued discussion about Board policies and procedures. Policy 6.13 and Procedure 6.13.1 will continue to be discussed. Revision suggestions were made, so ASGC will come back to those later.

The OEI rubric should be considered a guideline to follow. Commentary on the draft of the DE Contact Hours policy document is still being sought. Each college's Academic Senate is asked to give the go ahead to move forward on both of these documents. The Regular Effective Contact Document is important when establishing online course vs. correspondence course status, which has an impact on federal funding. Thus, measurement of the contact hours is important. Comments can be given to David Laderman. GC members informally approved use by the district of the OEI rubric as a guideline, and the current draft of the DE contact policy, for further revision and development (no comments at this time).

The upcoming OEI forum was discussed in depth. On the whole, feedback on Canvas has been positive. Student and faculty beta testers remark on improvements over Moodle. Additionally, there are significant cost savings if we join as part of the California Community college group, as it will be free for a period of time. Administration is on board. DAS wants each college Academic Senate to formally approve adoption of Canvas. David Laderman, Jasmine Witham, or Tania Beliz can provide further details for those interested in testing Canvas. If down the line we choose to join the statewide course exchange, we must join Canvas. The migration timeline would begin Spring 2016 for ITS to begin transferring courses and end in Summer 2017 when Moodle would be completely phased out.

2. ASCSM Update, Sennai Kaffl, President, ASCSM

No report.

3. Standing Committee Reports

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

One goal for the committee this year is discussion of general education requirements for the local associates degree. Requirements that are part of Title V and those that are to be shaped locally will be discussed. The needs of students who may have different educational goals will be considered. A larger campus conversation is needed. Updates will be coming on this issue.

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

The LAC will meet tomorrow from 2:30-3:30pm in 15-155. There are vacant positions in Business/Technology; Kinesiology, Athletics, & Dance; and Math/Science. Please ask your colleagues in these Divisions to consider joining the committee.

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

No report.

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

The CAC is moving forward with a general education SLO assessment pilot program. Currently, the Campus Climate Survey is the means of assessing general education SLOs. A model from Skyline is being followed. Individuals from Student Services (Admissions & Records, DSPS, Counseling, EOPS) are needed to volunteer for an afternoon workshop regarding effective communication. The CAC is also looking at learning outcomes and how they are used, defined, and more across all departments.

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

The CAEC approved its goals for 2015-16, including plans to develop a three year professional development plan. This will be brought forward to ASGC & IPC in Spring. The budget has been revised and will be brought forward for approval. Funding and budget were briefly discussed, including potential sources that may augment professional development. ASGC wants to be kept in the loop. Questions were raised about potential District discretionary funds from the California community college system and at the SMCCD level. Innovation grant, rental fees, and other sources of professional development funding were mentioned. Funding should be in addition to existing funding sources.

Announcements:

- *Facing Fear* film showing, October 15, 2015, 11:00 am, Bayview Dining
- Safety Workshop, October 23, 2015, focus on student mental health and behavioral issues.
- English and Math Acceleration event, November 13, 2015.
- Flex Day, November 25, 2015. The committee is looking to do a community day with a hike, breakfast, and fun break out sessions. Suggestions for activities are still being taken.

III. ACTION ITEMS

- a. Board policies and procedures 1.10, 7.69, 7.69.1, 8.06

Note: The Senate only approves policies, not procedures.

1.10: Motion to approve the policy by Kathleen Steele, Seconded by Rosemary Nurre. Approved, all in favor, no abstentions.

7.69: Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the policy, Jackie Gamelin seconded. The policy was approved unanimously, no abstentions.

Note: Procedure for student conduct moved to 7.69.1

Procedure discussion: Misuse of email such as spamming could be featured more prominently. How faculty should appropriately respond and what that process entails should be emphasized in some way. David Laderman will put forward any comments regarding the procedure to the Board. He reminded members that we don't vote on procedures, only on policies. But we can advise the district on procedures.

Further discussion regarding emergencies on campus ensued. In case of emergencies such as active shooters, some would like more information to be provided by our Office of Public Safety. A suggestion for a Flex Day activity to review safety procedures was made. It was noted that emergency announcements aren't clearly audible in all buildings on campus.

8.06: Policy regarding investment of interest forms. A couple typos noted by Stephanie Roach, which will be submitted. Motion to approve by Rosemary Nurre, seconded by Kathleen Steele. The policy was approved, no abstentions, everyone in favor.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. SLO handbook draft (Madeleine Murphy)

College wide discussions about how to best use of SLOs is needed:

1. What are learning outcomes? They can be approached in different ways.

2. Why do we do SLOs? What can SLOs tell us that other measures can't? For example, it can help with norming or to discover weaknesses in process, courses, skills. SLOs have the capacity to be interdisciplinary.
3. How can we come up with college wide policies and procedures that will be fruitful?

Of note: Uniformity in approach is important. Disaggregation of data and association of data with a G number will be expected in order to get at specific groups or demographics. Problems with random sampling should be addressed. Frequency of assessment should be determined. Faculty need to be a part of this discussion. There was an acknowledgement that it is hard to know how best to use assessment data once it is captured, and comments that TracDat is difficult to use. There is a new customizable version of TracDat. It has been proposed that one person will be responsible for data entry to streamline that process. There was emphasis on creating an assessment routine for the campus, including regular review of the process, and setting aside specific time for assessment throughout the year.

ACCJC's specific requirements regarding SLOs is unclear and still evolving. Nonetheless, it is clear that data will be required to be disaggregated. If we get out in front of the process, we can anticipate ACCJC's requirements for SLOs. Comments: If ACCJC is replaced by a different accrediting body, it is not anticipated that there will be much of a change in our approach, so long as we have a campus discussion about what works for us. There are questions regarding software for disaggregation.

Potential problems include Student Services and Library Services that are not always tied to a G number. This is particularly evident where privacy issues arise—health, including psychological services, for example. Finally, certain measures aren't effective if a student is required to identify herself with a G number. When candid responses are required about sensitive issues, students are more likely to report honestly if their G number is not required.

b. Program Review change: Submission timeline

David Laderman is considering sending an email to notify all faculty members, so that everyone has a chance to give feedback. Regarding the timeline, PRIE data can come by August 1. We can vote on a general Fall timeline, but set the actual date later.

Responses from Division representatives regarding the timeline: Several members said that they were in support of the Fall timeline. Reluctance, reservations, and concerns were expressed by some regarding workload but were still in favor—or at least okay with—the move to a Fall timeline. One person reported a negative response, because it would be too much of a burden. Many didn't receive feedback from members of their division. But all division reps were proactive in disseminating the proposal, and soliciting feedback. A commonly cited concern about Tenure Committee work in the Fall was discussed. This work does vary year to year, and the Deans are willing to be proactive in addressing workload issues for those whom it applies to. Program review material can be started in the late Spring to begin the process early and anticipate the heavier Fall workload, filling in the data

portions once the data becomes available in August. COI updates can also be done early (prior to the fall when PR is due).

Questions regarding the push for this and where it is coming from, and how it is of benefit specifically were brought up. Questions regarding position requests and whether the position request and hiring timeline really works were brought up. It is questioned how much the data really influences requests for filling faculty positions. Retiring faculty aren't always automatically replaced.

Program review will be every other year, via a user-friendly online form that automatically reloads the previously submitted PR.

- c. Funding caps and gowns for students (Kathleen Steele)

Postponed to next meeting.

- d. Diversity and committees statement

Postponed to next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:41 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 2:30pm.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman