

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

Tuesday, October 27, 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
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales (Absent)
Business/Tech	Vincent Li
Physical Education / Athletics	Larry Owens (Absent)
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin (Absent)

OTHERS ATTENDING

Diana Bennett, President, District Academic Senate; Faculty, Creative Arts/Social Sciences

Janet Black, Faculty, Creative Arts/Social Sciences

Mike Claire, President, College of San Mateo

Laura Demsetz, Interim Dean, Creative Arts/Social Sciences Division

Charlene Frontiera, Dean, Math/Science Division

Sennai Kaffl, President, ASCSM

Dan Kaplan, AFT

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:39 pm

1. Approval of the Agenda (October 27, 2015) and Draft Minutes (October 13, 2015) Agenda

David Laderman proposed changing the order of the two President's reports.

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the minutes with the changes and Kathleen Steele seconded the motion. All in favor, no abstentions, agenda approved.

Minutes:

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve and Steve Lehigh seconded the motion. All in favor, agenda approved. Santiago Perez abstains.

2. Public Comment (2 minutes per)

No comments.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. ASCSM Update, Sennai Kaffl, President, ASCSM

Associated Students has many events, past and upcoming, to report on.

Past events:

- Today, from 11am-2pm, the Programming Board coordinated a Halloween event which included face painting, and other activities.
- Latino Heritage was celebrated with an event where food was provided and information about the Latino community was presented.
- The Student Leadership Conference, held in San Jose, occurred this past weekend. Participants went to workshops and had networking opportunities to connect with other student leaders in the District.

Upcoming events:

- Upcoming event: There is a Homecoming Rally scheduled the day before the football game. The rally is scheduled for November 13, 2015, 12:05pm, location TBD, and will last approximately 20 minutes. The rally is historic in that other community colleges do not traditionally have homecoming rallies. Fostering school spirit is an important goal of the ASCSM, and this event has been well received by the CSM football community. All faculty are encouraged to attend.
- The Advocacy Board has organized a Board of Trustees Candidate forum, where candidates will meet with students (Thursday, October 29, 2015).

Faculty members are encouraged to direct interested students to Student Government, as they are seeking new members.

2. President's Report

a. Committee update (IPC)

The Program Review themes and trends summary is coming together. Once it is completed, the document will come to Senate for review. IPC will share the document with the broader CSM community.

b. Fall 2015 ASCCC Plenary Conference

David Laderman will attend the Fall 2015 ASCCC Plenary Conference. The statewide resolutions to be voted on at the conference will be posted soon. David will provide Senate with a link to the Resolutions and be available to hear any comments from CSM faculty. Contact David with questions or concerns.

c. Other updates

David Laderman has added Local Senate handbooks to the Center for Academic Excellence library. These handbooks provide details about Local Senate rules and procedures, including use of Robert's Rules of Order.

David clarified details of the upcoming discussion schedule, and brief discussion followed. David recommends that the Student Equity Plan discussion item move up for discussion at the next meeting, thus postponing the CCSF discussion item. Rosemary Nurre clarified the CCSF discussion item does not have to specifically refer to an intention to strike, but should support faculty at CCSF. Regarding the CCSF discussion item, Dan Kaplan urges Faculty to read the October edition of the Perspective for more information on this topic. Regarding the faculty workload discussion item, David would like to invite AFT to present on the topic at a future meeting. It was noted that the November 11, 2015 AFT meeting will feature a discussion item on workload. Interested parties are encouraged to attend.

3. Standing Committee Reports

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

No report.

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

Goals have been approved for the year, and include energizing the committee after a year of inactivity, recruiting members, staying abreast of the OEI initiative as it develops in order to contribute information about library resources for distance

education students to the ASGCs planned statement, to perform a needs assessment regarding library services, and to continue communicating with the Library and Senate as needed.

The LAC would like to get clarity regarding the ASGC goal to “redefine and refocus” the LAC. David Laderman agreed this was a good topic for discussion, and will raise it at a future meeting.

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*

Theresa Martin provided two handouts detailing the goals and proposed budget for the CAEC.

Discussion followed regarding the CAEC budget, which is approximately \$83,000. Some new funding sources will be sought. The situation was complicated because some money was awarded late last year, and was not used in entirety, which is a concern if this happens on a regular basis. The three year planning cycle embarked on by the committee is anticipated to prevent this type of issue. The importance of promoting the availability of professional funds to faculty was noted.

Budget lines include New Faculty Institute, Adjunct professional development, RFP Innovation development funds, Mindset 4.0, Reading initiative, collaboration that is in alignment with the annual goal about collaboration, Flex Days, speakers & presenters, travel, and SLO assessment as detailed on the handout. Of travel funds, \$5000 remains from last year.

Approximately \$30,000 in funding is still to be requested. Theresa Martin expressed confidence that additional funding sources will be found and approved.

Mike Claire reaffirmed that professional development is a priority of the college, and that funds have been set aside for it. He specifically named income from parking as an example.

Dan Kaplan asked about the status of the Board of Trustees discussion or study session that was to be planned about professional development opportunities offered across the District. Diana Bennett agreed to check the status of this discussion.

A brief discussion of Flex Day planning concluded the CAEC update, and included specific events for November, and whether one day of Flex workshops is sufficient for January.

III. ACTION ITEMS

a. Program review submission timeline

Prior to voting on the action item, there was discussion about two points, the commitment by the Deans to proactively address issues related to additional workload during Program Review, and the connection of Program Review to the faculty hiring process.

It was reemphasized that the Deans have committed to making the rollout of program review in Fall as easy as possible, by anticipating the needs of those with heavy workloads. It was also noted by Laura Demsetz that Deans can assist in other ways, for example by suggesting language to effectively communicate priorities. Charlene Frontiera noted that the process being tied to budgeting is very important for making decisions about resources. She remarked that responsibility regarding workload is on the Dean, and it is important to her personally, that workload is managed efficiently and as fairly as possible. David Laderman noted that faculty should communicate how we want to see the Deans be involved with program review.

Mike Claire emphasized that he hears the frustration about repeated requests that don't get filled over time, or aren't prioritized in the process. He further emphasized the helpfulness of requests made as part of program review to the faculty hiring process. Advocacy for individual positions is needed, as is seeing the big picture of long term College level needs for developing the highest quality faculty. Prioritization for requests should also occur at the Division level. All of this contributes to the hiring decisions that are ultimately made, though the President has final authority on these recommendations. The most important decision a college will make is the faculty they hire.

Concern about the current number of full time faculty and the consequence this has on faculty workload was expressed. Mike Claire responded by affirming his support for hiring more full time faculty. However, he noted the issue is how to accomplish this in a responsible way. As a general rule, he tries to follow the practice of hiring faculty based on the number of retirements. This year there are seven confirmed retirements, so seven faculty members will be hired. If more retirements are confirmed soon, there may be time to work down the prioritized list of positions to be filled. Positions may or may not be directly replaced in the department or division from which the retirement occurred.

Dan Kaplan suggests finding funding to use to pay Adjunct Faculty so they are able to contribute to alleviating the workload problem, thus providing Deans with another potential solution to the problem.

Motion to approve the program review timeline was made by Rosemary Nurre. Michelle Titus seconded the motion. No abstentions. The resolution passed with everyone in favor.

b. Resolution supporting new district course management system

The resolution is only in regards to adopting Canvas, not to joining the course exchange.

Diana Bennett updated the Senate regarding the informational meeting about Canvas. Mostly favorable responses to the CMS were shared as well as technology updates, and an outline of the support provided. Roll out timeline is 18 months, and begins in Spring 2016 with IT. There will then be a full academic year for use and professional development opportunities for faculty and administrators beginning Fall 2016. Should we move forward with Canvas, Fall 2017 would be the date Moodle (WebAccess) is no longer available.

It was recommended that we invite someone from the OEI exchange to discuss this aspect at a future date.

Santiago Perez brought up the issue of uncertainty regarding which Canvas add-ons will be available, and whether faculty will have input regarding which add-ons are available. There also is interest in learning which add-ons come standard, and which add-ons are at an additional cost. If add-ons are developed at our request, will this incur additional costs.

Diana Bennett requests an add-on wish list from faculty. The Math/Science Division has a list started, which can be shared with other faculty. Are specific decisions regarding add-ons required at the time the initial contract is signed, or can these decisions about specific add-ons come later.

It was noted that the contract for use of Canvas is free through the 2018-19 academic year, if we join as part of Cohort 2. After that, the cost is estimated to be less than the current cost for Moodle (WebAccess).

Motion to approve the resolution was made by Rosemary Nurre, and seconded by Michelle Titus. There were no abstentions. The resolution passed with everyone in favor.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Funding caps and gowns for students (Kathleen Steele)

Kathleen Steele presented an idea for funding caps and gowns for students with some level of financial need. Kathleen has been in discussion with Krystal Romero about this possibility. The current cost for a cap and gown is \$45, although cheaper alternatives may be available via online retailers. Of the approximately 3500 students in economic need at CSM, it is possible that some who are getting an Associate's degree may not be able afford the cap and gown. It was suggested that John Seward be asked to look at the data to determine accurate numbers about the

number of graduates each year who might be in this situation. If we move forward with the idea, Dennis Tordesillas will also be an important contact. ASGC would need to come up with specific criteria for the program.

It is unknown how many actually make a decision about whether to participate in graduation based on economic need. Some programs and learning communities provide some support for graduation costs. For example, EOPS pays for the cost of caps and gowns for EOPS students, and the Puente Project provides sashes but not caps and gowns. Other learning communities do not supply financial support for caps and gowns. Students who aren't affiliated with one of the learning communities may also need to be identified for a program like this.

Funding options and possible models were discussed briefly. These include partial funding, donation or scholarship by the bookstore, possibility of purchasing at cost from the book store, and purchasing from outside sources with better pricing. The Senate expressed interest in exploring the possibility further, but more information on this item is needed. Additionally, there is a concern that this would be difficult and expensive to manage. It was suggested that Student Services or other partners who are better equipped to work with students needing this type of financial assistance can manage it, in partnership with Senate.

b. Diversity & committees statement

David Laderman provided a draft of the statement, including commentary by Wendy Whyte who made several wording suggestions. Language suggestions were put forward and discussed.

In general, the Senate agrees with the statement. It is in need of wordsmithing, before a final statement is approved. After adjustments are made, the statement will be put forward as an action item.

c. Community Service AS Scholarship

Two points were discussed regarding the Community Service scholarship proposed by the Senate.

1) What kind of parameters do we want to set up for a community service award, as differentiated from our academic scholarship?

It was generally agreed that: 1) Students should be in good academic standing, but that the scholarship should not be based on GPA; 2) Service should be community service, but not necessarily campus community service; and 3) Diversity should be part of the selection process. It was pointed out that there are other scholarships requiring students demonstrate financial need, and thus we don't need to include this criteria in order that our scholarship be available for any student, regardless of income, who serves the community. Further discussion should follow regarding whether we want to limit the scholarship geographically and the scholarship application process and other criteria that

have not yet been addressed.

2) Do we want to name the scholarship after George Kramm?

With the recent death of George Kramm, it is appropriate to consider naming our scholarship after him. Another option is to allow the College to create a scholarship, to which the Senate can donate to. It was agreed that coordination with CSM and the scholarship Foundation is needed, so that competing scholarships aren't established by different groups, and so that the scholarship named after George Kramm will be established in the venue where the most benefit to students will be assured. The point was made that when naming a scholarship after someone, it is important that the funding source is clear. It was pointed out that if the scholarship goes through the Foundation, donations can be made that are tax deductible. s

Meeting adjourned at 4:31 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, November 10, 2015.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman