

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

March 22, 2016

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 (Absent)
Language Arts	Jon Kitamura
Language Arts	Kathleen Steele
Library	Stephanie Roach
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (Absent)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales
Business/Tech	Vincent Li (Absent)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mikel Schmidt
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin

OTHERS ATTENDING

Theresa Martin, CAE chair

Diana Bennett, Language Arts; District Academic Senate

Jonathan Bissell, Director, Community, Continuing, & Corporate Education

Sennai Kaffl, President, Associated Students

Dan Kaplan, AFT

Danni Redding-Lapuz, Manager, International Student Program

Amy Sobel, Language Arts

Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Dean, Academic Support & Learning Technologies

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm

1. Approval of the Agenda (March 22, 2016) and Draft Minutes (March 8, 2016) Agenda

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve, Jacqueline Gamelin seconded. All voted in favor, the agenda is approved.

Minutes:

Kathleen Steele moved to approve the minutes, Rosemary Nurre seconded the motion. All voted in favor, the minutes are approved.

2. Public Comment (2 minutes per)

Animal Volunteer Club plans to show a film April 13. The film is about the dolphin hunting in Japan. The plan is to follow with a discussion. Faculty are encouraged to offer extra credit to students who attend. Kathleen Steele will coordinate with David Laderman regarding some publicity options.

Dan Kaplan shared that it appears that the District will again be opening faculty evaluation as a topic for negotiation as part of the AFT negotiation cycle. It was a surprising development because representatives including Deans and others were a part of the prior task force working on the faculty evaluation process. Rosemary pointed out that issues among faculty too have arisen as a result of the last changes to the evaluation process. However, it seems that the current issues brought up by the district are more complex than the issues referred to by Rosemary. Dan will keep us posted as this issue further develops.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. President's Report

a. IPC Update

IPC is developing a survey to send out to those who serve on committees regarding the planning process. The purpose of the survey is to ensure quality participatory governance. The committee is working on revising their mission statement. Rebecca Alex presented an idea to bring art to campus, and a committee is forming to lead this effort. She will come to Academic Senate to talk to us about this committee.

b. DAS Update

DAS has focused some discussion on concerns about the community education program, and courses offered that may compete with college courses. Also, the community education program has received \$100,000 from the college Enterprise Division's auxiliary campus services such as Bookstore, SMAC, etc. for a summer program for children.

There wasn't much traction from the other colleges regarding the issue of faculty author royalties, textbooks, and a potential conflict of interest for faculty authors. They felt that faculty should be compensated for their work, and if that means getting royalties from students buying their books, then so be it.. The issue will be brought to individual campus Senates for further discussion.

The paywall issue resulting from online access codes was discussed, as was linking the purchase of books with registration of classes (so students could use financial aid). Interest and concern regarding this issue was expressed.

The DAS president position is opening soon. Nominations are open. Leigh Anne Shaw's name from Skyline will be put forward. However, anyone who has served as AS president can run for the position.

c. George Kramm Scholarship update

David has been working closely with George Kramm's widow, the Language Arts Division, and others to work out details of the scholarship, which will be continued as a result of funding from George's widow. A copy of the fund donor agreement for the scholarship was provided. Academic Senate would like to thank her for this generous contribution.

d. Textbook order draft letter

Word-smithing suggestions were made to the draft letter, and suggestions were made regarding the subject line so it would get more attention. Further suggestions were made regarding providing hard copies in faculty mailboxes, perhaps using a half sheet of brightly colored paper. On further discussion, it was decided that this year we will attempt email only. Next year, new options can be discussed if the problem persists and a different approach is needed.

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*

No report. No quorum for our last meeting. Jeff Flowers will fill in for Darryl Stanford who has not been available this semester for the meetings.

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

No report.

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

An RFP was submitted to CAE by the art department; it was approved. Rebecca Alex (Fine Arts), Nico Van Dongen (Art), Vera Fainshtein (Digital Media), and John Lucchesi (Architecture) will work on the project, an interdisciplinary project on student portfolio development which will be supported for \$9000.

III. ACTION ITEMS

a. Board Policies: 1.00, 1.10, 1.20, 1.65, 1.7, 8.27 / 1.40, 2.12, 2.21, 6.39, 8.14

1.00, 1.10, 1.20, 1.65, 1.7, 8.27: Minor changes to these already approved policies were reviewed. No suggestions for changes came in by email.

1.40, 2.12, 2.21, 6.39, 8.14: Minor changes to these policies, which have not yet been approved, were reviewed.

Several changes reflect language requirements about the penal code, or other reference points. These policies come up for renewal cyclically. Many changes are made in an effort to match our language to language used by the CCLC.

Rosemary Nurre moves to approve the changes to the board policies, and Kathleen Steele seconded her motion. All are in favor, and the board policies were approved.

b. Board procedure 6.27.1 regarding Distance Education Contact Hours

It was clarified that because this is a draft procedure, there is no need for an action at this time. Suggestions for changes were provided from the Cañada instructional design team. We have yet to see the policies that will reference these procedures. This is designed to be in line with the online rubric.

Discussion followed regarding the timeline for calling in a substitute instructor. Two weeks, vs. three days, and where these numbers come from were considered. What is the comparable requirement for in person courses? It would be strange to have the requirement in one place, but not another. Is it consistent with what the students have? Dan Kaplan believes there is flexibility provided by the contract. Should the duration of a lengthy absence be specified, or should it be left open? Rewording might be a benefit in order to emphasize that students should be notified. Send comments to David or the DEETC committee for consideration.

Not an action item at this time. For now we only need to review and provide suggestions. No vote will occur today.

c. CAE Three Year Plan

The Three Year Professional Development Plan: 2016/17 – 2018/19 was presented for approval.

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the plan. Kathleen Steele seconded the motion. All are in favor, and the plan is approved.

The ASGC is very appreciative of the work of Theresa Martin and the CAE Committee on this effort.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Community Education, *Jonathan Bissell, Director of Community, Continuing, and Corporate Education (CCCE)*

The community education program has been reimagined to include continuing and corporate education. The program is self-sustaining (meaning they cover their own expenses) and provides programs for diverse stakeholders. Traditionally, short courses, and workshops for community enrichment were the extent of offerings. Now, the program is **building many new initiatives and** transitioning to provide skill building and gateway courses **in collaboration with each of the three colleges**. Some legacy courses will not continue going forward.

Examples & Future Directions:

The program considers how to upgrade the skills of working professionals. Leadership skills are explored in the not for profit leadership program. Regional corporate and organizational partnerships will continue to be built over time, and is one of the most important strategies for the program. For example, NOVA (a premier workforce investment board) refers industries to our community education program, and we, in turn refer faculty & other resources to them. For example, the Interactive Advertising Bureau is partnering with Diana Bennett to develop curriculum for an entry-level pathway that targets groups who aren't well represented in the technology industry.

Corporate education at CSM was eliminated in the past because of too few contracts. The current strategy is to develop multiple contracts in order to avoid this problem. Relationship building will take time, but will allow for repeat business. Considering the needs of corporate training partners is another strategy of the program. Jonathan is seeking professors to do trainings with these organizations. Professional development academy workshops for corporations could include: Excel, Word, team building, time management, etc. Jonathan appreciates the work HR has done to partner on this.

Additional program update:

Bay Area Pathways Academy summer camp at College of San Mateo has been planned. The camp features project based learning taught by credentialed teachers, as well as fitness activities. They have partnered with SMAC to provide space for fitness instruction.

There will be a two unit math class, to be paid on our faculty schedule, because it is a for credit course, offered as part of the camp. The course is not degree applicable, and has no option for a permanent grade on the student's transcript (high school or college)—thus it will be letter grade. The course is designed to give students a taste of what college is like. Studies show that early experience on college campuses is key in improving chances for attending college later. It was agreed that educating parents regarding any credits appearing on a student transcript is important—especially for students so young.

Scholarships for foster youth and others who can't afford the program are available. The program is for students grades 6-9. Please ask anyone you know who is interested and who can't afford the program to contact Jonathan Bissell about options.

Discussion:

A lengthy discussion followed on several aspects of the community education program, particularly in regards to how its offerings might compete with courses at CSM. The impact to ESL courses and the International Student Program at CSM were of particular concern.

Clarification regarding the difference between adult education provided in the San Mateo Adult School was requested. Funding sources apparently vary between the programs. Silicon Valley Intensive English Program (SVIEP) partners with the adult schools to offer not for credit classes. Eventually, the plan is to work with F1 Visa international students. Students will take ~~an~~ the college placement exam on completion. Then they would matriculate and enter the district as international students.

~~Diana Bennett Danni Redding Lapuz shared the concern from faculty expressed at District Academic Senate that this programming will compete, and ultimately reduce enrollment in our courses.~~ Diana Bennett commented that we don't want the CCCE course to compete, but be a complement of gateway to credit courses. Jonathan responded that he sees these courses as a gateway ~~or complement~~ to our current courses, not as in competition with them. It seems this belief results from the fact that the courses offered at the Continuing Ed program are not for credit, and thus not in competition with the for credit courses offered at CSM. In Jonathan's vision of the partnership, community education courses would be "feeder" courses that would ultimately boost enrollment in district courses. He does **not** see the potential for competition between the colleges as a result of this model.

He wants to encourage faculty to fill out RFPs to create courses that will feed into CSM courses.

Specific concerns regarding ESL courses for our international students were discussed. Faculty feel it is important to have the exam used at the CCCE be the

placement test used by the colleges. Plans to place International students with lower TOEFL scores, and then keep them enrolled in the CCCE program until they reach a high level of proficiency (testing into ESL levels 4 or 5) is worrisome. Getting students ready for the highest levels of ESL would be in direct competition with our ESL lower level courses, which would be bypassed by these students. Our F1 Visa International Students typically place into ESL level 2 or 3. When students recognize a faster and/or cheaper way to meet their needs through the community education program, there is a strong likelihood that CSM will lose students as students in this group may choose to drop out of their CSM program. ~~Jonathan indicated that this will not be the case because international students and SVIEP students are accepted on different I-20s. SVIEP is not-for-credit and the college I-20s are for an academic program.~~

Specific details regarding the intensive language offerings by CCCE are unavailable at this time due to restrictions on what they are allowed to share while waiting on approval from the federal government. Once the approval has gone through, more details can be shared about the program such as tuition, cost to students, pay scale for instructors, etc. Regarding how their offerings are different than ours, Jonathan ~~expressed a desire to have a smooth~~ is concerned with the handoff from one program to another, ~~and this is under review~~ and this will be discussed with ESL/ESOL faculty. Also, they will recruit IEP students but will coordinate with district recruiters ~~have a separate recruiting effort.~~ Some faculty expressed that competition between the schools can be exacerbated if the process isn't uniform across district.

It was pointed out that openness and transparency is required in order to have an informed conversation about these issues. Jonathan ~~will be putting out the numbers~~ will share the program website with tuition and other cost information when they have received government approval and are allowed to share the information.

Clarification regarding the stated goal of the programs would reassure ESL faculty. For example, stating that the specific goal is to get students ready for ESL level 3 would help alleviate some concerns of ESL faculty. Level 4 or higher is worrisome, and would result in competition between CSM courses and CCCE courses.

Regarding the big push for SVIEP, the goal of the program from the Chancellor's perspective is to internationalize our campuses and grow these programs. From the Student Services perspective, the goal is to make students feel at home and welcome so they will stay enrolled in our District.

Ultimately, the SVIEP is designed to help students become college ready ~~while not college students,~~ and to prepare them for placement testing. This can include local immigrants wishing to study in an Intensive English Program as well as F1 students ~~students who are foreign born but Americans, as well as students with F1 Visas down the line.~~

Regarding class size for CCCE courses: It varies depending on the class, and the needs of the instructor. Instructors have a big part in determining class size. 40% of tuition typically goes to the instructor. The remainder is spent on administration

such as marketing, and other overhead costs. CCCE does not pay rent at CSM, so this is not part of their overhead costs.

For future conversation, consider the following:

We are a community college district, dedicated to students who want to move forward in education or career. What does the CCCE program do for the community college district as a whole? It seems that this is unclear for some faculty at this time, and that clarification is needed.

b. ASLT updates (Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza)

On January 13, 2016, the Board approved the move to Canvas.

For more information, please visit the CSM Canvas website:

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/canvas>

Once our instructional technologist is on board next month, additional information about Canvas migration will be available. The handout provides many details regarding the implementation plan. Today's discussion will focus on the timeline for the transition work plan. There have been many enthusiastic volunteers for piloting the migration and implementation.

There currently is not a policy in place for mandatory training in online instruction and pedagogy. Of note, Skyline has put in place a 40-hour training for instructors before they are allowed to teach online. Further conversations about following this model would be needed. Specific language regarding the "mandatory" nature of trainings, payment, etc. will be determined because mandatory trainings without compensation is not contractual. *It was pointed out that as a result of the transition to Canvas, there is expected to be a cost savings for the district. We should explore whether or not these savings can be allocated to pay for the compensation of faculty participating in mandatory trainings.* Skyline in fact has clarified that the training is not mandatory. Ultimately, it will be a local decision for CSM—there is no requirement to follow a model from another college.

The fate of STOT is still to be determined. STOT provides technical assistance and training that has focused on use of WebAccess, but not on pedagogy for online instruction. Diana Bennett points out that it would be sensible to keep STOT because it is currently funded. It could be reviewed and revised to meet different needs.

When the new instructional technologist comes aboard, her office will be located in the Center for Academic Excellence. Changes will be made to the space in order to make it a vibrant center meeting the technology needs of faculty. Accessibility issues are a key area that will be looked at in our online classrooms. Currently there is an approved list of acceptable third party products from IT. Further discussion is needed to address how to approach instances when faculty want to use technology not on the preapproved list. Course reviews completed by the instructional technologist will not be tied to evaluation. The emphasis will be on alignment with best practices. Some guidance will come from the district level. An appropriate communication strategy regarding any issues discovered by the instructional technologist in individual online courses is still to be determined.

Steve Lehigh will follow up on figures regarding STOT funds and potential savings.

Please email suggestions to anyone from the Canvas team: Theresa Martin, Rosemary Nurre, Tania Beliz, Chris Smith, and Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza.

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, April 12, 2016.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman