CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES
May 10, 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
Language Arts	Jon Kitamura
Language Arts	Kathleen Steele
Library	Stephanie Roach
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (Absent)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales (Absent)
Business/Tech	Vincent Li
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mikel Schmidt
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin

OTHERS ATTENDING

Sennai Kaffl, President, Associated Students
Teresa Morris, Library & COI Chair
Madeleine Murphy, English & CAC Chair
James Carranza, Dean, Language Arts
Laura Demsetz, Dean, Creative Arts & Social Science
Jamie Marron, Reading

I.   ORDER OF BUSINESS

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm

1. **Approval of the Agenda (May 10, 2016) and Draft Minutes (April 26, 2016)**
    Agenda
    Add a brief update regarding the meeting at CSM with Trustee Richard Holober meeting regarding CCCE as information item D. Strike information item A as there are no committee updates to report. Finally, add an update on the recent Scholarship Ceremony.

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

    Minutes:
    Revisions to the April 26, 2016 minutes have been requested and are forthcoming. We will wait to approve these minutes until the revisions come in.

    Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the postponement of the minute approval until next August, once the minutes have been revised. Jacqueline Gamelin seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion, and approval of the minutes will be postponed.

2. **Public Comment (2 minutes per)**

    - Dan Kaplan provided an update regarding the recent one-day unfair labor practice strike at City College San Francisco. Associated Students for CCSF campuses unanimously supported the strike. As a result, administration canceled classes on this day. There was a large demonstration of support that was well covered by the media. There was a rally at Civic Center in downtown San Francisco with 600+ attendees. Overall, it was a very successful one-day strike, which is notable because this type of strike is a rare event among community colleges in California. Talks at CCSF are continuing regarding faculty wages which are currently at 2007 levels.
    - In the spirit of today's social justice student event, Stephanie Roach shared a flyer featuring historic photographs from the CSM Archive of student protests on the CSM campus. The historic photo collection is available via the Library website.
    - There will be changes in the Library come Fall. Library Director Lorrita Ford is retiring at the end of June, and new faculty librarian Renee Bu has received a Library management position closer to her home, so won't continue with us in Fall.

II.   INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **President's Report**
    Please remember to vote in the election about the new bylaws. Login with your user name (the first part of your email address) and your password. Michele Titus and

Kathleen Steele are rotating off of the ASGC. A big thank you goes out to both of them for their time and commitment of service to Academic Senate.

a. Scholarship ceremony

    David attended the scholarship ceremony where the ASGC scholarship awards were presented to the recipients of our scholarships.
    ASGC Academic Support Award:
    Divyashish Kumar, Menghao Li, Petelo Tuipolotu, Qingni Yu
    ASGC Community Service Award:
    Jerry Johnson, Richard King, Walter Manuofetoa, Mary Monroe.

    AFT also gives scholarships, including the Joe McDonough Social Justice scholarship, and these have recently been awarded. The George Kramm scholarship was also awarded.

    Of note, over the next year, we need to promote, recruit, solicit and otherwise find monetary support for our scholarships in order to continue them. The suggestion was made to "put a name to a face" in our promotion of the scholarship and solicitations for funding for our scholarships by including profiles and information about past student recipients.

b. Program review update

    A timeline for providing support for the navigating the recent changes to the program review process was put forward in a document. If you have ideas for revising or modifying the timeline, please communicate with David. Suggestions regarding changes to the online form are in process. The suggestion to provide a PDF version of the new program review process will be made available right away so that people can review the document in advance.

c. Senate goals: year-end review

    The annual Academic Senate goals were reviewed for completion. Annual goals are posted on the ASGC webpage. Goals one through three were completed regarding establishing a community service scholarship, improving program review, and redefining and refocusing the subcommittees of Academic Senate. Goal three regarding the subcommittees is ongoing so momentum and focus in the committees will continue. Goal four about establishing a CTE certificate event is also ongoing. With Jennifer Hughes at Cañada College serving as Interim President until the end of the year, progress on this goal has slowed, but will move forward in Fall. Goal five regarding online education wasn't completed. ASGC did stay abreast of information but did not produce a statement at this time. We can consider this as a future goal for Senate.

Suggestion that we work with DAS to make sure that the Board is receiving communications about the issues we are facing. Important that communication goes both ways. Improvements to this process can improve the effectiveness of our work. This is something to look at for a goal for next year.

d. AFT & Academic Senate member meeting with Trustee Richard Holober regarding Community, Continuing, and Corporate Education (CCCE) program

Impressions of the meeting with Trustee Holober were shared by those in attendance. Trustee Holober was very forthcoming about CCCE and the situation that has developed. He listened, and was interested in what meeting attendees had to say. He indicated that sometimes the Board doesn't get in depth information regarding what is going on at the campuses when it comes to key issues. This communication and information gap problem goes both ways. The conflict surrounding CCCE and programs such as ESL is a case in point, because faculty members at CSM weren't aware that the changes to CCCE were a problem until it the process was already in motion. There wasn't a lot of consultation with faculty on SVIEP prior to implementing the program. As a result, trust has eroded. One problem is that it isn't clear what level of ESL students are being prepared for as part of CCCE courses. There isn't a faculty review process for CCCE (in terms of new programs or courses) is not in place. These courses appear to be created in a vacuum. Filling this information gap and communicating better about changes could prevent this type of problem in the future. Communication and information should have been provided in advance, rather than after the fact. There are two stories being told—one by CCCE and one by faculty who are impacted by their offerings. CCCE does not acknowledge that there is conflict or competition between their program offerings and the campus for-credit courses. They believe that their programs will be feeder courses, and thus benefit the college. This has been an assertion on their part, without demonstrable evidence provided as to the effect of the program on our course enrollment. Trustee Holober indicated that while turning a profit is an important consideration, it doesn't by default make a profitable program a good thing. The purpose of the program regarding life long learning must be considered.

Trustee Holober called the meeting in advance of Wednesday's Board meeting so that information could be shared.

This topic will be continued at a future meeting.

2. **ASCSM Update,** Sennai Kaffl, President, ASCSM

- Elections are completed. New representatives will begin serving on Senate committees. James Roe is the new president. Senate took a moment to recognize and thank Sennai for his service as the student representative to Senate meetings.
- Diversity week events are today and tomorrow from 11:00 am-1:30 pm: Today the theme was social justice, and tomorrow the theme is unity.
- The Spring Fling event was April 26-28. Music, food, and fun were had. The goal is to raise school and student spirit.

3. **Standing Committee Reports**

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

Updates on Curriculum Review: In Fall there will be training for COI members and general faculty on curriculum review. GE requirements will be a goal for next year. A sub-committee may look at this next year, because it is a big project.

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

No report. We are meeting tomorrow. Topics will include the planned survey & leadership and membership of the committee.

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

Comment: The report is clear and represents an interesting common sense approach to SLOs. Madeleine should consider publishing the report in a formal setting.

The purpose of this work is to make SLOs less onerous and more meaningful. This process is currently focusing on instructional SLOs. Other types of SLOs will be explored in the future. When beginning the process, the question was asked "Are there solutions to common problems that can simplify the work for everyone?" For the most part everyone is doing SLOs. Norming sessions, and multiple approaches have been attempted. Most of us use the SLOs as a breakdown of the grade. Some of these approaches are time consuming. No one is using a capstone project approach, though some use a quiz or assignment at the end of the semester or program. Many departments consist of one faculty member who must do this work. On the whole, people are stumped by program assessment requirement, as it is difficult to track. An alternative is a grading approach. Consider changing the assessment question from "What did I teach?" to "What did the student learn?" It is felt that SLOs don't often bring something new to this.

There are misconceptions about how to do SLO assessment. Some believe that only passing students should be assessed, which leaves out students who are not passing. Some outcomes are not easily measurable or are not measurable. Some approaches to assessment require skills such as statistical analysis that many of us don't have

training in and/or enough students to warrant this type of approach. Exit exams are one approach, at the local or external level. For example, Cosmetology students must take the California Board of Barbering and Cosmetology exam in order to become licensed. In academic disciplines, because we work to transfer students, this approach is harder to use.

Overall, TracDat is not liked as a tool. Because SLOs are required for accreditation, people expect to do them.

Regarding specific problems identified on page 4 of the report, there should be a policy in place regarding assessing passing & non-passing students and regarding a firm timeline and routine for SLO assessment so that we are up to date when it comes time for assessment. It is important to remember that assessment is not actually about the SLOs, it is a device to determine if students are learning. Examples of programs that have been put in place in response to challenges in student learning that became apparent as a result of assessment include Project Change, Reading, and Learning Communities.

Of note, moving forward, course level data alone will not be sufficient. We will have to disaggregate data as part of new accreditation requirements in the future. This means our assessment will need to be associated with the g# of individual students.

Some important takeaways:

- How often should we have SLOs? We can look at this next semester.
- Recommended that we model SLOs on grading, and link the two as a practice. OR: Canvas provides you with a way to data tag an activity, which means that we can tie activities and grades to SLOs within the LMS—if it is simplified and everyone is using the same approach we can complete SLOs more frequently in this fashion.
- Clear policies and procedures are needed. It will be necessary to provide ample administrative support for faculty in following the policy and procedures and completing SLO assessment accordingly. We'll look at this next semester.
- Information about assessment should be easy to get and provide, without requiring special training. We should lobby for an online system that works well for us.
- Ramp up the assessment—have more time set aside for this (program review & SLO assessment) on flex days with support for faculty
- Madeleine would love to join with other faculty and departments to have focus groups/forums. It would be nice to explore more interesting approaches to assessment.
- Allowing time for norming is also important.

If you have feedback, please reach out to Madeleine. It will take time to implement any online systems. Immediate feedback regarding the drop down concept and for making time available on flex days was positive, and that these both make sense. Part time staff should be considered to enter assessment data.

Senate expresses its thanks to Madeleine for this doing this quality work.

It was suggested that Madeleine write a brief version of this report for the Advocate. Political context and considerations regarding a preoccupation with SLOs, which is driven by ACCJC (and others), and leaders in those bodies who are in support of privatization of higher education. Accreditation at community colleges is being looked at more broadly, and changes may be coming.

Contact Madeleine with questions.

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

   No report.

III.   **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

   a.   Academic Senate Scholarships: Criteria and selection process (Steven Lehigh)

        Insight from the scholarship committee on the process of selecting our award recipients was shared in this discussion led by Steven Lehigh.

        There are likely refinements that can be made to the selection criteria and process for awarding the community service scholarship so that the award better reflects the intention of our scholarship. For example, we need to decide how we want to fit learning communities within the framework of the scholarships. The scholarship process through the Foundation relies on online submission forms and selecting boxes such as "tutor." Qualified students may miss eligibility requirements because the volunteer service that they have completed doesn't fit nicely into those options. Mentorships, for example, don't fit easily into "tutor" or "community service"—we miss these students in our application process and would like to discuss the option to add additional filters at the Foundation. Another option would be to move away from the Foundation's filtering system. However, due to the additional labor that would be required on the part of Academic Senate to manage the application and selection process, this approach is not ideal.

        Of note, the recommendation process through the Foundation provides faculty with clear structure, by dividing it into three sections. Students however, are not provided with a structure guiding them to include specific volunteer or community service items in their statement. As a result, many statements are generic, and do not lend themselves to the specifics of our scholarship requirement. It would be important for students to be aware that there is a community service scholarship to target their application to. It was suggested that eligible students might be contacted

after the fact for a second round of application screening in which they target their statement toward community service.

It was pointed out that using the current selection criteria and process, there may be a small pool of applicants who are identified as the best candidates, and who are selected as award recipients, while others who would otherwise be eligible for our scholarship are not included in this pool. As a result, scholarships may not be distributed fairly, because a winner may receive multiple scholarships. However, it is important that we award our scholarships to those who best meet the scholarship criteria. To be fair, it shouldn't depend on whether an individual has been awarded another scholarship already.

It was noted that in Engineering, scholarships aren't going through the Foundation. Instead, they are being divided into categories and reviewed accordingly. It was pointed out that because the award targets a specific discipline, this is likely a much smaller pool than the ASGC scholarships will have, so the same approach may not work for us.

Sennai Kaffl shared the student perspective by emphasizing that the reasons eligible students are filtered out should be identified so this problem can be resolved.

It was pointed out that AFT experiences a similar problem in awarding the Joe McDonough Social Justice scholarship. They went back to the pool because the initial applicants provided to them by the Foundation weren't working. Filtering really changed the initial pool, though because the process is invisible, it is hard to know who is missed.

Practically, it is challenging to go outside of the Foundation. Since our criteria and definitions for community service are specific, we should have a conversation with Stephanie from the Foundation and Karen regarding the issues.

Nuts and bolts:
- Definitions and clarifications in our scholarship description and requirements are needed, including learning community mentors.
- Learning about how the filtering process works can also help us in refining the process we have in place through the Foundation.
- Rubric scoring system was used by the committee and Foundation. Discover if it is possible for the Foundation to alter the Rubric and create a unique equation for our scholarship. Example: Put financial need at 0, and community service at 8.
- It may be Part time vs. FT students may be another criteria that hurts certain students.

Changes to the process may help us address the concern that we are getting the same top 60 applicants as other scholarship committees. However, students may still inadvertently filter themselves out by not selecting the correct options.

We will continue this conversation early in the Fall. First, find out what is possible from Karen & Stephanie, then rework our criteria based on this conversation. Scholarship committee should be set early, in January 2017.

b. Reading Program (James Carranza)
James Carranza lead a discussion about what we want to do college-wide to best support students in reading, now that Jamie Marron from the Reading program is retiring.

James doesn't want to run a department that relies only on part-time faculty. One reading course will be offered in Fall 2016, and moving forward until decisions about a new approach are made. The English Department and BSI have been approached to discuss ideas.

Issues raised include staffing and workload, as well as the quality of our actual support using the traditional model. This model uses an external "satellite" approach, where students go to the Reading center to receive assistance in separate courses. Current research indicates there are other models that are more effective. We should explore new approaches as we move forward. It is important to look at specific areas where students are struggling, and contextualize their experience.

Several individuals will lead a faculty task force on re-envisioning the reading program. The desire is to bring potential changes to the campus community and have an honest conversation about how we approach reading support for students. We need to meet our students' demand for reading support. James wants to be clear that he is not anti-reading, but that he is proposing changes to the current model because he wants us to create something better, that better meets the needs of our students.

The task force should include individuals from departments where text book reading is particularly challenging. BSI is excited about this idea, but ultimately it should be a cross-disciplinary approach to the problem. There is a curricular aspect to be considered regarding ENGL 838. Students' ability to successfully read impacts their ability to master the content of a given class. Mismatches between student skill level and what students are asked to read in disciplines like Philosophy with difficult texts are apparent. Being clear about the kind of skill needed for successfully reading the texts for a given course may help guide students in deciding what to register for.

Both reading and written expression are important. Often, the recommended preparation for a course is meaningless. Students who do not have the recommended level of preparation, often ignore the "recommendation," and thus struggle or are not successful in the course. It was noted that pre-requisites are more effective, as students must follow them.

There are plans to look at things like drop-in reading support, reading specialists, a sub-committee of Senate, placement concerns, linking reading support to short courses in specific disciplines, and more. New course outlines are in preparation for Fall.

James wants faculty support in developing the task force in order to develop focused reading support. It is important to distinguish between reading support needs, literacy needs, and support needed for students served by DSPS, ESL, and other places on campus. Specific needs should be identified. Professional development

and training will be important to make certain faculty and staff are prepared to meet the needs of our students. Assessing and measuring can help determine effectiveness and justify whether and when changes are needed. Faculty must recognize that students need reading support, and identify what they can do to help their students.

Academic Senate whole-heartedly supports this effort. Those interested in participating in the task force should contact James Carranza.

c. Corporate education

There was no time to address this issue during the meeting. The discussion will be postponed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:31 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, August 23, 2016.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman