

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

September 13, 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	Margaret Kaluzny
Language Arts	Jon Kitamura
Language Arts	Mick Sherer
Library	Stephanie Roach
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle
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, Biology
Teresa Morris, Library
Madeleine Murphy, English
Sandra Stefani Comerford, Vice President, Instruction
Jeramy Wallace, English

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm

1. Approval of the Agenda (September 13, 2016) and Draft Minutes (August 30, 2016)

Agenda

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

Minutes:

Margaret Kaluzny moved to approve the minutes, and Wendy Whyte seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the minutes are approved. Mikel Schmidt, Rosemary Nurre, and Steve Gonzales abstained.

2. Public Comment (2 minutes per)

Mark your calendars for Flex Day, which is coming up on October 12.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. President's Report

David drew attention to the mission statement of Academic Senate Governing Council which is available on the website. He pointed out the ten plus one categories listed there that guides us in the work that we do in Senate, and identifies key areas of focus for our committee. The "plus one" list item, is a catch all that brings in other areas of focus that might not be expressed specifically in the first ten items. Also of note, is the contrast between the issues addressed by the union, and the issues we focus on in Senate that are academic or pedagogical in nature.

There are public safety forums taking place tomorrow at CSM. Please remind community members to attend.

a. Committee updates (IPC) Institutional Planning Committee

David co-chairs IPC with Jennifer Hughes, Vice President of Student Services. The committee discusses programs, accreditation, and other institution wide planning issues.

Currently under discussion is revision of the mission statement to be more accurate and specific. Updates have been provided by the committee on the accreditation midterm report, which has been shared via email. The report is submitted to ACCJC, the current accrediting agency for California community colleges. The report is

“mid-term” because it is in the middle of our 6 year review cycle, and reports back to ACCJC about issues raised during the visit in October 2013. In October 2014 our accreditation was reaffirmed. They provided feedback regarding SLOs and other points. This report spells out how we’ve addressed these points and are moving to act on the recommendations in order to satisfy their requirements.

David solicited comments and input from governing council members, and most in attendance felt that the report was solid, detailed and accurate. David noted a recommendation to institute a program review for administrators. It is described in detail in the report, and it will be moving through IPC and we’ll hear updates about it in Academic Senate. The ability to integrate SLOs and Learning Support Centers more effectively into our departments and divisions are also a focus area. Flex Activities on related topics is an example of a response or action identified in the report. There are sections focusing on Distance Education and Career and Technical Education.

Thanks to everyone who worked on it.

Any remaining questions or concerns should be expressed soon, as the report needs to be submitted promptly to ACCJC.

College Index

The college index provides information about rates and measurements for student success. Information is provided for each college in the District for the past six years. Currently the index is being reviewed in order to help determine our targets for the next year.

b. District Academic Senate (DAS)

Leigh Anne Shaw is serving as the District Academic Senate President. Updates from their meetings are regularly shared at our meetings. Diana Bennet, the past president, is serving as the Vice President.

An update regarding construction plans for the CSM campus from the last Board of Trustee meeting was shared. More details coming about this with bond measures and funding for projects.

Of note, we’re the only community college district in California that provides faculty and staff housing. Skyline is scheduled to get housing in addition to the units at CSM and Cañada.

Future goals and areas for discussion at the District Academic Senate range from senate organization to communication, and distance education . One goal is to make the move from a Senate of the Whole to a Representative Senate. This will happen sometime in the future, and will require a change to Senate bylaws. More to come on that as information is available and action is needed. Another goal is in regards to better sharing of best practices, and better communication overall among all three colleges. Finally, putting in place a Distance Education policy, and the Canvas migration will important issues discussed at District Academic Senate.

c. Business / Technology Tenure Review Committees

The Business/Technology Division tenure review committees were preapproved by David in order for them to meet the September tenure track committee meeting timeline due dates.

Of note, there was a change to the tenure chair on the Accounting committee (Bruce Maule). Additionally, two Kinesiology, Dance committees have remained the same, and the committees were approved by Senate during a prior approval vote.

The question was raised about whether the process for approving these committees is a “rubber stamp” process. Historically, there have been times when diversity, or other issues do come up and may interrupt the approval process, although in most cases committees are approved without any issue. Additionally, Senate has posted a formal statement about encouraging diversity on committees.

2. ASCSM Update, Stephen McReynolds, Vice Chair, ASCSM

The student government is in the process of getting up and running. All representatives have been appointed to various Board positions, and there are twice as many students involved as in the past. Work is progressing on setting annual goals. ASCSM hosted some of the Board of Trustees, as well as President Mike Claire, and Vice President of Student Services, Jennifer Hughes.

Interclub Council (ICC) is also now up and running, and training is complete for those students who are involved. As a result, proposals can now be brought forward for funding.

Club Fair is planned for next week, details are pending. Safety Forums are being advertised by students.

The “Not Anymore” videos regarding psychological issues associated with violence in relationships, sexual assault, etc. have been a topic of discussion. A goal has been

identified to increase viewership of the videos—the videos only received approximately 100 views last year. They are asking what actions could be taken in order to make it easier to access the videos and still track viewership, as well as encourage students to watch for Title IX. Syllabus information regarding Title IX is present, but isn't discussed or featured prominently in most classes. Please share your ideas about improving access to Title IX educational pieces. It is clear that the website needs clear navigation that provides easy access to the videos.

3. Standing Committee Reports

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

COI began course review and policy review. Policy review will be on the agenda at a future meeting.

Teresa attended the Curriculum Institute which was hosted by the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges in July 2016. Of interest were discussions regarding the high unit associate degrees for transfer (ADTs). While matching ADTs for local degrees has mostly been achieved, there are still challenges for CIS and Chemistry in particular. Documentation regarding these problems is encouraged.

Additional discussion of interest was about general education basics, and the local GE requirements, and CSU GE and IGETC patterns.

Drop in sessions for curriculum development and Curricunet help are planned. Dates will be posted on the COI website. A particular focus can be placed on how you can use curriculum info for program review.

Thanks and appreciation was extended to Teresa Morris for her work and leadership on this committee which has resulted in positive change for the curriculum development process.

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

No report, the first LAC meeting is this week.

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

The first meeting was focused on catching up and reorienting the group to the tasks ahead. There is a discussion planned regarding Madeleine's SLO report at the next ASGC meeting. Please take time to review her recommendations as there are changes to our approach, and guidelines are needed. Feedback—positive & negative—is encouraged, so that faculty are collaborating and contributing ideas as the assessment process is shaped.

At the national level, the trend is to change from a peer review type process to a quality control process. Thus, we need to shape our own experience of SLO assessment.

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

Nothing new to report at this time.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Academic Senate 2016-17 goals

The initial suggestion for amending our goals is to focus on goals one through four, because for five and six, we are waiting for action from other groups, and are not empowered to make a decision regarding the outcome (although we can make recommendations). A suggestion for editing the wording on goal three came in via email.

1. Establish better communication and interaction with the District office, especially the Board of Trustees, Auxiliary Services, and CCCE.
Of note: Tom Bauer and Eugene Whitlock will be coming in October. Additionally, we should plan to invite the Board of Trustees to join us at a meeting.
2. Revise and improve Academic Senate student scholarship review criteria and selection process.
3. Explore concrete improvements to textbook policies, and solutions to textbook problems.
Suggested rewording: Encourage use of open source texts, and other solutions to textbook costs.
Of note: While the initial conversation in Spring focused on requiring texts authored by District professors, it is felt that our main concern should be accessibility and cost to students. We want to ensure equitable access to resources.
4. Research, discuss and recommend processes by which enrollment caps are set.
5. Move toward establishing CTE Certificate completion event.
6. Stay abreast of the OEI initiative as it develops, with the aim of addressing curricular issues that arise from changes implemented through the initiative.

Regarding goal four:

It was pointed out that this goal falls into the 10+1 items that direct ASGC work. We should make sure faculty are indeed involved in these discussions which historically appear to have happened primarily at an administrative level. Safety, learning, and other issues are impacted with rising caps. Some faculty seem to be misinformed about caps, and clarification, as well as a proactive approach to decision making surrounding caps is needed.

Questions came up about administrative versus faculty purview of setting enrollment caps; and whether changes in pay rates with larger class sizes mean that there is a wage issue that the Union should also address as part of this discussion.

More information about caps is needed, including the relationship to the contract. ASGC will be in communication with the union about this. Information about class size minimums needs to be clear. The twenty minimum rule seems inconsistently applied, and enrollment management as a larger issue should also be considered. For example, how is pedagogy, equity, etc. impacted by changes in class size?

It was suggested that for future discussion, we look at Canada's process for setting enrollment caps, which more formally involves faculty.

Regarding goal six:

It was recommended that online learning more generally be kept as a goal. It does not have to be OEI specific. Erica Reynolds has information on online classes that is very helpful, and she will be a good resource for us.

The goal should be aimed at helping to increase saturation of information about issues in distance education, and could be followed up with a survey. Additionally, facilitating professional development for distance educators, and helping to coordinate communication between DE committees and stakeholders on campus and across the district would be beneficial. Finally, quality assurance procedures for distance education should be taken into consideration. David will draft a goal regarding DE, and present it via email. It will come as an action item next meeting.

Goals will appear on the agenda as an action item for our next meeting.

b. AS Scholarships criteria and selection process / Karen Chadwick & Jeff Peterson

Steve Lehigh and Teresa Morris served on our scholarship selection committee last year, and opened the discussion with their questions, comments, and concerns about the process, based on their experience.

Foremost was discovering what options are on the table for adjusting our process. For example, on the rubric, can scale be altered by changing weights, or eliminating items? In this way we might get a better match between applicants and scholarship requirements in our pool.

Essentially, data is filtered from student applications. If criteria are overly broad, there are more applicants for review. Tailored questions can be added for a specific scholarship so that students are prompted to address issues important for meeting our scholarship criteria. This approach was used for the George Kramm scholarship and successfully helped to narrow the pool.

A potential drawback is that students then have to follow through on taking the step to fill out the additional questions. However, some eligible students may not take the extra step.

Another option would be to add criteria for filtering. The scoring matrix for general scholarships itself probably can't be adjusted, but Karen will double check. It may be possible to have a separate matrix altogether for AS scholarships. Criteria including grades and financial need that are taken into account by the general scoring matrix, but that don't apply to both of our scholarships could potentially be addressed in this way. A final option would be for the committee to share the data in a spreadsheet that could then be manipulated on our end.

Our goal is to match the qualifications of candidates in the pool with the scholarship description. How can we filter accurately so that our pool has qualifications that are relevant. Additionally, personal statements are often not targeting our specific scholarship criteria. Different definitions for community service and academic service both need to be clarified by us. Of note, the filtering issue was primarily problematic in the community service scholarship.

In conclusion, adding a specific question or questions has potential value as part of the application and should be pursued.

Additionally, clarifications should be made regarding obtaining references from volunteering efforts. Preferred references should be from the volunteer organization supervisor vs. academic references, which are often provided by default on the application.

Suggestions:

- Add question regarding community service
- Add a section for students to upload documents regarding proving community service
- Ask Academic Works about the possibility of creating a new rubric for Academic Senate—find out if this is possible, just for the community service scholarship
- No changes to academic service scholarships except revisiting definitions

Applications are coming November 1, 2016. Modification of our language in scholarship needs to be in at least a week in advance of this date to be included for this scholarship cycle.

- c. ART (Assessment of Reassigned Time) form / Jon Kitamura, Jeramy Wallace, Sandra Stefani Comerford

Jon Kitamura shared a document in response to the ART form that includes feedback from faculty who filled out the form from Language Arts, Counseling, and ASLT.

Themes:

- **Time consuming:** 3 hours minimum – 20 hours maximum (usually when coordinators worked together on a document)

- **Dean's role unclear:** Expectation of collaboration with Dean was typically not met. Lack of collaboration ranged from back and forth revision requests, or no involvement at all from the Dean.
- **Redundant information:** Similar information may be provided in other venues such as tenure review, faculty evaluations, coordination review, etc.
- **Purpose unclear:** Assessment language is not well received, for some it suggests evaluation of the employee, although the stated purpose is accounting for time for purposes of audit. Differences in how the forms were filled out across the Division indicate that the purpose of the form may have been unclear to both faculty and Deans.

Six questions that came up from faculty in the Language Arts Division:

1. Has any faculty member lost reassigned time after completing the form? **No.**
2. Do Deans complete/submit a separate ART form or similar document that evaluates performance of reassigned time? **No.**
3. What is the purpose of the ART form? **Auditing purposes.** Is it possible to change the language in the title of the form in order to clarify its purpose? **Yes.** Sandra Stefani Comerford understands how the word "assessment" – can be interpreted as evaluative. There is no objection to changing the language on this.
4. Is this a self-assessment? To many faculty, assessment is equivalent to evaluation.
5. If it is an evaluation, was our bargaining agent involved in the discussions about this form?
6. Was an analogous form accounting for administrator time used?

Statement from Teeka James

The statement was read by the representatives attending the meeting, and is included on the document submitted by Jon Kitamura on behalf of the Language Arts Division. The statement expressed confusion regarding the form's purpose, a mismatch between the form and how the Writing in the End Zone coordination team works collaboratively, and the format and meaning of some specific questions regarding schedule, reporting, and effectiveness. Difficulty in measuring success of the program appropriately using available statistics was mentioned, as well. Additionally, it would be good to close the feedback loop by sharing the official response to the form's content. Finally, there was frustration felt because of the stated intent that the form was simple, when in fact, it did not prove to be simple due to confusion, and lack of clarity regarding many aspects of its completion.

Response from Sandra Stefani Comerford

Sandra Stefani Comerford sought to clarify the purpose of the form and answer some of the questions brought forward in Senate. The form was not meant to be

punitive, and was not meant to be an evaluation of the faculty. The purpose is primarily for auditing. No documentation of reassigned time has happened in the past. Also, there is a need to gain control of and maintain awareness about where reassigned time is assigned.

The intention was not for the reported amounts of time to be spent on the form. Particularly when bearing in mind other workload issues for faculty.

There have been some changes to the form to improve it, and ultimately to resolve many of the issues brought to light in this discussion.

The order of some items on the form have changed. The effectiveness of reassigned time in meeting needs, not the effectiveness of faculty is being looked at.

Thus, going forward, the Deans will fill out the form. The Dean has to determine whether a member of faculty should do the reassigned work, or if it should be completed by another employee or classified staff. This new approach has been presented to the Deans already. Because reassigned work doesn't change much from year to year, the heavy lifting of "beta testing" the form now has already been done as a result of the hard work by everyone who filled out the form last Spring.

The form will be due in February. Deans may check in with Faculty, but the burden will be placed on the Dean to complete the form moving forward, and for submitting the documentation to the VPI.

Comments:

Faculty do want to be involved in this process of assessing reassigned time for auditing purposes, but there is a feeling that it is at times redundant since the information is duplicated in many other places such as tenure review, program proposals, etc. Of note, coordination is voluntary, rather than reassigned time. There may be a faculty load factor. Faculty should be made aware that if they are coordinating their load is impacted.

The end goal is online fillable form, like is used for program review. The form would be programmed to auto fill data from the prior year.

One representative indicated that if you are able to hold the purpose of the form in mind, and focus not on a given individual and the work completed during reassigned time, but rather the tasks that need to be completed in order for the reassigned time to be effective in getting the job done, it can be helpful in framing how and why to make adjustments to reassigned time. In this case it was particularly helpful because the reassigned time was changing from three to six hours, and consideration of work to be done was warranted. The form in this case helped document the why and how of the change.

Another comment was made about newer positions that come with reassigned time. How does the reassigned time get incorporated into the planning process. Do justifications go to IPC and/or cabinet?

Finally, some people appeared to have done double duty on the forms. For example, with some of the coordinator positions, two individuals are assigned the same role. In these cases, only one form is required. A form should be filled out for each job with reassigned time, not for each individual, as it is the effectiveness of the job being documented rather than an evaluation of the individual.

Thank you for listening.

Sandra Stefani Comerford came to some of the same conclusions that were shared in the meeting today. This feedback can be shared with Deans if appropriate in order to continue to improve the process.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, September 27, 2016.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman