CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES
October 11, 2016
2:30 – 4:30 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	David Laderman
Vice President	Kathleen Sammut
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre (Absent)
Secretary (Interim)	Stephanie Roach
Creative Arts/Social Science	Steven Lehigh
Creative Arts/Social Science	Margaret Kaluzny
Language Arts	Jon Kitamura (Absent – Jeramy Wallace is acting as substitute)
Language Arts	Mick Sherer
Library	Stephanie Roach
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (Absent)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales (Absent)
Business/Tech	Vincent Li (Absent)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mikel Schmidt (Absent)
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin (Absent)

OTHERS ATTENDING

Charlene Frontiera, Dean, Math / Science
Theresa Martin, Math / Science
Stephen McReynolds, Associated Students
Teresa Morris, Library
James Roe, Associated Students
Jeramy Wallace, Language Arts

I.   ORDER OF BUSINESS

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:46 pm

1. **Approval of the Agenda (October 11, 2016) and Draft Minutes (September 27, 2016)**
   Agenda
   Additions to the President's report will be made. Add Items D, E, & F as follows:
   Program Review Update; Future Discussion Items; All College meeting update.

   Wendy Whyte moved to approve the agenda with the additions as noted, Margaret Kaluzny seconded her motion. All voted in favor, the agenda is approved as amended.

   Minutes:
   Theresa Martin was not in attendance at the last meeting, and should be removed from the list of others attending.

   Wendy Whyte moved to approve the minutes with changes as noted, and Margaret Kaluzny seconded her motion. All voted in favor and the minutes were approved. Mick Sherer and Jeramy Wallace abstained.

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

   - AFT will hold a negotiations update October 18 from 3-4pm in College Vista, you are urged to attend
   - World Village will be November 16, 2016. Danni Redding-Lapuz is looking for faculty participants for the event
   - A presentation to faculty, staff, and administrators by Willy Wilkinson is planned October 26, 2016 from 12:30-2pm. Willy will speak about creating a trans-affirming campus.
   - The documentary film *Suited*, produced by HBO, Lena Dunham, and Jenni Konner will be screened October 27th from 6pm-9pm in 10-194. The screening will be followed by a discussion. The film *Suited* is also available in the Films on Demand database which is available from CSM Library, if you are unable to attend.

II.   INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **President's Report**
   a. IPC Update

      IPC's primary focus right now is on Program Review.

      The next IPC meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 21, 2016. The second hour will be devoted to a budget update and discussion. Faculty are encouraged to attend in order to learn more about CSM's budget and the budgeting process.

b. DPGC Update

The DPGC is primarily focused on reviewing and approving the Board policies, many of which are up for approval on our agenda today.

c. DAS Update

The faculty diversity internship program was presented to DAS (similar to what James Carranza presented to GC, last meeting). The program will continue to be vetted throughout Fall semester. The EEO committee has purview (at the District level), and the proposal will be brought to the Board of Trustees as well. Official approval from Academic Senate is not required, but the task force wants to bring the proposal to the Board with the blessing of the Senate and other key groups. The issue of grant funded faculty in relation to the tenure process was also brought up. It will be brought forward as needed in the future, depending on discussion in future at DAS.

Plans to change the Senate type from a Senate of the Whole to a Representative Senate are moving forward. The goal is to see this pushed through by the end of Fall or early Spring at the latest. It will require an all faculty vote. We need to have a future discussion item about it. In a Senate of the Whole, every faculty member is a senator, while in a Representative Senate, specific individuals are named senators, and who serve as representatives on the Senate. The latter is more in line with how Academic Senate functions at all three colleges.   It is important to avoid violation of the Brown Act, because with Senate of the Whole, quorums frequently occur unintentionally as part of the natural progression of college business. This is problematic when trying to adhere to specifics of the Brown Act.

Finally, Board Policy 6.13 has been approved by Skyline. Now we can move forward on its approval at the next DAS meeting.

d. Program Review Update

David Laderman will be hosting a forum with Val Tyler on use of the Resource Request Form. All the online forms for Program Review are now online and available. An exemplar Program Review document, as well as draft versions of evaluation guidelines will be posted online. These are designed to help people submit Program Review documentation that is satisfactory.

Please continue to reach out to David with your questions about Program Review.

e. Future discussion items

1. Tom Bauer & Eugene Whitlock are coming to talk at our next meeting. Any faculty with concerns about CCCE should come prepared with questions and comments.
2. At our November 8th meeting, we will be joined by Trustees Tom Mohr & Maurice Goodman. Please come with your questions and comments for members of the Board of Trustees.
   Tom Mohr sent some of his thoughts about the role of the Academic Senate to David Laderman via email. These were shared at the meeting, and the email is quoted by permission below.

   If I may, I would like to say that the leadership of the academic senate has never been more important. With the goals the district colleges have set for academic success for all students and the focused goals on greater success for underrepresented students, the matters of curriculum and pedagogy loom before the district as critical matters that influence levels of success in very substantial ways. The voice of the academic senate is the guidance the district counts on regarding how the district needs to invest in these matters that drive student success. The academic senate can help the board, in my opinion, pursue the right policies and ask the right questions. – Tom Mohr
3. Senate of the Whole conversion discussion will be coming soon.
4. Madeleine Murphy wants to get the blessing of the Senate regarding her proposal on SLOs. This would include recommendations for a data entry system and clerical support to complete the process.
5. A budget update will be coming, Mike Claire can be available for this discussion, and Steven Lehigh will be bringing information from Jan Roecks.
   Currently, there are no plans for hiring additional faculty positions. However, five positions will be filled based on known retirements for the end of the year.

f. All college meeting
    Discussion items included the announcement of a $5 million grant awarded to the Math / Science division to improve success among Hispanic and low income STEM students; Year One, which will continue to be an important project for our campus and first year students entering CSM from high school; and addressing concerns, and making improvements for our CTE programs, including an emerging technologies complex in buildings 19 and 12.

2. **ASCSM Update,** James Roe, President & Stephen McReynolds, Vice Chair, ASCSM

Welcome to James Roe, President of Associated Students, who hasn't been able to attend past Academic Senate meetings due to a conflict. Moving forward he will be joining Stephen McReynolds at our meetings.

Student Activities Fee update:
The current fee is $8. Proposals to raise the fee are different at different campuses. $12 at Canada, and $15 at both Skyline & CSM. The Student Activities Fee is not collected during summer session.

Event updates:
Money has been allocated to support the LGBTQ history events that are coming up later this month. Additionally, a timeline has been set for internal review of proposals.

Associated Students will be cosponsoring Hip Hop for Change with Ethnic Studies, featuring a lecture by Professors Rudy Ramirez and Fredrick Gaines, as well as live performances. The event is scheduled November 2, 2016 from 7:30-9:00pm in the CSM Theatre.

Student Evaluations:
Skyline's Associated Students approached ASCSM about the issue of increasing student evaluations so that they occurred for every class, every semester. It will be discussed soon by ASCSM. Eugene Whitlock attended one of ASCSM's meetings and provided the administrative perspective, but Associated Students would also like to hear the faculty perspective, so they can make a recommendation as the students of the district.

Brief discussion followed, and touched on challenges of implementing such a change due to administrative issues, time factor concerns, and online delivery problems including student participation.

Because the issue of student evaluations is part of contract negotiations between AFT and the District, the question was raised about whether the administration had approached the students about something that is a faculty union negotiated issue, and whether this was an appropriate action for the administration to take. There were conflicting reports about who initiated the contact regarding discussion of this issue with students.

3. Standing Committee Reports

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

No report. Curriculum drop-in sessions are ongoing through mid-November. There is also a session tomorrow during Flex Day. The deadline for Fall is November 11 or 12 for "technical review".

b. Library Advisory Committee, *Tim Maxwell, Chair*

No report. Next meeting is October 20, 2016.

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

No report.

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

No report. Next meeting is October 24, 2016. Flex Day is tomorrow, participation is expected to be good, as many have signed up for activites.

III. ACTION ITEMS

a. Board Policies

Several Board policies have been brought forward with changes for approval. Most are minor technical changes regarding the Ed code. There is one that there are concerns about, so we may need to address it at a future meeting.

- 1.02 Organization of the Board
- 2.12 Employee Rights & Protection, Domestic Partner Rights, and Whistleblower Protection
- 2.45 Conflict of Interest
- 3.16 Equivalency to Minimum Qualifications: There is feedback that needs to be shared regarding minimum qualifications. We will pull this from the vote today and discuss it at the next meeting.
- 7.41 Disabled Student Programs
- 8.33 Auxiliary Services
- 2.08 District Participatory Governance Process

It was decided to remove 3.16 from the voting action today so there can be further discussion on it at a future meeting.

All other list items (1.02, 2.12, 2.45, 7.41, 8.33, 2.08) are ready for approval. Wendy Whyte moved to approve all list items except 3.16, and Steve Lehigh seconded her motion. All voted in favor, and all the listed Board policies except 3.16 (1.02, 2.12, 2.45, 7.41, 8.33, 2.08) were approved. Jeramy Wallace abstains.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. AS Scholarship criteria revisions

Discussion focused on suggestions made to add a question to the community service scholarship, add a section for uploading documents, and to revisit definitions for the academic scholarship.

Academic Works can create a special rubric for our scholarship.

Information about specific requirements for our scholarships should be shared clearly with students during the application process. In the past scholarship submission cycle, it was apparent that some eligible students were missed because

the application process for the community service scholarship didn't accommodate our requirements.

There is a short 750 word limit for the personal statement, and students report that it can be hard to get the whole story out in 750 words. Uploading additional documentation could help with this problem.

Options for uploaded documentation could keep the original letter of recommendation (written by a volunteer service supervisor) requirement in place and/or have a specific personal statement regarding the service experience.

In conclusion, we should move forward with the following:

1. Add a question to prompt students to include volunteer service information in their applications. This would serve as a way for students to elaborate about the service experience. Could be a simple "Have you done community service?" If you want to apply for the ASGC Service Scholarship, fill out this info…
2. Add an upload documents section in order to provide an additional reference specifically from the volunteer supervisor. The reference letter would serve to verify community service as well as provide details of the volunteer experience. The student would have a choice to upload either a letter of reference from a supervisor or a personal statement detailing the volunteer experience.

By including an option to check the box in order to move through the form to the community service scholarship specific portion of the online submission, it is possible that some students may end up on the community service scholarship information page without intending to. However, this scholarship application information could be useful for other scholarship committees, which is an unintended, but perhaps positive consequence of adding additional steps.

The current rubric includes academics and financial need which aren't considerations for our service scholarships. By manipulating the data, we could "zero out" the weight of academics and financial need in the rubric. The personal statement and quality of service ratings could be added. In practice, it is thought that the updated rubric would result in a review screen view that is different from scholarships using the general rubric. Depending on the practical details, we still may need to acquire the student scholarship application data in a file, which can then be imported and manipulated as needed to fit better with our scholarship criteria.

For the Academic Support scholarship, we need to address whether or not mentors from Puente, Mana, the Learning Center, and Year One mentors fit with our scholarships. These students do some community/volunteer service, represent the CSM community at events, and sometimes provide academic support for fellow students. Bearing these activities in mind, it seems that mentoring in this capacity is more aligned with the requirements for the Academic Support scholarship, than the Community Service Scholarship.

David Laderman will contact Scholarship Coordinator Karen Chadwick about details. All instructions and an updated rubric should be submitted to her by mid-November in order for changes to be accommodated for the current scholarship cycle.

b. Textbook cost issues

There was some discussion of approaches to reducing textbook costs for students. Potential actions include the following:

- Promotion/messaging
- Raise awareness through sharing of information
- Recommend sources for finding open texts
- Proposal for price caps

Increasing access to textbooks, which is one of the features of the California Promise program, is the goal. There are several approaches to this that can include decreasing the cost to faculty and students as well as learning where to find free options. It would be good to know how students use required course materials, and what student expectations regarding textbook costs are, and whether based on that, we could make recommendations as a body about price caps.

Recommendations for faculty should extend to documentation in the syllabus about what options are available and acceptable for the class. This would be one step toward helping students know in advance what their expenses will be. It is important to make sure students understand the options that are available to them. In other words, both faculty and students need to be aware of the issue and potential solutions. Collaboration with Associated Students on this issue will be key. Student surveys by ASCSM, PRIE, and other groups can help us understand the student perspective.

It is important to recognize that expectations about costs as well as the practicality of using open educational resources will vary by discipline, and even on a case by case basis within a discipline. One option would be envisioning a paradigm shift, and taking a zero cost stance. However, this is one end of the spectrum, and this is likely to cause frustration for some faculty who have to conform to it, as it may rule out more expensive options that are of a better quality and are more suited for meeting the learning outcomes set for their students. Additionally, there is a periphery products problem, as many open educational resources do not provide access to the online tools provided by traditional publishers.

At the local level, we may not have the negotiating power to deal with vendors/publishers directly regarding reducing price. However, it may be possible that the California Community College system or other regional consortium or group can negotiate with these publishers to get better pricing as part of a contract/subscription.

Another way to look at the problem is from a campus wide perspective, in which cost of required course materials are analyzed as a whole across all divisions. In this way, we can address the problem of reducing cost of required course materials as a whole, particularly when specific disciplines find it more challenging to do so. For example, class sets could be supplied for courses like English. While this wouldn't work for all courses, in combination, the cost associated with required course materials can go down on campus as part of an overarching goal.

It was recommended that we bring in people from the State or other open text initiatives to come in on Flex Day, or for a workshop so that we can learn about our options.
In general, it is felt that the Academic Senate needs more information on this issue. The formation of an Academic Senate Task Force is recommended.

Meeting adjourned at 4:42 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, October 25, 2016.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman