

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

October 25, 2016

2:30 – 4:30 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	David Laderman (Absent)
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 (Absent)
Language Arts	Mick Sherer
Library	Stephanie Roach
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (Absent)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales
Business/Tech	Vincent Li
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mikel Schmidt
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin (Absent)

OTHERS ATTENDING

Theresa Martin, Biology
Madeleine Murphy, English
Leigh Anne Shaw, District Academic Support

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:38 pm

1. Approval of the Agenda (October 25, 2016) and Draft Minutes (October 11, 2016) Agenda

The agenda was amended to move the order of the discussion items, so that Madeleine Murphy could discuss SLOs during the College Assessment Committee report. Leigh Ann Shaw moved to approve the motion, and Vincent Li seconded. The motion was approved.

Additionally, the agenda was amended to add an associated action—approval is needed for a screening committee for the faculty position that became available when Laura Demsetz became Dean.

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve, and Vincent Li seconded the motion. All voted in favor, the agenda was approved as amended.

Minutes:

Margaret Kaluzny moved to approve, and Mick Sherer seconded the motion. All voted in favor, agenda approved. Rosemary Nurre, Vincent Li, Steve Gonzalez, and Mikel Schmidt abstained.

2. Public Comment (2 minutes per)

Thursday November 3, 2016 is the 4th Biannual Writers' Ruckus, a celebration of reading. Students will read out poetry, fiction, and more from 2pm-4pm in the Bayview Dining Room. Featured faculty readers will also appear. Free books will be available for those in attendance.

Year One is delighted to welcome Wes Moore, author of *The Other Wes Moore* to College of San Mateo on Tuesday November 15th, from 11-12pm in theatre. He will speak about causes and complexities in relationship to equity. Please invite students, faculty, and staff to attend.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. President's Report

a. IPC update

Program review and budget have been the primary items of discussion at IPC. Work preparing for Program review is ongoing. At the last meeting, Kathy Blackwood and Jan Roecks presented information about funds and budgeting at the district and college level respectively.

Another issue that IPC has been looking at is the collection of indexes used to track a number of student success indicators. Examples include transfer rate, course completion, etc. It has become apparent that not all of the indexes provide straightforward data. When definitions from outside organizations are used, which is required for many of the indexes, some students are left out of the equation, which can result in data that is unclear. For example, when transfer rates are calculated, the total number of transfer students is not captured because the external definition requires that only first time college attendees be counted. In other words, returning students, or students who have taken one course elsewhere, are not counted as a transfer student even if they successfully transfer from CSM to another institution. IPC is considering working with PRIIE to come up with a set of indexes that are more useful for our purposes at the CSM community.

b. AS scholarship criteria revisions

There will be a “pop-up” addendum to the service scholarship. This will allow a reference or statement meeting the needs of our specific scholarship to be provided by the applicant. Work is still being done on ways to modify how we use the rubric. We have some options to use as workarounds if there isn’t a system based option in place. Karen has confirmed the changes.

c. Conversion to Representative Senate / Leigh Anne Shaw

Leigh Anne Shaw, District Academic Senate President presented details about the coming conversion to a Representative Senate. Currently, we are operating as a Senate of the Whole, in which every faculty member is a senator. This is problematic for a variety of reasons as follows:

- Frequent inadvertent quorums occur, which is a problem with meeting the Brown Act requirements regarding open meetings.
- Posting the time and place of meetings in advance is required, even in these situations.
- Taking minutes is required.
- Votes for all senators should be recorded individually.

In order to stay within the guidelines of the open meetings laws, we need to shift to a Representative Senate. Most colleges have already changed over to a Representative Senate. This Fall, we will ask for changes to the Senate bylaws, at which point we can vote to make the change. The conversion to a representative senate would be followed by identifying representatives for each division. Bear in mind that with a representative senate, if a Senator is unable to attend a meeting, their vote can’t be cast, and a substitute can’t be sent. A recommended solution to this potential problem is to identify two representatives from each division. These can be appointed or elected according to the bylaws of each Senate. The conduct of

the executive council and functionality of the Senate operations are determined by each individual college. It is important that we move forward with this, and answer any questions about the changes prior to the vote. Please go back to the divisions, and explain how the Representative Senate works. It was emphasized that functionally, the Senate will stay the same. Once each campus votes, if it is approved, the process will be completed. The goal is to move forward on this by the end of this semester.

Leigh Anne Shaw will make her slide presentation on the topic available.

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

Stephen McReynolds opened the ASCSM update with information regarding the proposal to increase the frequency of student evaluations of faculty. Since the last meeting, when it was apparent that the administration had provided information to the Associated Students about this issue, which is currently a part of contract negotiations, Teeka James spoke to ASCSM and provided the AFT perspective. Stephen emphasized that while the body makes decisions as a whole, the leadership of ASCSM doesn't want to intrude into the negotiation process. The resolution about this issue came to ASCSM from Skyline's Associated Students. The resolution is too vague, and ASCSM fears it may have the unintended consequence of affecting the ongoing negotiation. If the issue remains important for students, they may revisit it at a different time, and work with faculty directly.

Clarity on the history of the involvement of administration was requested. ASCSM was approached to do a collective student resolution by Associated Students of Skyline. Because the resolution was written by students at Skyline last semester, and Stephen began serving this semester, he is uncertain of the origin of the resolution. However, it had to have been written by students. Whether or not it was written by students after a prompt or suggestion from administrators is unknown.

3. Standing Committee Reports

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

No report.

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

No report.

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

Details of the SLO proposal was shared by Madeleine Murphy.

Madeleine is unsure if we need an official vote from Senate in order to move forward with the SLO proposal, but she would like to move forward with the support and approval of the Senate.

Summary of report recommendations:

College of San Mateo needs to ramp up the frequency and consistency with which we are doing SLO assessment. It should be a priority to provide tools and resources to make the process easier. For example, it is possible to embed an SLO quiz or other tools that can track disambiguated data as is now required by our accrediting body. Gateway departments like English and Math are positioned well to lead the way because they reach so many students. In order to move towards capturing SLO data in a way that is painless, administration must provide support in the form of clear policies, procedures, training, and human resources. In so doing, they can allow faculty to focus on collecting more meaningful data without facing technical barriers that prevent us from doing so. For training, it would be a good idea to earmark at least one FLEX activity per semester for student learning outcomes and issues. We could work with students or graduates in focus group for example in order to capture and assess qualitative data.

ASCSM are willing to help recruit students for these efforts. Partnerships on campus would be key. Individual professors and/or departments can work with ASCSM to put a survey out. Extra credit and food goes a long way in getting students to participate. Students like to be heard, and will value these types of opportunities.

Some colleges have an assessment day that is formalized. In the future, we may want to move in this direction. But for now, if we can start with Flex Day opportunities and support from administration we are on the right track.

Our current assessment cycle asks for assessment every three years. The three-year rule was established arbitrarily, not in response to a specific requirement. But when we're being asked to disaggregate data, we need to have access to trends on a regular basis, which is why we need to increase the frequency with which we assess SLOs.

Unfortunately, generic data for a full course can't be disaggregated to a granular enough level. To meet the requirement for disaggregation, we can't anonymize the data, and still tap into the benefits of the existing data attached to the student id number. We want to maximize use of the registration database, and its existing data. We also have to have enough data, for assessment to be meaningful. Again, increased frequency will help with this problem. Nonetheless, it is important to note that for some programs, with lower enrollment, getting enough data can be challenging.

A problem that was identified is that the program review information currently doesn't provide disaggregated data that controls for all of those variables. Thus, use of the data isn't maximized. Special requests have to be made of PRIE in order to get at this information.

Of note, if faculty doesn't get administrative support on this issue, then it won't be feasible to accomplish the goals regarding SLO assessment. Of course, if we don't achieve the requirements for disaggregating data collected for SLOs, then there may be consequences like getting a warning from accreditation agencies. It is likely that this will help demonstrate the need for making changes and providing support as needed.

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

- Goals 2016-17: The CAE seeks to articulate and align its goals to CSMs strategic goals.
 - Implement the three year professional development plan developed last year
 - Make professional development sustainable. Find solutions for keeping the budget consistent from year to year.
 - Make the committee an IPC subcommittee rather than an Academic Senate subcommittee, because the committee serves classified staff, faculty, and administration.
 - Work with the district to coordinate professional development offerings, in order to be efficient, effective, and maximize use of funds.
- Budget 2016-17: The budget for this year is being allocated for various opportunities.
 - The committee welcomes feedback and ideas for speakers and presentations.
 - If you would like to participate as a presenter, please contact CAE.
 - The suggestion was made to collect data about professional development in a wider survey. In doing so, it might be possible to identify themes and needs across a wider group of faculty, adjunct faculty, and others.
- Flex assessment activities will be planned. Please stay tuned for more professional development opportunities.

III. ACTION ITEMS

a. Approve a faculty hiring committee for a full time Engineering faculty member to replace Laura Demsetz, who has moved to an administrative position as Dean.

Committee:

- a. David Locke, Physics
- b. Chris Walker, Math (non-tenured)
- c. Alex Wong, Physics
- d. Charlene Frontiera, Dean, Math/Science
- e. Laura Demsetz, Dean, Creative Arts & Social Science; Engineering discipline expert

There was a brief discussion about two aspects of full time faculty hiring committees: 1) clarification regarding the details of policy for the participation of non-tenured faculty on screening committees was requested; and 2) the question of an administrator serving as the subject discipline expert on the committee. Non-tenured faculty may serve on screening committees when appropriate tenured faculty members are not available. Likewise, an administrative discipline expert may serve on the committee in an advisory role. Laura Demsetz would not be a voting member of the committee.

Additionally, follow up information was requested about how and if this differs from the Adjunct Faculty selection procedures. Leigh Anne Shaw will share the official documentation about hiring committees for clarification on these questions.

Rosemary Nurre moves to approve the screening committee, and Vincent Li seconded her motion. All voted in favor and the committee was approved. A 2/3 majority was needed.

b. Board Policies 3.16, 6.13

3.16: Equivalency to Minimum Qualifications

The issue regarding minimum qualifications is sensitive for disciplines such as counseling, because historically, when moving non-counseling faculty into counseling teaching areas by stating they meet the minimum qualifications can impede on Faculty Service Areas (FSA). Other courses have been developed with similar course topics to COUN or CRER, but are taught by those outside the discipline.

There were several points of discussion regarding Board Policy 3.16 and FSAs as follows:

1. Why is FSA dealt with separately? Policy 3.16 is now only about minimum qualifications. FSA will be treated in a separate policy. FSA is not within the purview of Senate, it is a contractual item, and thus within the purview of AFT. One exception to this is, for example, when a German teacher might want to add a second FSA in ESL. In these cases, a district wide committee formed from the Senate president, a Dean from a different college, and faculty discipline experts determine if the person meets the minimum qualifications. If they do, then the question moves forward to AFT. If not, the question moves to a separate process regarding equivalence which might include course work, professional equivalency, etc.
2. According to policy and procedure, the process of determining equivalency is led by Senate and faculty discipline experts. However the question was raised about whether or not policy and procedure are correctly put into practice. The concern is that there may be instances where it isn't. An area of particular concern might be CTE, because many applicants may have relevant qualifications but not meet specific academic requirements. Ultimately, Senate and faculty experts should be leading these efforts of equivalency and making determinations for both new hires and for those applying for a second FSA.
3. There is a master list of FSAs. When a reduction of positions is likely, faculty are frequently given the option of applying for an FSA that is less likely to be cut.

4. FSAs apply to all faculty, including adjunct faculty.
5. The procedure accompanying 3.16 has not yet been fully revised. It seems as though work still needs to be done on the procedure to make certain that it addresses specific concerns regarding creation of a faculty minimum qualifications committee by Senate, including makeup of the committee, which is crossed out of the policy, and not clear in the procedure.
6. When courses with similar content are offered across departments or divisions, there should be a conversation at COI where discussion and resolution can be determined. Essentially, cases like these are a curriculum issue. When courses are initially approved, there should be discussion about who should teach it. Transferability can be affected when there is inconsistency.
7. In determining equivalency, everyone has to be in agreement. It can cause tension when not everyone agrees, however, it is required as part of the process. Applicants may appeal, but determinations of equivalency must be unanimous.

Procedure 3.16.2 covers the question about committee membership.

The big changes to Policy 3.16 are that procedural items have been pulled out of the policy, and minimum qualifications and FSAs have been treated separately, with 3.16 focusing on equivalency.

Clarity regarding role of the Academic Senate president and the Academic Senate is needed in the procedure and perhaps should be stated briefly in the policy, as well. The Dean, while responsible for hiring and/or changing the status of an existing faculty member is a non-voting member of the committee.

Definitions should go into the procedure and the policy to help clarify confusion regarding roles.

A typo was noted in the second paragraph of *Item 2: Licensed or certificated occupations*.

There was a motion to table this item until the November 8th meeting made by Steve Lehigh, which was seconded by Theresa Martin. Documentation of the accompanying Board Procedure will be provided.

6.13: Curriculum Development, Program Review, and Program Viability

These changes stem from concern with issues determining when programs are changed or downsized. The policy has identified the District Curriculum Committee as the body to resolve issues that may arise. The change to the policy shifts that responsibility to local Academic Senates instead. Thus, local Senates will make certain a program is viable prior to discontinuing it, making sure that there is an emphasis on viability during decision making regarding programs.

Procedures will outline how to determine if it is viable or not. Ultimately, the power to determine viability resides in local colleges, not the District committee.

Rosemary Nurre motioned to approve the changes to the policy, Vincent Li seconded her motion. All voted in favor. The changes to Policy 6.13 were approved.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Textbook cost issues

There is additional information since our last discussion of textbook cost issues. The Chancellor's office has put together an RFA for a zero-textbook-cost degree program grant. These would be due in December. We should discuss further at a future meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:31 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, November 8, 2016.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from Kathleen Sammut