

# CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

November 8, 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	Wendy Whyte (Absent)
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales (Absent)
Business/Tech	Vincent Li
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mikel Schmidt
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin

## OTHERS ATTENDING

---

Tom Bauer	Danni Redding-Lapuz
Diana Bennett	James Roe
Mike Claire	Jan Roecks
Laura Demsetz	Leigh Anne Shaw
Teeka James	Sandra Stefani Comerford
Dan Kaplan	Eugene Whitlock
Stephen McReynolds	Theresa Martin
Teresa Morris	

### I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:34 pm

**1. Approval of the Agenda (November 8, 2016) and Draft Minutes (October 25, 2016)**

**Agenda**

Rosemary Nurre motioned to approve the Agenda. Jacqueline Gamelin seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the agenda was approved.

**Minutes:**

The minutes were amended to correct the board policy numbering. The old board policy regarding equivalency for minimum qualifications is 3.15, however the new policy will be numbered 3.16. Thus, 3.16 was the number of the policy up for approval by Academic Senate, while 3.15 was referred to in order to compare language and changes to the policy.

Two changes were noted regarding attendance. Both Dan Kaplan and Jon Kitamura attended the meeting, but were not noted on the minutes.

Margaret Kaluzny moved to approve the minutes with changes as noted, and Vincent Li seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the minutes were approved with changes as noted. Jacqueline Gamelin and David Laderman abstained from voting.

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

The Library is participating in a food drive called Food for Fines beginning November 14, 2016 and lasting through the end of the semester. Late fines accrued for any items checked out from participating Peninsula Library System Libraries (most public libraries in the county, and College of San Mateo Library and Cañada College Library) will be waived with the donation of non-perishable food items. A list of participating libraries will be shared.

Leigh Anne Shaw attended the State Plenary Conference, where there was discussion about the Taskforce for a Strong Workforce Program. This Board of Governors initiative will allow approximately \$200 million to be released to colleges across the state. The initiative has a Career and Technology Education (CTE) focus. However, the deadline for this program is January 31, 2017, which is a cause for concern because the timeline is short and there hasn't yet been the opportunity for faculty feedback to be provided to the many program partners. Please talk to your leadership to ask about this program. Faculty input is needed.

**II. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**1. President's Report**

Thanks to Kathleen Sammut and Leigh Anne Shaw for helping to run the last meeting while David Laderman was out. Their efforts are much appreciated.

A quick update regarding next steps for Madeleine Murphy's SLO proposal was provided. No formal approval from ASGC is needed. The proposal is still evolving, and

faculty input and feedback is still welcome. Madeleine will continue to update us about the process. She is working on getting administrative support, infrastructure, etc. as needed to support implementation of the proposal.

On CSM's campus, because there have been delays getting information from the state for the Taskforce for a Strong Workforce Program, we are off to a slow start. Nonetheless, CTE Dean Kathy Ross is moving forward, and though broad faculty feedback and input has not yet been sought out, CTE faculty have been a part of the process. In the end, while there has been some movement on the taskforce at CSM, it does still need to come to Senate—we'd like to hear from both Kathy Ross and Dianna Bennet at Senate to discuss this program.

The Zero textbook degree program grant proposal is coming up soon in December. There will be a webinar regarding the program this month. We need faculty partners to support this effort. There will likely be financial support for those who participate. Theresa Martin was identified as a potential partner. Including a Library partner is important. Identifying additional partners will be important.

a. DPGC update / Board Procedure 3.16

Policy 3.16 and its pending approval was discussed at the DPGC meeting. Many of the points of concern we raised have been moved into the procedure for 3.16, which seems to address the concerns we raised. Leigh Anne Shaw regularly attends events about minimum qualifications when attending the State Plenary Sessions. Her takeaway was that there is no such thing as granting provisional equivalencies for minimum qualifications. If minimum qualifications aren't met, we can't hire. The question remains about whether this should be stated specifically in our policy. For the time being, there is a blanket statement that covers this issue.

Because ASGC doesn't approve procedures (only policies), we can address our questions and concerns about the accompanying procedure as recommendations. A procedural question at hand is in regards to the generic statement that "faculty," rather than "full time faculty" are selected to serve on minimum qualifications committees. These committees can be contentious, and it is important to protect the interest of part time faculty who may be tapped to serve on these committees. It would be better to seek full time faculty from each school first, before appointing part time faculty. However, there are some departments without any full time faculty, so there are situations where part time faculty are required to serve on these committees. While the Dean can help guide the process, the goal is to make sure that the decisions are a faculty driven expert process.

A valid question is whether or not there is a reason to duplicate some of these details in the policy so that ASGC can have more control over details addressed in

the procedure that are important to ensuring an appropriate faculty driven process. An example of this is the makeup of the committee.

There was also a brief discussion about the potential to see language added about compensation for adjunct faculty serving in this type of committee, where the workload is more demanding. Because compensation is contractual, it may not be appropriate to put in the policy, however there may be a precedent for it, so follow up is needed in order to answer the question. It would definitely be appropriate for stating in the contract though.

b. Representative senate conversion (cont'd)

The conversion to a representative senate has continued to be discussed at our last meeting, and at other venues. Representatives, please be sure to share this information with colleagues in your division. David will draft an email regarding the issue to help inform all faculty of the issue and of the upcoming all faculty vote.

Many expressed that it doesn't seem like that big of a deal because functionally not a lot will be changing.

Of note, some Brown Act conflicts will still exist at Flex Day and other large gatherings where many faculty gather. This could potentially be an issue.

Implementation of the representative senate will not retroactively invalidate any past policies or issues already decided on.

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

No update regarding the issue of frequency of student evaluations. Students support options for open educational resources in order to help keep costs down.

There is still disagreement among the three colleges regarding the student body fee increase. The goal is to have fees uniform across all campuses. CSM is seeking a \$15 per semester fee, to be collected year round, including summer.

**3. Standing Committee Reports**

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

Thursday is the deadline for new curriculums to be posted in CurricUNET. The Dean must have approved it there by the due date, otherwise it won't be eligible until the following school year. The process is the same across district, although the deadlines are separate. If working on a joint project across campuses, submitters at each campus must meet the deadline for their campus.

This afternoon, Teresa Morris has a help session on the process planned for those who need it.

The committee seeks to change the Senate bylaws so the name of the committee is in line with other campuses across the state. Instead of Committee on Instruction, they propose changing the committee name to Curriculum Committee.

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

No report.

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

No report.

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

There is not a meeting to report on. However, of note, during this Program Review cycle, the Center for Academic Excellence is being considered for renovation in order to give more privacy and safety to the Instructional Technologist, whose office shares the space. Additionally, it is hoped that technology, and other updates will be made.

### III. ACTION ITEMS

a. Board Policy 3.16

In order to add details of the makeup of the committee in the policy, we need to suggest language and forward a draft to District Academic Senate, so we can move forward with approval of the policy.

Regarding makeup of the committee, Adjuncts should not be called upon to serve unless there are not full time faculty experts available.

FSA information is separated out because it is a contractual issue not a policy issue. FSAs usually don't come up as an issue unless there is a reduction planned. A separate FSA procedure is to be developed. Regarding FSA for new hires, a procedural step could be added as part of HR's process. There is concern, because not all of these procedures have been drafted or approved, that there will be a gap during which proper procedures and policies are not in place. Because so much is being separated out of policy 3.16, it would be better to have all drafts written and ready for approval, so that there is no gap in policy / procedures for the details formerly contained in 3.16. The timing is complicated. Policy 3.15 (with FSA language) is still in place. It will be effective until 3.16 is approved. Once approved, the accompanying procedure for 3.16 will be expedited. However, it seems apparent that there is a period during which 3.15 will no longer be effective, and 3.16 will be effective without an accompanying procedure. During a gap, as needed, we could fall back on contractual language. These concerns will be brought forward to DAS.

Nonetheless, time is of the essence, and we need to approve this policy as soon as possible. David will put together draft so it can be discussed at next DAS meeting.

### III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. CCCE (Corporate, Continuing, and Community Education) / Tom Bauer, Eugene Whitlock

Amy Sobel and Kristy Ridgeway are unable to be in attendance today. Each wrote letters regarding their concerns, which were shared in advance with Tom Bauer and Eugene Whitlock, who will provide a response.

The SVIEP caters to international students who are ineligible to enter CSM or other colleges and universities because their TOEFL score does not meet the minimum standard of a 56 score. The path for these students is to come to the United States, and enter an intensive English language program which grants them guaranteed admission to an affiliated college on successful completion of the program.

There are many intensive English language programs that partner with colleges. The goal is to funnel these students, after successful completion of the SVIEP makes them eligible, to CSM, Cañada College, and Skyline College rather than have them go to other colleges. Having the SVIEP partnered with and guaranteeing admission to our district colleges allows us to compete with other intensive English language programs that have partnered with other colleges or systems.

The primary concern of our faculty that needs to be addressed is that SVIEP courses are in direct competition with ESL courses at CSM. It seems clear that the international students are not initially eligible for entrance into CSM and thus to our ESL courses due to admission requirements for the TOEFL scores.

It is the exit from the SVIEP that is potentially problematic, as there is room for the students to receive the same level of ESL instruction at SVIEP as they would be receiving at CSM. If students stay in the SVIEP program until they are placed at ESL levels 4 or 5 according to CSM's placement tests, the implication is that the students have covered that content and are prepared for courses such as ENGL 100 or 105, and thus don't have a need to complete ESL instruction at CSM. It will remain to be seen where these students place upon completion of the SVIEP, and if there is actually a conflict here. If students consistently place at the highest levels, there would seem to be a conflict. Thus, there is the potential that by default (even though not by design), there may be a conflict as a result of exit placement scores and overlap with ESL coursework at CSM.

The ultimate goal is to enable these students to succeed once they are eligible to enroll at CSM. Even though SVIEP language students will attempt to move toward ESL level 4 while in the program, they may or may not place at that level. These students would still be required to be placed via an exam administered by CSM, before registering for courses. A good goal would be to place them at the level that is equivalent to a 56 TOEFL score required for admission as an international student. This might be the equivalent of ESL levels 3 or 4, so there may be some overlap for instruction at levels 1 - 3. CSM teaches ESL levels 1 - 2 primarily for domestic students for whom English is a second language, but who do not have to meet the

same entrance requirements as international students (F1 visa students must meet the TOEFL score requirement, while domestic students do not).

It is important to bear in mind that the international students attending the SVIEP would not otherwise have been on track to attend CSM at all, because their TOEFL scores didn't place them at a high enough level to be eligible. It is this point that seems to have been a sticking point for leadership of the SVIEP, in regards to acknowledging a potential conflict between the course offerings. Because the students otherwise wouldn't have attended CSM, they do not see an overlap because the students are not eligible to enroll until completion of the SVIEP. However, attention will need to be paid to the placement levels of students completing the SVIEP, in order to identify potential areas of overlap, and/or to demonstrate there are not areas of overlap.

Mike Claire pointed out that students are coming to the United States for college regardless of TOEFL scores. If they don't hit the minimum scores, they'll go to another intensive English language program and enroll, which is a missed opportunity for us. We want to capture these students and funnel them into the CSM. Hopefully this will be an opportunity for our faculty, particularly our ESL faculty, to work with Tom Bauer's group. The students are coming, so it is good for us to be part of this process moving forward so that the students will be more likely to stay at CSM, rather than going to another college. Our competition is really with other IEL programs. We want these students to attend CSM.

Additional areas of conversation regarding the SVIEP included planning for and communication about the program, as well as other issues. Highlights are featured below with in depth discussion of the communication and planning process following.

- The placement test when these students reapply is important in helping us to control the process.
- Concerns were raised about the ethics of guaranteeing admission to students completing the SVIEP who have not placed high enough on the TOEFL to initially attend CSM or another college. However, it was pointed out that one of the best ways to learn a language is through immersion in a country where the language is spoken. Intensive English language programs are designed to take advantage of this.
- Faculty of the SVIEP aren't employed by CSM, and aren't protected by our union negotiated contract, because they are employed by SVIEP, which is private. While this might provide an opportunity to forge a closer relationship, there may also be conflicts of interest when our adjuncts are hired, and use material developed for ESL courses at CSM.
- With a promise of guaranteed admission to CSM, Cañada, or Skyline for students completing the SVIEP, but who scored below 56 on the TOEFL, are we skirting an important requirement? This is a very common practice among intensive English language programs. Students don't successfully complete the program until they are assessed and determined to be ready. They are eligible for up to 32 weeks of intensive English language programming. Finally, because a placement exam is still required prior to entrance to the college, it will be assured that they are placed at the

appropriate ESL level courses. This assurance that taking CSMs placement test before entrance has reassured some.

- Students in the SVIEP get a different visa and I20. On completion of the SVIEP they then must reapply, and retest in order to get into CSM or another college.
- It will take time for enough students to be in program. Currently the program has about eight students and is not self-sustaining. It is being subsidized by CCCE. The seed money of \$400,000 must be paid back eventually.
- Tuition is \$10,000. Housing is separate, etc.
- The program is marketed only to people who don't pass the TOEFL.
- The advantage to the district in bringing these students here is when there is a surplus. Money goes to the community education fund, but if there is a surplus, the college gets some of that money.

### **Perceived Problems with Communication and Planning for SVIEP**

Frustration has been expressed regarding communication about and planning for the SVIEP, which has taken a top down approach. Part of this problem is a result of piloting the program with Cañada College. Many initial conversations happened at Cañada College only. Skyline College then made a decision to fast track the program. As a result, CSM was largely left out of the communication loop and planning process, which seems like an oversight considering that CSM has the largest number of international students attending on an F1 visa.

Curriculum processes between the colleges overlap a lot. Communication for any program of this nature needs to be broader, so that we can maintain and plan for curricular alignment across the district. It can't be accomplished in a silo, with decisions made at one or two colleges alone. To be out of alignment, and to only have a conversation at one school is insufficient.

Tom Bauer and Eugene Whitlock acknowledged that in hindsight, a deeper conversation across the colleges would have been beneficial. Private schools typically don't consult with others as part of their planning processes, so the need for this wasn't recognized in advance, although they did take time to consult with Cañada College. In hindsight things would have been done differently.

It seems like most conversations with partners at Cañada College focused on how to make students successful rather than about the impacts of increased numbers of international students on campus and for faculty. We must address these issues as well.

As we grow, we need to make sure conversations that include all stakeholders continue to happen.

### **General questions and additional areas for partnerships with CCCE**

The requirements for vetting instructors hired to teach CCCE courses varies depending on the course and discipline. For example, for pharmacy technician



courses, you have to be an experienced pharmacist, with at least “X” years of experience. For other courses, the instructor needs a master’s degree as well as experience in instruction. So, it varies.

CSM offers creative writing and reading/literature options at the 800 level. CCCE offers creative writing, too. Is there potential for synergy between the two programs through cross-promotion or advertising? While the majority of the CCCE enrollees are out of state, there are still options for promotion.

Digital media piloted a not for credit course at CCCE. In spring it will become a credit course at CSM. In a sense, CCCE served as a “research & development lab” for Digital Media in this example. The course was able to fast track via CTE and get tested out for CSM. Additionally, CSM skill builder courses are taken alongside CSM courses, and sometimes are similar to CCCE courses. Communication with CCCE about the similarities and differences between their courses and those at CSM has been very helpful for those in Digital Media.

Perhaps there should be some sort of policy and procedure established that assists in working out details for communicating with faculty and CCCE. It is particularly important when CCCE courses are closely aligned with what is taught here already.

Please look at the catalog and explore CCCE course options. Ultimately, the responsibility for communication and collaboration should lie with both CCCE and faculty.

b. Tom Mohr, Maurice Goodman

Not in attendance.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, November 22, 2016.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman

Appendix: ESL Letters

November 8, 2016

I'm sorry I cannot be at this Governing Council meeting today. Although the SVIEP classes are not located at the CSM campus, I have some concerns I would like to share about this program, especially its effects on our District and the process by which it came about.

First, I want to be clear that I understand that SVIEP offers some benefits to our District:

- 1) The SVIEP provides an additional source of international students (in addition to the current, growing stream of international students who place directly into our ESL programs across the District). These SVIEP students will probably matriculate into one of our 3 colleges once they finish the SVIEP program, providing our District with an additional source of income.
- 2) The SVIEP offers job possibilities for ESL adjuncts with no 10-unit cap.

But these benefits come at a cost:

- 1) The SVIEP is a "private" school that is --and yet is not -- part of our District and which offers classes that directly compete with existing ESL programs. (NOTE: I put "private" in quotation marks because I honestly do not understand what kind of school this is. According to their website, students pay \$5701 in tuition for a 16-week session; the entire cost [with homestay, insurance, books, etc.] is estimated at \$13,000 per 16-week session.)

SVIEP does not see that its programs directly compete with our existing programs because, they argue, these students' TOEFL scores are too low to allow them to get into one of our 3 colleges directly. True. However, SVIEP hopes that its "graduates" will matriculate into our programs at our Level 4 (at one point they even expressed a hope to have students matriculate into ESL 400, our highest level, Level 5). This means that international students will be taking "Level 2" or "Level 3" or even "Level 4" courses either with SVIEP or with the District.

If the SVIEP program were set up to have students enter our programs at Level 2, then this would be a wonderful avenue for new students to enter our District. However, the way it is set up, SVIEP is competing with our District ESL programs for Levels 2, 3, and 4.

Has the District not then created a competitor to our ESL programs within one system, one "private" and the other community-funded?

- 2) Adjuncts who teach at SVIEP will be teaching on our campuses, but will lose out on benefits they receive as District adjunct faculty. Any adjunct faculty who teaches for SVIEP is NOT represented by the union and is not accruing seniority nor are they paying into STRS.

In addition to these costs of the SVIEP, I have a grave concern about the entire process of setting up SVIEP program.

As far as I understand it, only one ESL faculty member at one of our 3 colleges talked to the SVIEP Director before this program was put in place. Other faculty across the District were not consulted, nor was there a careful, thoughtful process to work with our ESL programs before starting SVIEP. Even if one accepts the SVIEP premise that this is a “feeder” school rather than a competitor (perhaps *especially* if this were a true “feeder” school), shouldn’t the SVIEP have been working conscientiously with ESL faculty to articulate effectively with our current ESL programs? The only meeting I ever have had with the SVIEP came at my request. During that meeting they expressed a desire to have their graduates enter into our ESL 400 (Level 5 class) and to have us share curriculum with them. Really? They want *me* to share *our* curriculum with them so that they can teach students who would otherwise be in *our* classes?

Thank you to the Governing Council for bringing this issue to the forefront and for allowing faculty like myself to have our voices heard.

Amy Sobel

ESL faculty, CSM

Nov. 8, 2016

Governing Council:

I apologize for not being able to share my thoughts in person. I would like to concur with Prof. Amy Sobel’s comments regarding the Silicon Valley Intensive English Program and add a few of my own. As Prof. Amy Sobel has stated, the ESL faculty would welcome a “feeder” ESL intensive program on-site if it were well-designed and helped students transition from low-level ESL to Level 2 ESL coursework at CSM, Canada or Skyline. However, we have serious doubts that the SVIEP is designed to do this, considering the way in which it was initiated and has operated thus far.

Along with Prof. Amy Sobel, I attended the only meeting that our CSM ESL Department has had with Community Education regarding SVIEP, which was on Dec. 17, 2015. At the time, I was quite baffled by the level of collaboration and support that Johnathan Bissell and others indicated that they desired between our ESL department and SVIEP, considering that 1) Prof. Amy Sobel and I were the ones to initiate a meeting with SVIEP after their initial pilot semester was already under way, and 2) when we did meet, they had very few questions about our program, leading us to believe that they had little interest in working together.

Since the meeting with Community Education nearly a year ago, no one at SVIEP has been in touch with our ESL Department. Since no one at SVIEP has consulted with the CSM ESL Department, this seems to indicate that the new SVIEP program is *not*, in fact, designed to feed into any of our ESL courses at CSM. What, then, is its purpose? Why is the district allocating money for this new SVIEP instead of directing additional funding to support its current college ESL programs and their increasing numbers of international students?

We would appreciate some answers and transparency in matters regarding SVIEP.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter,

Kristi Ridgway

Professor, ESL

College of San Mateo