CSM ACADEMIC SENATE
MEETING MINUTES

March 28, 2017
2:30 – 4:30 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	David Laderman
Vice President	Kathleen Sammut
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary (Interim)	Stephanie Roach
ASLT	Theresa Martin
ASLT/Library	Matt Montgomery
Creative Arts/Social Science	Steven Lehigh (absent)
Creative Arts/Social Science	Margaret Kaluzny
Language Arts	Jon Kitamura
Language Arts	Mick Sherer
Math/Science	Ellen Young
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales (Absent)
Business/Tech	Vincent Li
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mikel Schmidt
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin

OTHERS ATTENDING

Allie Fasth, ASLT
Dan Kaplan, AFT
Ray Kaupp, Director, Workforce Program
Stephen McReynolds, President, ASCSM
Madeleine Murphy, CAC Chair/Language Arts
Kristi Ridgway, Language Arts
Leigh Ann Shaw, President, District Academic Senate

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

1. **Approval of the Agenda (March 28, 2017) and Draft Minutes (March 14, 2017)**
   Agenda
   Please amend the agenda by adding item D to the President's report regarding the Faculty Diversity Internship Program.

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

   Minutes:
   Please amend the minutes to reflect the following changes:

   Dan Kaplan was in attendance, and will be added to the list of guests in attendance.

   There was a brief discussion regarding the ground rules listed on page five, and whether they accurately reflect what was said about categories of employees. Some senators remembered the point about Human Resources providing information, and others didn't. Ultimately it was decided to keep this information as stated in the minutes.

   However, the phrase "corners have been cut" on page nine does not accurately reflect the concerns addressed in that section of the minutes. That phrase, along with the word "worry" will be removed, and replaced with a more specific phrase that better reflects the concern voiced and questions raised about whether the hiring process for adjunct faculty who also serve as full time classified staff is properly followed and includes discipline experts.

   Wendy Whyte moved to approve the minutes as amended, Jacqueline Gamelin seconded her motion. All voted in favor, and the minutes were approved as amended. Rosemary Nurre, Matt Montgomery, and Theresa Martin abstained.

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

   Wednesday, March 29, 2017 is Raza Day at CSM. 330 Latino students from local high schools will be on campus for an event and panel led by our Puente students, to help students in their transition to college. Workshops will be held across campus throughout the day.

   Additionally, Associated Students of CSM's Cultural Awareness Board is sponsoring Immigration Awareness Day in Building 17, from 11 am - 2 pm. Featured presentations include Mike Claire's discussion of the Dream Center and DACA resources; Jenny Horne's discussion of Executive Orders and legal advice; Autumn Newman's discussion of immigrants and our economy; and Rudy Ramirez' interactive presentation and discussion.

   Also this week: Additional visits to campus were announced. ESL students from the San Mateo Adult School will tour campus. San Mateo High School students will be on campus

Friday. Finally, Sequoia High School students will be coming to campus to visit our human anatomy lab.

Monday, April 17, 2017: A student discussion forum focusing on responses to a climate change article by Matt Ridley is coming up in April. This forum is part of a CSM qualitative assessment project. The program organizers are looking to recruit student volunteer participants who have completed more than 45 units. Incentives for participation include pizza, a raffle, and door prizes. Space is limited. Please contact Madeleine Murphy for further information.

Saturday, May 6, 2017: Ten CSM Honors Project students have been selected to present at the Bay Honors Consortium's annual Honors Research Symposium at Stanford. CSM student alum and Stanford transfer Dionne Pickard will deliver the keynote. Please check in with David Laderman if you would like further information.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. President's Report

David Laderman extended a welcome to new Division representatives Matt Montgomery (ASLT/Library) and Theresa Martin (ASLT). Senators introduced themselves.

a. Committee updates (IPC)

IPC has been discussing the themes and goals that have emerged out of Program Review. The most pressing theme that has emerged again this year, is the need for full time faculty. Other themes regarding collaboration across campus and the need for student support centers and space upgrades were also noted. A refined document will be shared with Senate. IPC takes the themes and trends seriously. Regarding the need for additional full time faculty, the goal is to keep pressing the issue and messaging stakeholders about the need.
Additionally, IPC is discussing alignment of CSM's strategic goals with those of the District. Revisions to CSM's strategic goals are coming, and will be shared. Finally, IPC is working on updates to the Educational Master Plan document.

b. Spring election update

There are only three Academic Senate meetings left this year—Two in April, and one in May. For the April 25th meeting, the Spring Election Committee is soliciting nominations. Please send these to Tania Beliz and Diana Bennett. Nominees will be declared at the meeting. Self-nominations are okay. As a courtesy, please consult with any individuals you would like to nominate before a nomination is put forward. In May, the online election results will be revealed. The positions are two-year terms for President, Vice President, Treasurer, and Secretary. Additionally, all divisions

will be messaged about electing their committee members for the following two years.

c. Board of Trustees study session: Teaching and Learning

All faculty members are invited to attend the upcoming Board of Trustees study session on teaching and learning. The study session will be held on Wednesday, April 19, 2017, at 6:00 pm. It will take place at the District Office. Please see the March 22, 2017 email from District Academic Senate for further details. If you are interested in attending, please contact David Laderman.

d. Faculty Diversity Internship Program (FDIP) update

The plan is to approve the FDIP pilot at the next District Academic Senate meeting. Our next Academic Senate meeting is scheduled for the following day. As a result of this timing, we should consider the proposal now, and make sure to voice any concerns about it before the next DAS meeting.

Information has been sent via email about the changes to the program proposal. In summary, the changes specify that the intern will not be listed as instructor of record. Instead, the faculty mentor for the intern will be listed as the instructor of record. In this way, problems with listing an intern who may not have minimum qualifications will be avoided. If the intern wants to apply to teach for the District, they may only do so after minimum qualifications have been met.

District Academic Senate President Leigh Anne Shaw, as well as a representative from AFT have been at the table for discussions about this program. If we are informally okay with CSM's Academic Senate approving this program at that meeting, David Laderman will go ahead and do so at the DAS meeting. However, if there are any concerns, make sure to share them, as additional time can be taken to address these concerns. James Carranza came to Academic Senate a while back, and has been responsive in addressing concerns already brought forward. If possible, it would be good to move forward now with approving this program.

It is important that CSM and the District really commit to following through with this diversity initiative, and not just abandon qualified people who participate in the program. There is no obligation to hire interns completing the program. In order to really meet the goal of diversifying faculty on our campus, we need to commit to the program, to facilitate qualified and diverse applicants.

Some concerns raised: Often during hiring, we lack a sufficient candidate pool to hire diverse faculty. There is tension surrounding this issue, and a program like this needs to go hand in hand with a commitment to broaden hiring practices. This issue

should move to the IPC, perhaps as a statement from the Senate. It is thought that program participants with minimum qualifications will ultimately have a stronger application, and make them more competitive to be hired at our District.

Additional concerns were raised about the role of adjunct faculty in the program. It was pointed out that adjuncts could potentially benefit both from being mentored as part of the program, and by being mentors for interns in the program. Although it is agreed that adjunct faculty could benefit from participation in the program, the FDIP wasn't designed with them in mind, so we should look for alternative ways to support development of our existing adjuncts.

Regarding the potential for adjunct faculty to serve as mentors for interns in the program, several issues were discussed. The current language in the proposal specifies "Regular" faculty members are eligible. It may be preferable to use the term "Contract" instead.

For the FDIP, faculty members apply to be a mentor, and then are selected and paired with interns. Although some adjunct faculty would have a lot to offer an intern, there are some drawbacks. For example, there are potential areas of conflict regarding competing in the same hiring pool when future positions open up that both existing adjunct faculty and former FDIP interns may be considered for.

Additionally, adjunct faculty wouldn't be able to share experiences that can only be gained by working as full time faculty in our District. Adjunct faculty are less likely to have served on hiring committees for full time faculty in our District, and thus wouldn't be able to give the intern insight into that hiring process. On the other hand, some adjuncts might be in a good position to mentor, and be interested in doing so. David and Leigh Anne will bring forward these concerns.

Nonetheless, more information about the rationale behind excluding adjuncts is requested. We could still go ahead and approve the pilot program at the next meeting, as it could be amended later if we determine it is necessary.

Of note, the District will be mandating bias training for all those participating on hiring committees beginning Fall 2017. However, trainings have been offered this Spring. *Mandatory Hiring Training: The Benefits of Diversity and Understanding Unconscious Bias* will be offered April 14 and April 26, 2017 at CSM.

2. **ASCSM Update,** Stephen McReynolds, President, ASCSM

ASCSM has recommended not participating in the AFT faculty evaluation form process. There does seem to be the feeling that more frequent evaluations might be good, but

there were ultimately no arguments from ASCSM about participating further in the faculty evaluation process.

3. Standing Committee Reports

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

No report.

b. Library Advisory Committee, *[Chair position is vacant]*

No report.

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

No report.

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

Professional Development Coordinator and CAE Chair job descriptions will be provided soon, as both of these positions will be opening up.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Institutional SLOs & Data Entry Support, Madeleine Murphy

Feedback has been received from SLO coordinators that the assessment process is difficult and that further support is needed. New policies will also be needed, as new accreditation requirements ask us to adjust our data collection practices.

A calendar and additional information will be presented at Division meetings when finalized. The SLO assessment overhaul involves streamlining collection of assessment data regarding SLOs and revising General Education outcomes to better meet the needs of our student population. General Education student learning outcomes are helpful in determining if the college is meeting its goals for students, particularly for those who are transferring. However, because we are a community college serving students with a range of different goals, tools such as capstone coursework or exit exams are not practical for us to use.

Quantitative data can take advantage of mapping outcomes from TracDat (or other software) to the General Education (GE) outcomes or "Institutional Learning Outcomes" (ILOs), which are being proposed as a replacement. A change to the labeling from GE outcomes to ILOs, would allow us to better represent the outcomes of our students who aren't focused on GE requirements for transfer. New ways of assessing them can also be implemented. For example, activities like the planned student discussion forum on climate change can help us show critical thinking outcomes. Our current GE outcomes have gaps. For example, creative outcomes

aren't represented; and the outcome needs of some student services are left out. To help fill this gap, the proposed ILOs add "independent learning" and "creative thinking" as outcomes.

Independent Learning as an ILO
Independent learning as an outcome has been added in order to focus specifically on student services. It is a good outcome for students, and gives student services a specific outcome to meet. For clarification, we are reminded that student services such as Counseling (and others) involve a range of complex learning activities. Student learning outcomes such as critical thinking, effective communication, and others are required in addition to the added outcome of "independent learning."

For example, students taking advantage of counseling services are often asked to do research in order to come prepared to their meetings with counselors. The work is much more in depth than helping students select appropriate courses to take. In the end, the student has to make a good educational choice for them, in that moment. Good choices vary student by student, and depend on circumstances. It can be difficult to identify a certain choice as evidence of meeting an outcome. Additionally, the work is scaffolded.

The complicated nature of student services should be honored as we consider the ILOs. Student services isn't limited to using only the "independent learning" outcome. Time should be taken by those developing student learning outcomes for student services to identify each place within the ILO map that corresponds to the student service.

Creative Thinking as an ILO
Additional comments and discussion followed regarding "creative thinking" as an ILO and its relationship to other ILOs.

The Creative Thinking ILO seems linked to both critical thinking and artistic practice in its expression. How is "understand[ing] the role of the creative arts in relation to critical thinking" measurable? Would this be too difficult? Are there existing rubrics for scoring this and related ILOs such as Effective Communication and Critical Thinking?

Alternatively, would renaming the outcome "original" or "innovative thinking" be helpful? Creative or original "thinking" could be separated out. In the Creative Thinking ILO, the emphasis seems less on the "thinking" part than it does when applied to the Critical Thinking ILO. Critical thinking encapsulates a lot. The Creative Thinking ILO should be relabeled and focused more directly on creation/making/production of "stuff"—art(s) or other things, either physical or intangible/digital (like code, which relies on creativity and innovation in the creation of something new).

Therefore, should there be more of a distinction between "creative expression" and "creative thinking"? For example, can creative thinking as a concept be folded in with the Critical Thinking ILO?

This also points to a link between the Creative Thinking ILO and the Effective Communication ILO. Creative expression (art, music, etc.) is a form of communication. Perhaps we can add something about self-expression under effective communication in order to begin to get at this. For example, a phrase to the effect of "engage in creative thinking, expression, and application" might be useful.

Social Awareness and Diversity as an ILO –
It was pointed out that Skyline College requires students to take a gender or ethnic studies unit. We don't have that type of requirement at CSM, and it could benefit us. RISE UP and some other student groups would love to see a change like this. It is an important issue to many of our students. ILOs are designed to look above and beyond specific courses. Title V mentions Ethnic Studies as a way to meet general education requirements. However, CSM doesn't call this out in the same way that Skyline does. Of note, there are courses in departments other than Ethnic Studies that can allow students to successfully achieve the ILO. Ultimately though, if data demonstrates that we don't meet this SLO, then as an institution we need to take that information and respond by making changes.

Additional Comments
The group appears to like the proposed change to ILOs, which have a broader scope than an approach with a focus on just GE outcomes.

Do all students on campus have to meet all ILOs? Some students are here only for 3 units, and would likely not be able to meet all ILOs. Any one course or activity won't necessarily meet the ILOs. Most courses though, will at least align with one or more of the ILOs. The ILOs serve as an expression of values at CSM. In setting the ILOs, we determine what we think matters, and what we want students to take with them when they leave CSM.

The plan is to vote on the ILOs during this semester, so we can move forward as soon as possible.

b. Draft revisions to the bylaws

Timeline for taking action on this issue
Today's plan is to look at the draft of revisions to the bylaws. Then we can vote on it at a future meeting. Because next week is Spring Break, it may be too soon to vote at our next meeting, because we want to give time for Senators to discuss options and get feedback from members of the divisions that senators represent. We will plan to vote at the April 25th meeting.

A note on the Brown Act
Some of the email communications to date about this issue could be perceived as very nearly violating the Brown Act. We must take care to avoid this. In general, it isn't a violation of the Brown Act to send information to Senators in advance of a meeting. However, discussions via email are not allowed. When opinions are included it comes close to violating the Brown Act because this resembles the initiation of a discussion, rather than an attempt to provide information. In future, any informational emails should go through the Academic Senate President, rather

than being sent directly from one Senator directly to the group. In this way, we can better maintain collegiality, prevent spread of misinformation, and avoid any potential for violations of the Brown Act.

Current Bylaws are not in violation of Title V
A question was raised in an email communication about the possibility that our Bylaws are in violation of Title V. Leigh Anne Shaw has provided information (see handout) indicating that our Bylaws are not in violation of Title V. Title V is not specific about how faculty members are defined, this is determined locally, at the college level.

Human Resources documentation for Learning Center Manager
The Human Resources document (see handout) regarding the Learning Center Manager clarifies that the position is a Classified Supervisory position. Additionally, the Learning Center Manager job description (see handout) confirms this, and the General Statement (Section A) of the description indicates that the Learning Center Manager only supervises classified staff or students. Classified Supervisory positions don't supervise faculty, which is key.

There is some question about whether Classified Supervisory positions are represented by CSEA.

Of note, similar terminology about Classified Supervisory staff is also in use at Skyline.

Ultimately it is up to our local Senate to determine eligibility of Academic Senate members. Our district has three employee categories, within which there are different classifications such as the Classified Supervisory classification, which is within the Classified Staff employee category.

Review of Bylaw language drafts
Ideally, our Bylaw language should reflect the language that is used by the District for consistency.

- Draft 1: Articulates that adjunct faculty who are also Classified Staff be allowed to serve.
- Draft 2: Articulates that adjunct faculty who are also Classified Staff not be allowed to serve.

At this time we should agree on the language in the drafts, so we can move forward in a vote. At this time, we are not making a decision about who is eligible to serve on Academic Senate, we are only agreeing on the Bylaw language to be put forward for a vote at a future meeting.

On both drafts, clarifications regarding the faculty who make up the Senate are requested. Does the draft intend for all faculty, faculty from divisions, or just faculty who are Senators to determine committee membership?

For example, the draft states that committee chairs are "elected or appointed by the faculty or academic senate" while senators and senate committee members are

"elected or appointed by the faculty of the academic divisions." This should be changed in both drafts to indicate that appointments are made by faculty members of the committee or by Academic Senate faculty.

The attempt with the two drafts provided is to separate and simplify the process. Do the drafts represent the opinion options reflected? We need to agree on this so we can bring the draft language options to a vote at a future meeting. Draft 1 is the more inclusive option. There seems to be agreement that this draft will be ready for a vote. However, we can change the language in Draft 2 if it doesn't reflect the concern about classified staff being eligible to serve on Senate. Draft 2 is the option that is not inclusive. It addresses the concern about classified staff who are supervisors because it doesn't allow classified staff to serve on Senate.

A suggestion was made to include a draft of a third option that subdivides the Classified Staff category, so that any classified staff who are managers or supervisors are not allowed to serve, while classified staff who are not managers or supervisors are allowed to serve. This complicates the draft language because there are several classified staff classifications that would need to be spelled out in the draft.

Further discussion
There are disagreements about how to define administrators and classified staff who are not eligible to be members of Senate. On one side, there is the argument that we should be inclusive, and allow classified staff with the word manager or supervisor in their job title or description to be Senators or Senate committee members if they are also currently working as adjunct faculty. On the other side, there is the argument that we should exclude any classified staff in a category that includes supervisory or managerial job functions from serving on Senate. Classified Supervisory staff are only problematic if there is a conflict of interest. On the other hand, faculty conflicts of interest are not unheard of. For example, during the peer review process, there can be conflicts of interest among faculty who are serving on Senate.

Another possible way to define these groups would be to distinguish according to whether or not the adjunct faculty and classified staff member is eligible for the classified staff collective bargaining unit (CSEA) and/or the faculty collective bargaining unit (AFT).

Another option is to use the distinction of employees who supervise Faculty to determine whether someone is eligible to serve on Senate. It is agreed that it would be inappropriate for any employee who supervises faculty to serve on Senate.

Skyline College has had examples of adjunct faculty who are classified staff members (and who are supervisors) serve on Academic Senate and get important work done for the Senate. There are also examples of administrators who are adjunct faculty, who do not serve on Senate because it would not be appropriate due to the conflict of interest. A tenured faculty became Dean, and then was no longer eligible to serve. However, there is a Classified Staff supervisor who served as a Senate representative, and did important work as part of his committee service to help establish an Institutional Review Board at Skyline.

There was a reminder to separate individuals out from the discussion, so that the conversation isn't personal. Additionally, while the conversation primarily applies to the ASLT division, there are other examples across campus.

Additionally, it is important to remember that when adjunct faculty (even if they are also a classified staff member who supervises) serve on Senate, they are serving in their capacity as faculty, not in their role as classified staff. There is already some separation built in to the process.

Library representation discussion
The option of each division being represented by two Senators was discussed at the last meeting. Now the question of whether Library faculty should be counted as one of the two division representatives needs to be settled. The draft as written requires that whatever Division the Library is part of include one representative from Library faculty.

The problem is that Divisions currently represented by two Senators don't want to give up one of their representatives to the Library, were the Library to become a part of their division. On the other hand, were that division to keep its two representatives, and the Library maintained the separate callout, then that division would technically be represented by three senators—two from the Division, and one from the Library which is part of that Division. This means that depending on what is agreed upon about a Library representative, either divisions currently eligible for two representatives would lose a representative or, if the Library callout is maintained, the Division would have three representatives.

Due to time constraints, the decision was made to table this discussion and continue it later.

Once bylaw language is decided on, it will go out to the faculty to let them know about the upcoming vote. It is recommended that people who want more information read the pertinent minutes in order to gain the full context.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, April 11, 2017.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman

Appendixes

SMCCCD Faculty Diversity Internship Program

SMCCCD Faculty Diversity Internship Program (FDIP)

The district Equal Employment Opportunity Committee (EEO) is submitting a proposal to Board for approval to institute a district wide Faculty Diversity Internship Program. Drafting of the model began Spring 2016 and continued through Fall 2016. Working group members drafted the model and submitted it to the EEO committee in Fall 2017. The committee has approved it. Local senates contributed feedback in fall, and the model is out to senates for further feedback. The model provides a general framework for instituting a district wide FDIP. Operational details are to be developed in a coordinated effort by the to-be-identified campus coordinators and/or responsible administrators in consultation with Academic Senate.

Faculty and administrators who have participated as members of the working group or who have taken part in the development of the model are below:

Ted Broomfield, CSM, Business & Accounting Adjunct Faculty

James Carranza, CSM, Dean of Language Arts

Angélica Garcia, Skyline, Vice President of Student Services

Erik Gaspar, Cañada, Kinesiology Faculty

Michael Hoffman, Cañada, Math Faculty (Student Equity)

Lasana Hotep, Skyline, Dean of Student Support Programs

Denise Hum, Skyline, Math Faculty (formerly Cañada)

Teeka James, CSM, English Faculty (AFT)

Danielle Powell, Skyline, Communication Studies Faculty

Jeremiah Sims, CSM, Director of Student Equity

Supinda Sirihekaphong, Cañada, International Program Manager

Professional development consultation: Erinn Moore (Cañada), Nina Floro (Skyline), Theresa Martin (CSM)

The SMCCC District Academic Senate and Vice Chancellor of Ed Services Kimberlee Messina reviewed the draft at a DAS meeting in Fall 2016. VCES Messina gave input into the proposal, and DAS formed a review sub-group consisting of DAS president Leigh Anne Shaw, local senate president Kate Williams Browne, and AFT representative Monica Malamud. This sub-group met Monday, February 27, and the current proposal reflects revisions based on that meeting.