



ACADEMIC SENATE

Meeting Minutes

April 10, 2018
 Rm. 18-206
 1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.
 San Mateo, CA
 2:30 – 4:30 pm
[Website](#)

Executive Committee 2017-2018

Jeremy Wallace
President

Peter von Bleichert
Vice-President

Rosemary Nurre
Treasurer

Daniel Keller
Secretary

Executives Present

Name of Officer	Executive Committee Role
Peter von Bleichert Daniel Keller Rosemary Nurre Jeremy Wallace	Vice-President Secretary Treasurer President

Senators Present

Name of Senator	Division
Tabitha Conway Tatiana Irwin Margaret Kaluzny Stephanie Roach Kevin Sinarle	ASLT CASS CASS ASLT-Library Counseling

Others Present

Name	Representing
Mondana Bathai David Laderman Beth LaRochelle Sarah Mangin Teresa Morris Madeleine Murphy Ellen Young	ASCSM Past president Math/Science Library Advisory Committee COI CAC CAE

Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information/ Procedure
Call to order	President	2:35		Procedure
Adoption of today's agenda	President	2:35	Approved	Procedure
Adoption of past minutes	President		Approved	Procedure
Public comment	Vice President	2:40	Guided Pathways is on track and making progress: the website is now up and the steering committee will complete a vision statement tomorrow. Senate will need to approve the steering committee membership later this term.	Information

New Senate Business

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action (Motion/Resolution)/ Information//Discussion
1	<p>President's Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Board of Trustees meeting b. ASCCC Area B meeting c. Equivalency process 	<p>a. President</p> <p>b. Beth LaRoche</p>	2:45	<p>A. The community education policy (discussed at the March meetings) passed. Jeremy and a representative from Skyline read our equity statements to the board.</p> <p>B. ASCC area B (Beth) : The president talked about a number of governing issues related to AB 705, particularly for math courses. We also discussed committee work—some members feel that they have little to do on some committees and would like more guidance.</p> <p>C. Equivalency process—please remind your deans that if there is an equivalency issue in your division, it should go through the senate—deans alone cannot make decisions about equivalency. Although we have not had serious problems, failure to follow procedure for equivalency can have significant consequences—for example, students can lose credit for a class if it is taught by an instructor without minimum qualifications or equivalency. See the board website for more</p>	Information

				information.	
2	ASCSM update	Mondana Bathai, ASCSM	2:50	Upcoming events include “Spring Fling”—scheduled for May first and second—and a “relaxation week,” scheduled for the week before finals.	Information
3	<p>Standing committee reports</p> <p>a. COI</p> <p>b. Library advisory committee</p> <p>c. College Assessment Committee</p>	<p>Teresa</p> <p>Sarah</p>	2:55	<p>a. COI has been focusing on tightening up the language we use to determine what classes belong in the general education category and on institutional learning outcomes. We will return to curriculum review in May.</p> <p>b. The library advisory committee has been focusing on resources and facilities, particularly on how we can enhance information literacy instruction. In the long term, we would like to do a flex-day workshop or work with divisions to find ways to embed information literacy instruction in more courses.</p> <p>c. In the upcoming meeting (4/24) the College Assessment Committee will begin discuss a proposal to change how we do assessment. Discussions about student learning have not been “data driven,” despite our efforts to gather and interpret data. The current methods—such as entering data in Trackdat that is never seen again—do not seem to make an impact on how we teach or what we know about student learning.</p> <p>Instead, the CAC will be looking at changing how we collect data—for example, faculty in department or divisions might begin with goals they want to achieve and plans to accomplish these goals, followed by looking at the data to see whether</p>	Information

				<p>these goals are being met. We also want more sharing across divisions—particularly in program review, which could be more of a record of things we have tried to do to improve student learning along with a discussion of our results.</p>	
4	Academic Senate Committee restructuring	President	3:10	<p>We have talked about restructuring a number of committees so that the meetings are better attended and there is more conversation across groups doing related work.</p> <p>Among the changes we will continue to discuss: COI has been seeking a name change to the “Curriculum Committee”—the name used at other colleges in our district as well most California community colleges. Since this name change requires a change to the bylaws, we will have further discussion as well as a vote at the next meeting.</p> <p>We have also discussed merging the assessment, professional development , and library advisory committee into one area—we could merge all three into the committee on academic excellence. There are several advantages to this change: as is, the three subcommittees are understaffed, with as few as five members; while the work overlaps, with separate committees, people are not always aware of what has been done by other groups.</p> <p>The change would not mean that these committees are permanently merged into one. Instead, we would have working groups that would get together as one large group once or twice a semester. We will continue to discuss this.</p> <p>A final point regarding changes to committee names: Peter suggested that committee names should focus first on what the committee <i>does</i>—for example, the “Curriculum Committee” is a sensible</p>	Discussion

				<p>replacement for “Committee on Instruction.”</p> <p>The newly merged assessment, library advisory, and professional development committee might be called the “Teaching and Learning Committee.”</p>	
6	Program Review revisions	President	4:00	<p>Program review: the process should be meaningful, more based on teaching and learning. Many faculty do not feel that the process serves this purpose—some feel uncertain about how to use data such as LOAD numbers and question who reads the reviews once they are written. Others have objected that the reviews seem to ask us to justify our existence rather than engage in reflection.</p> <p>The revisions to program review reflect these concerns: for example, LOAD is something deans can discuss with faculty if the numbers are low—it does not seem like something faculty need to review on a regular basis. Administrators already have these numbers.</p> <p>The organization of the reviews has changed: reflection on changes since the previous review is now #2 rather than at the very end of the document.</p> <p>The prompts in the review have also been changed so that they will elicit more meaningful responses.</p> <p>Ideally, the reviews will be read by faculty and not just the IPC—the reviews are meant to lead to productive discussions among faculty.</p>	Discussion

Final Announcements and Adjournment

Peter will be standing in for Jeramy for the next two meetings.

Future Discussion Items & Tentative Schedule: COI name change (4/24); Enrollment caps (4/24); Adjunct equity (4/24)