



ACADEMIC SENATE

Meeting Minutes

May 14 2019
 Rm. 18-206
 1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.
 San Mateo, CA
 2:30 – 4:30 pm
[Website](#)

Executive Committee 2017-2019

Arielle Smith
 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 Arielle Smith	Vice-president Secretary Treasurer President

Senators Present

Name of Senator	Division
Yvette Butterworth Wendell Doman Stephen Heath Dyana Huaraz Tatiana Irwin Vincent Li Sunny Martin Tim Maxwell Teresa Morris Liz Schuler Lia Thomas	Math/Science Language Arts Business ASCSM CASS Business Counseling Language Arts Curriculum Committee/Library PD Coordinator/CTL ASLT

Others Present

Name	Representing
Allie Fasth Laura Demsetz	Guided Pathways CASS

Opening Procedures

Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information/ Procedure
Approval of today's agenda	President	2:35	Approved	Procedure
Approval of past minutes	President	2:38	Approved	Procedure
Public Comment	Public	2:40	<p>a. Allie: The Guided Pathways group is submitting a draft on March 1st. Allie will pass the draft along to Arielle, with some of the most important sections highlighted, so that we can take a look at it before the next meeting.</p> <p>b. Teresa: The library has moved to a new system. For employees, you do not need a library card—all you need is your campus fob/photo ID. However, you should keep your library card if you want to check out books from other collections than the three colleges in the district. Students can also now use their student IDs rather than a separate library card.</p> <p>c. Tatiana: A question regarding the people who “table” outside of building 10: While we need to let these groups be on campus as a matter of free speech, can we ask (or require) that they tell students that they are getting paid to collect signatures—and even that they say who is paying them?</p> <p>We discussed this question as well as a few other issues regarding the tables: Dyana said that she isn't sure if most students know that these are paid representatives rather than just concerned citizens, and noted that a few students have said that the petitioners can be somewhat aggressive, making the students feel uncomfortable. Do we have any rules or a code of conduct that the petitioners have to follow in order to stay on campus?</p> <p>While we want students to be able to defend themselves in “the real world,” we also want to make sure that they are comfortable being here. Peter said that we have a code of conduct that applies to <i>anyone</i> on campus—no one should be approaching students aggressively. However, the question of</p>	Information

			<p>whether they have to identify their funding is a totally separate issue.</p> <p>Arielle will ask Mike in a meeting tomorrow and get back to us about whether they have to identify who is funding them.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

New Senate Business

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action (Motion/Resolution)/ Information //Discussion
1	President's Report	Arielle	2:50	<p>a. The Sustainability committee is being reconvened and needs three faculty representatives. One person has reached out, but ideally, we need two more. Please contact Fauzi Hamadeh to get more information.</p> <p>b. The Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC), which meets the fourth Wednesday of each month, needs a faculty member who teaches online.</p> <p>Please get this information out to your divisions.</p>	Information
2	ASCSM Update	Dyana Huaraz, ASCSM Rep	3:05	The student senate has not met yet	Information
3	Standing Committee Reports	(a) Teresa Morris (b) Liz Schuler	3:10	<p>a) Curriculum Committee—does not meet until next week</p> <p>(b) Teaching and Learning Committee</p> <p>Liz and Madeleine are meeting to ensure that assessment and professional development are included in the committee and to get schedules aligned</p> <p>CAE: The opening day flex events were well-attended. You will receive an email that includes the various slides and asks for feedback about the events you attended.</p> <p>Note also that the district plenary is not happening on 3/5. The 3/27 flex day will be a district-wide event held at CSM.</p>	Information

5	Action Items		3:10	<p>a. Hiring Committee Approvals</p> <p>Although we only have two to consider today, there will be many more hiring committee approvals on future agendas.</p> <p>We should keep equity in mind as an issue not only for the make-up of all of these committees but for the issues they will encounter during the screening process. For example, we sometimes see applicants respond to questions about diversity in fairly trivial ways—such as “I grew up in the Bay Area, so I have been around diverse people”— but we do not give guidelines to applicants or have a set of guidelines for committee members to evaluate such claims. Peter suggested a flex day workshop on how to evaluate an application through an equity lens.</p> <p>We also had a short discussion about the value of the training we already have—Rosemary said that she did not find the unconscious bias training particularly helpful, though others said more recent workshops have improved.</p> <p>Regarding the specific committees proposed this time:</p> <p>CIS Committee: One member of the proposed committee may not have completed the unconscious bias training and will probably not be able to before March 5. Despite this, we voted to APPROVE with one abstention and one “no” vote due to the lack of committee diversity.</p> <p>Music: Correction from Teresa –Malathi is in ethnic studies, not music. All voted to APPROVE.</p>	Action
6.	Discussion items		3:55	<p>a. Program Review changes – initial discussion (the final version needs to be approved by March 24).</p> <p>The feedback from the last program revealed that many still find the process confusing. There are still questions about the overall purpose for writing the reviews, the true intended audience (are they for self-assessment or mainly for accreditation?), and the kinds of responses required for the different sections.</p> <p>We want to keep working to improve both the clarity of individual reviews and the consistency of reviews across divisions and departments. We discussed a few ways to improve the clarity:</p>	Discussion

				<p>Some would like the reviews to be more concise, with less of Russian novel-length narratives favored by some divisions. We could have a much simpler chart with boxes that can just be checked off instead of lengthy descriptions. However, there is a case to be made for at least some narrative in responses. Laura noted that a mere check doesn't tell us *how* the program meets any given criteria. We might suggest word limits or a range of suggested lengths for the narratives, or provide models of clear and concise reviews. Tatiana said that Skyline used to do a "program review showcase" as a way of sharing information and presenting models. The forms could also ask for a limited number of examples: after you provide a description of the program, highlight one or two specific ways that the program meets or does not meet a specific goal.</p> <p>Regarding the purpose of the reviews, Stephen suggested that a little more context could make it clearer--who is asking these questions and what are the reviews really used for? We want to use them for self-assessment, so that departments and divisions get something of value out of the process. The goal isn't just to present everything as perfect.</p> <p>We should also try to cut down on redundancy within the reviews and over time: if you have a clear description of the program, there is no need to rewrite it every time you do a review. Consistency is an important goal.</p> <p>Another challenge is using the most current data, but PRIE has found that the data is usually pretty consistent from year to year. Do we need access to the data in resource request years? Because we are using the data from the program review as justification for equipment and other requests, we want data to be current. And sometimes there are significant changes that may affect requests, such as changes in enrollments, the passage of bills like AB705, or the arrival of many more international students .</p> <p>We discussed moving up resource request deadlines-- ideally Oct 1, but data would be out</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

			4:00	<p>earlier every year (by end of July) As is, we sometimes don't have time to get equipment or faculty requests approved early enough. This is particularly a concern because other colleges, including those in our district, do get faculty requests together earlier and so get the "first round" of applicants for interviews. The later funding is approved for equipment requests, the harder it is to get materials out to students at the beginning of the term.</p> <p>The deadlines for submitting the reviews are also a problem: when they are due the same day as portfolios, this creates a burden, especially for those departments that have only one full time member who may have to complete portfolios and reviews at the same time. We agreed that having both of these documents due on the same day qualifies as "crazy sauce." The deadlines should be changed.</p> <p>b. Attendance policy draft</p> <p>We discussed a few issues with the draft and attendance policies in general:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -For online classes, if a student is dropped and then rejoins the class for whatever reason, we lose all of their information when they add back in. - Policies on excused absences may be a problem for particular events that cannot be made up. For example, in lab classes sometimes the work cannot be made up regardless of the reason for a student being absent. But faculty have received pressure in the past, for college events and sports in particular, to allow absences. We should try to make it clearer that it may not be possible for faculty to give permission in such cases. We should also include language about cultural issues as a valid reason for excused absences. <p>3) Board Policy review for feedback a) Board Mission (1.01) tabled b) DPGC Philosophy and Purpose (6.01) The edited version will be submitted in DPGC.</p>	
--	--	--	------	--	--

Next meeting: Jan 28, 2020 Location: 18-206, 2:30 p.m.