



ACADEMIC SENATE

Meeting Minutes

February 25, 2020
 Rm. 18-206
 1700 W. Hillside Blvd.
 San Mateo, CA
 2:30 – 4:30 pm
[Website](#)

Executive Committee 2017-2020

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	Vice-president
Rosemary Nurre	Treasurer
Daniel Keller	Secretary
Arielle Smith	President

Senators Present

Name of Senator	Division
Yvette Butterworth	Math/Science
Wendell Doman	Language Arts
Stephen Heath	Business
Tatiana Irwin	CASS
Vincent Li	Business
Sunny Martin	Counseling
Tim Maxwell	Language Arts
Teresa Morris	Curriculum Committee
Joseph Nguyen	ASCSM
Chris Smith	Math/Science
Tim Tulloch	Athletics
Lia Thomas	ASLT

Others Present

Name	Representing
Liz Schuler	PD Coordinator/CTL
Ron Andrade	ASLT
Laura Demsetz	CASS
Heidi Diamond	Bus/Tech
Lashonda Kennedy	Bus/Tech
Alex Kramer	Bus/Tech
David Laderman	LAD/ASLT

Ashley Phillips Michelle Schneider Samantha Vargas	Bus/Tech Bus/Tech Bus/Tech
--	----------------------------------

Opening Procedures

Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information/P rocedure
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>Wendell stressed a point left off of the last minutes: our campus safety handouts should include information for students.</p> <p>Rosemary: WE ARE STILL WITHOUT A CONTRACT. Rosemary requests that the senate make a statement to express our concern that both faculty and staff are still working without a contract-- we don't really have a public forum to express this concern.</p> <p>Other members noted that there are various ways to make our concerns public: Tatiana suggested showing up the board meeting tomorrow. Chris said that you can also express your concerns directly to Senator Jerry Hill and Assembly member Kevin Mullin, who hold regular open house forums. When our representatives are in front of the public (as opposed to hearing from us through calls or emails), they are more likely to be receptive.</p> <p>We also talked briefly about what we might do to get the district to take our dissatisfaction seriously. As is, the administration does not seem to have a strong incentive to respond so much as to buy time. Chris suggested that we should reconsider when we are asked to do favors for the administration—he recently refused. Arielle suggested that we have AFT come and speak at a future senate meeting to talk about what we might do to emphasize our dissatisfaction.</p> <p>Rosemary also mentioned that she has volunteered to be on an evaluation committee for Cal Bright—the online community college that we were told would not be a threat to our enrollment. Rosemary only volunteered because she feels that we were misled about the goals of this college</p>	Information

New Senate Business

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action (Motion/Resolution/ Information/Discussion)
1	President’s Report	Arielle	2:50	<p>Announcements and updates</p> <p>Board policy on faculty pay period update: Arielle got an email from David Feune in response to our questions. He said there is a lot of testing that would need to take place to see if Banner is compatible with a 12 month pay period while maintaining a 10 month retirement plan. They won’t have anything definitive for us until next year.</p>	Information
2	ASCSM Update	ASCSM Rep— Joseph Nguyen	2:50	<p>Student senate is sponsoring “March Madness,” scheduled for the third week in March</p>	Information
3	Standing Committee Reports		2:50	<p>a) Curriculum Committee, Teresa Morris, Chair – no updates</p> <p>b) Teaching and Learning Committee, Liz Schuler The CTL group is still not well attended: they had a meeting yesterday with only two faculty and two students present. Liz is trying to restructure and reschedule the committee to improve attendance. There have been a lot of scheduling conflicts. Madeline also has not been here so it is hard for her committee to meet</p> <p>Flex days (Liz): There is now a schedule for the March 5th flex day—please RSVP.</p> <p>The schedule for the 3/27 district-wide flex day is tentative but almost complete. Activities for the district-wide events will include a keynote on the gender spectrum as well as Safe Zone training. We will also have an event on “humanizing your online classroom,” online proctoring, and a student panel discussing the challenges of going between the three colleges in our district. There will also be events focusing on emergency preparedness—hands-on activities to learn about Nar Can and EpiPens.</p>	Information

5	Action Items		2:55	<p>Faculty Qualifications Committee – Art Equivalency Committee : There is one dean and a faculty member in the discipline from each of the faculty in the district.</p> <p>Approved with one abstention</p>	Action
6.	Discussion items		3:10	<p>.</p> <p>1) Potential division restructuring – Laura Demsetz and Heidi Diamond</p> <p>The opportunity for restructuring goes along with two changes in dean positions:</p> <p>Business/Technology: Heidi Diamond, the current dean, is retiring in August. The new dean position gives us an opportunity to restructure the division to focus on the goals of workforce development (including internships, apprenticeships, and career education) and on strategic partnerships with high schools and employers. The search for the new dean of “Strategic Partnerships and Workforce Development” will begin this spring. Along with this change, computer and Information sciences will return to the Math and Science Division; business (including management and real estate) and accounting will move to the CASS division.</p> <p>The second retirement is Laura Demsetz, current dean of CASS. Laura plans to return to faculty status to use banked leave for spring semester, but is also planning to retire. A search for a new dean of Business and Social Science will begin in Fall 2020 to have the new dean in place for Spring 2021.</p> <p>Further restructuring will include moving the Art and Music programs to the Language Arts Division in Spring 2021.</p> <p>There may be an interim appointment to fill the positions, but the intent is to bring someone in who is permanent. The plan is to discuss this further at IPC on March 4.</p> <p>2) Honors Program update – David Laderman</p> <p>The UCLA TAP (Transfer Alliance Program) is conducting a site review at CSM on April 14.</p> <p>UCLA came up with the TAP certification about 20 years ago for community college honors programs, with the goal of attracting more diverse students into</p>	Discussion

the UC system. It is now considered a gold-standard for honors programs.

While Canada and Skyline have had TAP certification for some time, our honors program is relatively new, so this is our first five-year review. We have also been very successful despite starting recently: during our first two years, we had two students certified; last year we had nine—of whom five were admitted to UCLA and four into Berkeley. This year 12 students received certification.

David presented a plan for the report last term at IPC and submitted it to UCLA. He has hard copies, and a draft of the planned site review, for any who are interested.

The team will visit on 4/14 to meet with different participants in the program. They are just focused on hearing how it is going and making recommendations rather than doing evaluations.

After the visit, the next step is that they will prepare a written response with recommendations and commendations. This will likely take at least a semester if not longer.

Though Tim Maxwell pointed out that some of what we do may seem a little “unorthodox” in comparison to traditional honors programs, UCLA knows about and supports our unconventional model. There are some issues that David thinks we can improve and work on, but we welcome that discussion. Our students have been doing excellent work, not only by getting into UC programs but showcasing their projects here and at other conferences and events.

The honors project is also moving into building 17 along with Mana, Project Change, Umoja and Puente. We hope that close proximity to these communities can help to bring in more underrepresented students who may not think of themselves as traditional honors students.

3) Program Review Draft

(a) Timeline: PRIE will have data available in July, so in October we are looking at a first Friday submission for program review and resource requests.

PRIE has up to three weeks to do their data compilation so that we have time to do resource requests. Faculty prioritization will be the first thing to focus on, followed by classified and

student assistant requests. IPC will read the program reviews and provide feedback within a relatively short time period after they are submitted. The goal is that cabinet will review by mid-November and by the first IPC meeting in December we will know what positions get approved.

We discussed a number of concerns about the new timeline. Rosemary noted that in the past when we have started early, the data hasn't been available and forms have not even worked. PRIE needs to be ready with everything. If it isn't ready, we should be allowed to hold off on the data analysis in PR.

Arielle said that PRIE is adding it to their annual workflow plans as soon as they can get the data. The faster timeline for all of this is based on our goal to get everything approved by spring break so that, come fall, we are ready to go and don't run into issues we have in the past.

Chris: Why would we want to shorten the amount of time faculty have to work on the reviews? It is almost certainly more onerous to complete if we reduce the time we have work on it. Who is looking out for faculty?

Arielle noted that changing the timeline was a collective decision, and that the biggest concern is that our sister colleges get their position requests out earlier. Laura added that with the schedule we have right now, we still didn't have the positions out by spring break, so we were not competitive with our sister colleges and give potential applicants time to prepare. For example, currently we have five positions, but one still has not even been approved. The other concern we had last time is that there are depts. staffed by just one person or have only one full time member, resulting in a massive pile up of work when program review is due at the same time as evaluations.

Rosemary stressed that faculty are in effect being asked to do more work with less time, even as we work without a contract. Why should we agree to do more work when we have an administration that does not have our back?

But Tatiana pointed out that PRIE is not responsible for us not getting a contract. Peter

added that if we want to protest not having a contract, it is best we do that through a discussion with AFT. Refusing to participate in this process would only hurt faculty and students.

David also noted that the real concern is that we need more positions—that may be even more of a serious issue than when we get the postings out.

- (b) One way to reduce the workload could be to have a split cycle. Arielle just wanted to run the idea by us of doing this—we could alternate when programs complete their reviews.
- (c) We also discussed the changes to the current draft of program review. The goal is to make it relevant, useful to faculty and not just a document for accreditation. To make it more useful, there have been suggested changes to word limits. We have also made changes in looking at gaps in persistence and enrollment across different delivery modes—online, hybrid, late start classes. Specifically, Madeleine has made changes to the assessment pieces of the program—trying to make it focus on something that is meaningful.

This leads to a concern about the kind and quality of data we get from PRIE currently. Chris noted that some of the data seems superficial—and some of it is already available. Is there any way we could get more specific data, or data that would help us to clarify concerns about, for example, equity and achievement gaps? Tim Maxwell mentioned that English has been discussing the kinds of questions we should use to get data that is interesting and useful—but it is sometimes hard to get the data we want. For example, we would like to know more about CSM students' high school grades, given that we now use their HS GPAs for placement, but we have limited access to this data. Arielle: it is also challenging to get data for some programs, particularly those with small sample sizes. The problem is getting accurate and representative data.

Please take the new review back to your divisions and get feedback on it.
This will be a discussion item for the March meeting.

- 4) Attendance Regulations**
We have made changes to the appeals process for attendance, resulting from a discussion with admissions and records. As noted in the letter attached to today's agenda, instructors can put

students' residency and financial support status at risk if we drop them. The letter makes a plea to consider faculty's ability to drop students after census, but the point of the changes was not so much to limit our options as to stress that faculty should notify students.

Stephen suggested that we could use a clearer, less ambiguous school policy on how we should treat students who just don't show up for classes. We don't want to just drop students, but we should also be concerned that some students may be taking advantage of the situation—with some deliberately signing up for classes with no intent of attending. We have a policy that it is up to the instructor, but should we have a school-wide policy on this issue?

Vince noted that this is particularly a problem with distance ed, where we don't even see the students. Chris mentioned that technology might make this seem worse than it really is: when students sign into online classes with handheld devices, we don't even know that they have "shown up." These kind of technical glitches further complicate the goal of creating simple guidelines for attendance and dropping.

A related challenge for faculty is to come up with make-up activities for students who miss classes: we have some activities that are extremely difficult for students to make up, such as labs and presentations.

Arielle noted that we are getting mixed feedback from people who want very different things: some want flexibility while others want much more strict guidance. We can provide some guidelines, but rigid policies are unlikely to appeal to many faculty.

We also discussed clarifying excused absences, especially around athletics. Tim Tulloch said that athlete absences depend on the sport—for example, because of scheduling, baseball and softball athletes miss more classes than football players, who miss very few.

At the same time, all student athletes know their basic schedules—and they should be able to tell professors at the beginning of the term what classes they will miss. Even in the event of somewhat unpredictable events such as championships, student athletes have time to check in well in advance. A lot of issues can be

				<p>solved with scheduling and communicating with faculty. Tim also noted that every four year institution has policies similar to ours for athletes—in fact, athletes at four year schools tend to travel much more. If some members of some divisions feel they are negatively impacted by more student athlete absences, athletics can come and discuss policies with them.</p> <p>Arielle suggested that the absence policy is not as time-sensitive as the issues raised about program review. Please focus on program review as a priority with your divisions and departments.</p> <p>Adjourned at 4:37</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--