

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

December 14, 2021

Zoom Meeting ID: 442 779 680

1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd. San Mateo, CA 2:30 – 4:30 pm Website

Executive Committee 2021-2022

Teresa Morris President

Jesenia Diaz Vice-President

Stephen Heath Treasurer

Daniel Keller Secretary

ACADEMIC SENATE

Executives Present

Name of Officer	Executive Committee Role
Jesenia Diaz	Vice-president
Stephen Heath	Treasurer
Daniel Keller	Secretary
Teresa Morris	President

Senators Present

Name of Senator	Division
Michelle Brown	CASS
Yvette Butterworth	Math Science
Jennifer Howze-Ownes	ASLT
Vincent Li	Business
Trang Luong	Counselling
Sunny Martin	Counselling
Gil Perez	Counseling
Kevin Sinarle	Counselling
Lia Thomas (she/her)	Library
Fi Tovo	ASLT
Christopher Walker	Curriculum
Katherine Webster	Language Arts
Lale Yurtseven	Business Technology

Others Present

Name	Representing

Opening Procedures

Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information/ Procedure
Approval of today's agenda	President	2:36	Todd: move to approve agenda; Daniel: second Approve: all	Procedure
Approval of past minutes	President	2:38	Minutes approved	Procedure
Public Comment	Public	2:39	Daniel shared that he had been exposed to COVID and was somewhat concerned about current policies saying fully vaccinated people are exempt from quarantine, do not have to be tested, and should monitor their own symptoms. While all of these policies made sense in the recent past, the latest news suggests that the Omicron variant is far more contagious, including to those fully vaccinated, and may have less obvious symptoms for vaccinated people. Do we need to modify policies? If an employee feels it is unsafe to return after exposure but is not technically sick, what is the policy? Will absence for quarantine count as sick days? Note that there is a quarantine tree that makes current policies clear: https://smccd.edu/return-to-campus/docs/SMCCCD%20isolation.quarantine%20decision%20tree%2011.17.2021.pdf We should continue to discuss changing policies next term.	Information

New Senate Business

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action (Motion/Resolution)/ Information//Discussion
1	President's Report		2:43	 We will be continuing to meet over Zoom next semester. The link may be the same, but you should check on the new agendas next term. 	Information
				Teresa shared information regarding the plan to return to campus next term. The site has been up for a while. https://smccd.edu/return-to-campus/employees.php Please encourage your colleagues to read this for information about next term	
				 Teresa went to and District Academic senate and IPC to discuss program review they are working on defining the different instructional modalities (HyFlex, synchronous, asynchronous, partially synchronous, and so on). The District 	

2 A	ASCSM Update	ASCSM: Andrea	2:58	meeting on safe zones and on future plans around equity, including possibly opening new centers for student groups. Todd mentioned the possibility of a pride center. Normally this would fall under the Multicultural and Dream center, but we may also be developing other centers to be more closely affiliated with the office of equity. The presentations on the safety committee are available online. Regarding requests: If you are interested in having your space assessed for safety—for example if you want extra equipment such as plexiglass—it will be possible next semester. However, this process is creating a lot of confusion right now. They are trying to be accommodating right now, but there is some resistance as well. 5. DPGC Jesenia: there is a pre-retirement program that allows you to take up to ten years to phase out retirement; the board seems to have attempted to change this to five years without full consultation, making it out of compliance with the contract. Jesenia will keep us informed of new policies coming next semester, including a new mission statement. 6. Teresa also updated that she and Ariel will be splitting release time in spring. They aren't sure yet how this will work. Information	
		Morales			

3	Standing Committee Reports	Christopher	3:00	a) Curriculum Committee, Christopher Walker, Chair	Information
				Last week was the final meeting of the term, so we had to power through all of the year-end outlines. Our first meeting in January will be our overflow meeting to clean up all the work from fall.	
				b) Committee Teaching and Learning, Liz Schuler/Madeleine Murphy	
				No representative present, though Madeleine and Liz did speak to Teresa about including information about assessment in the weekly emails	
		Jennifer Howze- Owens		c) Distance Education Advisory Committee; faculty chair Jennifer Howze Owens There will be many new programs in spring. Offerings for flex days will include presentations on the modalities (HyFlex, synchronous, and so on) and a presentation on student engagement; there will also be drop-in hours.	
				CSM is now a member of the CVC-OEI, so more information will be coming in the spring.	
				We will be sharing the dates for QOTL which will be offered in the spring and summer. QOTL 1 will be offered in mid-February, and 2 will be offered shortly after.	
				Also, to bring back the Proctorio conversation: DEAC discussed issues raised at the previous senate meeting and will be drafting questions for the spring listening tour. We are hoping to collect information across divisions and to bring the discussion back to senate in February.	
				We do have to be mindful that our contract with Proctorio ends in July—right now, we don't know if we will even have it next year. But feedback should be done by then.	
				Teresa said she would like to have at least one more wrap-up conversation next term. Even if Proctorio sunsets, we do have other questions about how decisions were made and concerns about these kinds of issues for the future, but that conversation is longer-term.	
				d) OER Update; Lia Thomas/Chris Smith	

	Г			
		Lia	We had our last meeting of the term and spoke with the teams on the other campuses. We should have some clarification about policies as well as a new label, Low Textbook Cost (for books 40 dollars and less), which should go forward by fall. We are still waiting on the ZTC grant. A chancellor's session was cancelled so we do not have current info, but we believe all campuses will get money for ZTC without too many restrictions. I am doing a ZTC flex day on 12/13, so if you are interested in learning more about it, it is called "CSM: ZTC: OMG." Teresa: one more reminder—I want to encourage all chairs and anyone else who is part of a campus committee, please be sure to submit information on to the campus events calendar. There is a form that will allow you to add your events to the calendar, which will make it much easier for people to get a sense of what these committees do and when they meet: https://calendar.collegeofsanmateo.edu/events/inde x.php?com=submit	
5	Action Items	3:10	1. Consent Agenda Resolution: Brown Act. Because of the ongoing proclaimed state of emergency relating to the novel coronavirus causing the disease known as COVID-19, we will hold senate meetings online. All approve 2. Committee Approval a) DRC Counselor Screening Committee Lale noted that everyone on the committee seems to be from the discipline—aren't these supposed to include at least one person from outside? Mike: one of the reasons we are looking for an outside perspective is for some balance in decision making—a form of checks and balances. Anyone	Action

			from outside of the area would be considered an outside. Lale suggested that it would be better still if it were faculty, someone not in student services. It also creates connections across campus, improving our institutional knowledge. General counseling is outside of DRC and so is the resources member. After some discussion, some members felt that we do need an outside perspective. Todd suggested someone in the learning center. Teresa will send this feedback back to Krystal Duncan, the dean in that area, to discuss having a different perspective.	
6.	Discussion items	3:22	Discussion Items, 3:30 – 4:30 1) Dual Enrollment – conversation with Mike Holtzclaw – Vice President of Instruction This fall we put together a document to clarify the purpose of the dual enrollment program: https://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/docs/CSM_Dual_Enrollment_Plan_2021-22.pdf The goal is to reach students who are traditionally not likely to go to college: there are already many options for students seeking things like advanced placement classes. This is targeting students who are low SES, first generation, marginalized communities: they are the target group. We have not had a full-time position dedicated to working on dual enrollment, but there are a lot of resources supporting this program. We hope to hire a retention specialist in addition to a full time position. CSM has been trying to do dual enrollment, but it hasn't been very effective. We did not have the momentum going that Skyline has—they have over 2,000 students. We now see the program as part of the "early pathways" that we are trying to build, connecting this to guided pathways and other programs that will allow students to start working towards building some units towards a degree or certificate. We are also hoping to connect more with the Promise Scholars program.	Discussion

Questions about the "big picture"?

Vincent: If students take many of these classes, can it make them transfer students instead of new applicants? And if we are attracting a lot of these students who are disadvantaged, will this hurt them in terms of getting scholarships?

Mike: they are not coming in as transfer students, so much as coming in with credits.

Mike also clarified some of the terminology: dual enrollment should not be confused with concurrent enrollment, which is when students come to campus; middle college is also students coming to campus. This is about students taking college-approved classes in their school day in lieu of one of their high school classes, though they can get high school credit for the courses as well.

Vincent: another problem that we had in the past was that the classes were offered late in the day. Mike: that's why we have tried to make sure that they are now accessible during the school day.

Lale: I have taught at a high school in dual enrollment. Two questions: the majority of my students were *not* disadvantaged. How do we make sure that we are reaching these students? Second question: what year do students have to be in? I am somewhat concerned given that some students in concurrent enrollment are not ready for college classes—I have been asked to have a 13 year old in my business law class.

Mike: a lot of that has changed—the focus on this target population is new. As far as grades: this is the beginning of a conversation. We were more focused on Promise in the past, but this is a major concern going forward.

We also need to be sure that we talk with high school faculty about what to offer and when, what kind of progression would make sense and how far down in the grade levels this could go. We will be doing more to make sure that the classes being offered are more appropriate. We also may need to develop courses like intro to public service or intro to health occupations.

We need to be sure that we are working with faculty to build these pathways.

Jesenia: for clarification on Vincent's question—for three different types of students (concurrent, middle, dual) they are earning high school credit, but when they start at college they come in with that credit even though they have a college transcript already started. But they are considered regular transfer students when they transfer to a four-year, and will still be considered freshmen for scholarships.

Kat: English faculty have raised concerns about this: some faculty have taught in other districts with dual enrollment and found that the pass rate was extremely low. We wanted some research that would show that the dual enrollment model can work. We were also concerned that our courses may not go well with a lot of students in the high school environment.

We are also concerned about personnel issues, including who is teaching these classes, and how much say we get in who is hired.

Mike: First, English dual enrollment is now off the table.

On the issue of hiring, there are two kinds of instructors for dual enrollment: CSM employees who are either full-time or adjunct are offered the classes as part of their load. The other is HS faculty who meet minimum quals for California community colleges. Faculty who don't meet these requirements are not eligible even if, for example they have a master's in education but not in their discipline.

All of the faculty teaching our courses are evaluated by us and with our standards. So even if a high school faculty member is teaching we evaluate them, but they are not are employees--we don't hire them, but we do evaluate them.

4:10

Stephen: Dual enrollment is something we could think of on a case-by-case basis: in accounting, I've had great experiences with dual enrollment, bringing a subject into high schools that is not already taught. What we teach in accounting are really powerful

tools that students don't have access to. So accounting is definitely in favor of these programs.

Lale: my other concern is that not many high school teachers will have the credentials in business, and it may be very hard to find faculty who want to teach at a HS or who can make it. Are we going to require faculty to teach it?

Mike: we do not want to be in a situation where we tell faculty where to teach. We will be working on writing dual enrollment into new job descriptions. We don't want to force current faculty to teach at high schools.

Michelle Brown: I was actually thrown out there a couple of years ago to teach a class at Hillsdale—it was one of the worst experiences I've had. None of the students were vetted to see if they were planning on going to college or even on schedule to graduate. My concern is that in some areas, such as CTE, they don't need a masters so much as some professional experience. The faculty are not adjuncts at CSM, but they can be hired to teach as adjuncts according to the website.

Mike: if we wanted to hire qualified faculty, we could, but we don't automatically consider the teachers faculty here. They are teaching our class and have to follow our course outlines and meet those standards, but it is still part of their load as high school teachers. Our faculty are involved in evaluations, going over the COR, and so on.

Michelle: in some disciplines such as digital media, we also look at portfolios. We wouldn't hire someone who could not demonstrate the necessary skills to teach in a CTE course. If we don't have control over hiring, what do we do? Also, do we get credit for students?

Mike: Yes, we get credit for students. Regarding the hiring: if it is beyond minimum quals, we would need to have an equivalency grant.

Teresa suggested a few questions for the senate to think about regarding this:

What is the line between being a school district employee versus a college faculty member? There are a lot of questions that might help us get a better sense of this: the information about high school faculty is not really out there. We need more transparency on what that would look like. We also need more of a faculty voice in what kinds of courses are offered—this will make a difference in the success rates. We are concerned about student success: does the program really have all it needs to be successful? Do the classes count as attempts if the students don't pass? We need to be sure they are on a successful pathway. We also mentioned how to balance the needs of a high school when we don't have the capacity to teach additional sections. Does it take away from our faculty if we are low?

I also heard support for the inspiration that can come from these courses. Courses like accounting may be ideal. But what has not been particularly strong is the decision of what to offer. When looking at the current plan, I think there is more to be talked about: how many students we want and most importantly quality—make sure faculty are involved in the discussion.

Lale: We also really need to make sure that we are reaching those who need this program and not the ones who already have great advantages.

Mike: We've had to educate the high schools as well about what this program is and what is not—our early attempts didn't go well because we did not do enough of this. We don't want the high social capital students in these courses, but we also don't want it to be a dumping ground: we don't want people who aren't even on track to graduate in these classes. So far, we have mostly brought CSM faculty to the high schools. This is a way of getting students into CSM also—they get to see some of our great instructors and students follow them.

We need to be sure that our standards are being met—we are not interested in having a second- rate version of our curriculum being taught.

Teresa: there is a lot that we need to talk about, but we need some structure. I've heard a lot of concerns and some good experiences about the program, but it is not consistent. Involvement is not consistent—we need to be sure that we are listening to faculty and getting consistent voices. We need integrative, iterative process. An advising committee, guidance committee—maybe it needs to be a new committee

but even there where does it go? We need to make sure that it is not just one voice.

We should think about instructional capacity for participating, but we also need to make sure this is about the students.

Mike: It is true that dual enrollment is being pushed and it can seem like it is being pushed on us: it is happening because of pushes from the state and the board. We need to be sure that it works for us. This is about students. We can all agree on that, but we need to figure out how to get that we are in a place that truly supports students and faculty. This is the beginning but I think coming back in spring and getting some feedback on this document would be very helpful.

Teresa: We are almost out of time, so I want to remind everyone of the "Great Read" plan for next semester: you should have received updated links to program review. Please try to contact people in your group. Also note that the due date has been changed—it will be due the first February meeting instead of January. That will give everyone a little more time.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30