



ACADEMIC SENATE

Meeting Minutes

October 23, 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	Vice-president Secretary Treasurer

Senators Present

Name of Senator	Division
Tabitha Conaway Tim Maxwell Colby Nixon Stephanie Roach Arielle Smith Vincent Li David Laderman	ASLT Language Arts Language Arts ASLT Counseling Business and technology Past president

Others Present

Name	Representing
Dorian King Liz Schuler Madeleine Murphy	ASCSM Professional development CAE

Opening Procedures

Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information/ Procedure
Approval of today's agenda	President		Approved	Procedure
Approval of past minutes	President		Approved	Procedure
Public Comment	Public	2:35	<p>Stephanie: Because one of our film classes is showing horror movies, there are several Halloween-themed movies now on the library database.</p> <p>Colby: a constituent contacted Colby and Tim with concerns about where our CalSTRS/PERS money is being invested— with an argument that we should divest from some objectionable companies, particularly for-profit prison companies such as CoreCivic and GEO Group that are currently involved in the detention of migrant families. Colby shared a letter of support for a petition demanding complete divestment from CoreCivic and GEO Group.</p>	Information

New Senate Business

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action (Motion/Resolution)/ Information//Discussion
1	Vice-president's report	Vice-president	2:40	<p>Guided Pathways has an open meeting tomorrow from 2-4. Peter has met with the curriculum committee to discuss how curriculum would go through and whether we would need to make changes. For Spring, the business department are mapping "meta majors"—mainly because business is the largest declared major on campus. They will also be doing an analysis of the curriculum to "clean house" before they map everything out.</p> <p>As a reminder: Guided Pathways still needs more faculty on the general team, which remains very administration heavy. Rosemary argued that faculty are not participating due to feeling "tapped out" by all of their current commitments. This is a big program, a big commitment for faculty. We should be offering release time for the project. While Peter believes that communication has been the main reason for a shortage of faculty participants, he noted</p>	Information

				<p>that other colleges are offering substantial release time.</p> <p>Madeleine argued that projects like this are a part of full time faculty workload, but perhaps this is another reason to emphasize that we need more full-time faculty.</p>	
2	ASCSM Update	Dorian King	2:45	<p>The voter registration drive was very successful, registering more than 60 students.</p> <p>ASCSM would like faculty to help get the word out for student club events</p> <p>John Burrigh has been approved as the new finance director; they also will have a vacancy on the senate. If you know of students who might be interested, please ask them to go to the office of student life.</p>	Information
3	Standing committee reports	Madeleine Liz and Arielle	2:55	<p>CAE—Madeleine—CAE are still working on their assessment handbook, though all work has been derailed by program review. They have also been talking about “program review review” (PR squared). The goal is not so much to evaluate the reviews (which remains IPC’s function) as finding out where faculty need support, or looking for things that were done particularly well.</p> <p>Professional development—Liz and Arielle—we had double attendance at the flex day sessions, so they were very successful. They have already begun to plan January. As with Guided Pathways, they need more faculty involvement, particularly from Math. But, as noted above, everyone seems to be tapped out. The sense of feeling tapped out is widespread at this point. Madeleine suggested that we should warn full time candidates that they are expected to be a “withered husk” after working here for a few years.</p>	Information
4	California Community Colleges Library Services Platform Project	Stephanie	3:05	<p>The Library Services Platform Project , from the state chancellor’s office, is somewhat similar to Canvas, but for the library services, to be used in community colleges across the state.</p> <p>The LSP is a system that the library will use to manage library resources like student accounts, the course reserve system, among others.</p> <p>It is also more robust than the Peninsula library system—for example, it will allow us to search</p>	Information

				<p>databases at the same time that we search books.</p> <p>Positives: Stephanie feels that it is a student-centered approach, one that links us to all the community and CSUs as well as some UCs. Students who are transferring are then already used to the search system. It also may allow us to share resources with other CCs, and will free us from some of the limits of PLS.</p> <p>The new system also allows us to avoid some of the problems we have with vendors and our databases as they are now. Finally, the system also has state funding for at least one year, with five years more expected.</p> <p>As a result of all these positives, all librarians and the cabinet (at both CSM and Skyline) are in support. Canada is more concerned about the work entailed in moving to a new system because they do not have a director or technical services specialist, so making the changes would be a considerable amount of work.</p> <p>Less positive: the relationship change with the PLS may create problems if we are not communicating clearly. The library cards that work at PLS will no longer work at CSM. Students will need two library cards if they want to use the Peninsula system. Faculty and students will still be able to request books from across the Peninsula system, but the process may take a little longer.</p> <p>The cost for the new system are lower—at first—because the state is paying for it for the first two years. But there are some services that will cost us later, such as a system librarian (currently supplied by PLS): we will need a new position (at the district level).</p> <p>This change will be discussed at district academic senate, the plenary, and at the next cabinet meeting. The due date to decide on participation is 10/31.</p> <p>If you have questions or concerns, please send them to Stephanie.</p>	
5	Board Policies 2.03, 2.09, 2.10, 2.12, 2.13,		3:30	Peter mentioned some questions he has about the changes: we aren't clear what the difference	Discussion

	2.15, 3.00, 3.15, 3.30, 3.3			<p>is between “Contract” and “Regular” faculty—and we aren’t clear where “temporary full-time” fits. Arielle mentioned that counseling funds these positions as a one-year contractual assignment. It isn’t clear whether this can be extended beyond a year; these positions are filled in a hiring process similar to part-time positions.</p> <p>We would like this category clarified before voting to approve.</p> <p>David noted that at the last AFT meeting, this topic was discussed, particularly with regard to evaluations. Are these positions evaluated as if they were in the beginning of a FT position? Or are they evaluated as if they were part-timers? If a temporary full time hire subsequently becomes full time, can he or she count the first year evaluation as credit towards FT evaluations? We probably need more discussion and clarification.</p> <p>Peter also has questions about policy 2.10—item five: what exactly is “appropriate consultation”? Rosemary noted that this may be outside of our purview, but we should ask for clarification. Tabitha suggested that this phrase refers to our current process of making position requests through deans and ranking. We will discuss this further.</p>	
6	Statement of Professional Ethics	Peter	3:45	<p>We looked at the 2009 revision of the statement.</p> <p>Peter asked if faculty should be limited in “self-promotional” messages—promoting their published books through campus email, for example, something considered unethical in the corporate world. Dorian noted that she has experienced faculty “self-promoting” to students as well—an instructor was promoting her own films—and found it awkward and distasteful. Students don’t want to feel like they have to compliment professors on their work, particularly if it isn’t even relevant to the class.</p> <p>Although discussion of this issue is missing, the language of the statement otherwise seems fairly uncontroversial.</p> <p>We could adopt the current statement, but ask for an addendum regarding self-promotion. Tabitha suggested that we also might ask to add something about equity—that faculty have an</p>	Discussion

				obligation to promote an equitable atmosphere for all students.	
7	Program Review Process for Academic Senate	Peter and Madeleine	3:55	<p>As a reminder, our goal is to be advocates, not evaluators, in reading program review.</p> <p>For example, we can look at what equity gaps have been identified by different departments, and what the different departments are doing to close them. This could help us to have a college-wide discussion about the resources we need to help close the gaps.</p> <p>Among areas we are looking at are connecting faculty with resources to help them reach goals, efficacy of assessment, concerns about equity, professional development needs, distance education needs. We are also looking for themes and trends overall. Rosemary argued that it seems like deans should already know these kinds of things, but Madeline argued that faculty have different goals and perspectives than deans.</p> <p>For example, if a program review notes there is a shortage of Latinx students and they would like to do more to recruit, senate might be able to help them find resources to improve their recruitment. The point is to change how “siloeed” we are, and to encourage more conversations across divisions.</p> <p>We worked on a “summary chart” that might help us look for needs and trends.</p> <p>We also discussed how we might reduce the workload for this process: we could just focus on the final section of program review, where the most pressing issues are discussed, or we might just look for particular themes only—equity, link between disciplines, and so on.</p> <p>When would we be able to actually do this? Peter argued that we could look at them between January and March, perhaps on a flex day or a full-day retreat. We might try to do this sometime before March.</p>	

Next meeting: November 13, 2018 Location: 10-401, 2:30 p.m.

Future Discussion Topics Joint Academic/Classified Senates meeting (11/13) Enrollment Caps (11/27) Adjunct Equity (11/27) Public Safety Update (11/27) Early College (11/27) Flexible Scheduling (1/22) Reading Task Force update (1/22) Textbook Task Force update (2/12) Classroom Technology Educational Equity 50th Anniversary of the 1968 CSM Protests