

## **Meeting Minutes**

March 26<sup>th</sup> 2019 Rm. 18-206 1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd. San Mateo, CA 2:30 – 4:30 pm <u>Website</u>

## **Executive Committee 2017-2018**

Jeramy Wallace President

Peter von Bleichert Vice-President

Rosemary Nurre Treasurer

> Daniel Keller Secretary

## **ACADEMIC SENATE**

## **Executives Present**

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

#### **Senators Present**

Name of Senator	Division
Tabitha Conaway	ASLT
Stephen Heath	Business
Tatiana Irwin	CASS
Beth Larochelle	Math/Science
Tim Maxwell	Language Arts
Stephanie Roach	ASLT
Chris Smith	Math Science
Arielle Smith	Counseling
Tim Tulloch	Kinesiology

#### **Others Present**

Name	Representing
Mike Claire	CSM President
Laura Demsetz	Dean, CASS
Allie Fasth	Year One
Steven Lehigh	Finance committee
Madeline Murphy	Language arts
Jan Roecks	Vice president, administrative services
Liz Schuler	Professional development

Keira Travis	Language Arts
Tiffany Zammit	Concurrent enrollment

# **Opening Procedures**

Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information/ Procedure
President	2:35	Approved	Procedure
President	2:40	Approved	Procedure
Public	2:45	Tim Maxwell: A colleague from CSM served at Skyline on an equivalency committee and objected to the equivalency decision—but her decision was overruled by district administration. Even though the board has the final say, these decisions are supposed to be unanimous—faculty input should not simply be overruled. Note: we voted at the end of the meeting to have Jeramy ask for a delay in the decision.  Laura: Update on the "Improving Online CTE Pathways" proposal: we have been given a planning grant and are currently working to develop a comprehensive support plan for student success in online pathways. The proposal will be due May first. The main goal now is to get faculty input: we are hoping to have multiple days and times for planning sessions. The sessions should have some incentives for faculty participation: like food and compensation. We came up with some ideas for getting more input, such as having an online survey, a shared Google doc.  Chris, Faculty professional development committee chair: — The committee needs one faculty volunteer to serve as a replacement for this Friday only. The committee has not yet been able to meet to discuss long term proposals due to scheduling conflicts. They have finally found a time that works for most (this Friday), but there need to be four faculty members on the committee, and one cannot make the meeting.  Tatiana: if you are interested in joining the conversation about	Information
	President President	President 2:35 President 2:40	President 2:35 Approved  President 2:40 Approved  Public 2:45 Tim Maxwell: A colleague from CSM served at Skyline on an equivalency committee and objected to the equivalency decision—but her decision was overruled by district administration. Even though the board has the final say, these decisions are supposed to be unanimous—faculty input should not simply be overruled. Note: we voted at the end of the meeting to have Jeramy ask for a delay in the decision.  Laura: Update on the "Improving Online CTE Pathways" proposal: we have been given a planning grant and are currently working to develop a comprehensive support plan for student success in online pathways. The proposal will be due May first. The main goal now is to get faculty input: we are hoping to have multiple days and times for planning sessions. The sessions should have some incentives for faculty participation: like food and compensation. We came up with some ideas for getting more input, such as having an online survey, a shared Google doc.  Chris, Faculty professional development committee chair: — The committee needs one faculty volunteer to serve as a replacement for this Friday only. The committee has not yet been able to meet to discuss long term proposals due to scheduling conflicts. They have finally found a time that works for most (this Friday), but there need to be four faculty members on the committee, and one cannot make the meeting.

The goal is to have a course at some point in a student's education that satisfies a diversity (or multicultural) requirement.	
--	--

## **New Senate Business**

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action (Motion/Resolution)/ Information//Discussion
1	President's Report	Jeramy	3:00	There is no new information to report. We will review the district senate meeting during the dual enrollment discussion.	Information
2	Vice President's Report	Peter	3:05	Guided pathways will meet tomorrow in this room at 2:00 and at Skyline on Friday at 2:00. We have an end goal of creating a flex day activity for fall.	Information
3	ASCSM Update			No representative	Information
4	Standing Committee Reports	Arielle		CAE: don't forget to RSVP for the flex day at Skyline if you have not already done so.	Information
5	Discussion Items	Jeramy	3:20	Academic Senate Executive Committee Nominations  Nominations received via email: Rosemary has been nominated for treasurer; Pete has been nominated for vice-president; Arielle has been nominated for president. There are currently no nominations for secretary and the current secretary is uncertain about next semester.	Discussion
		Rosemary	3:25	Workload Equity Survey The committee met all of last year to discuss workload equity. The number one tenet to start with on this group was that there would be no additional faculty hiring (our enrollments have dropped by 10,000 students across the district) But several	

participants noted that even though the number of students has decreased, there has not been much impact on faculty workload.

One issue to help ensure a more even sharing of workload is using a "points" system, where faculty would be given extra points for anything beyond what is determined to be a reasonable workload. There will be some compensation for more work, but the committee has not decided how to determine this. The most obvious goal for such a system is accountability, but we also need to set clearer expectations for faculty: "other duties as assigned" is a vague category that is getting to be too big.

If the points system is accepted and implemented, it will not be perfect—there will need to be a committee that will evaluate the various projects that we want to get points for. It is not intended to punitive—to "shame" faculty who don't go beyond the minimum—so much as to provide more clarity about activities beyond teaching assignments.

Arielle mentioned that we should be mindful of workload issues for non-classroom faculty such as counselors, who also participate in committees, program review, and so on.

There will be a meeting on April 10—we hope to come up with some basic agreements, but the process of fine-tuning the proposal will take much longer than this semester.

Steve Lehigh, Jan Roecks 3:30

#### **Finance Committee Update**

The committee had a presentation this past flex day to try to increase the dialogue about financial issues across the campus. The goal is to provide more transparency about budget decisions.

Some interesting facts: across the district, FTE student enrollment is down by over 1,000 students, though international students have reduced the total loss to about 600.

We've seen an addition to our fund 1 (equipment) and fund three (instructional) revenues—over 20 million in additional revenue between the two funds. Much of the increased

revenue is going to STRS—which has raised the amount they take from faculty paychecks, so this funding comes on the "back end" of faculty revenue. In other words, you may not see it in your paycheck. There have also been 57 hires over the past five years, the equivalent of 23 FTE faculty, 34 FTE classified . We've also created 11 new initiatives (like Year One Promise, Guided Pathways, etc.) that require support—from faculty release time.

If we see an increase in enrollment, we have some leeway so that we will not need to hire a huge number of new faculty. We hope to have a smooth transition—not cancelling classes and trying to keep adjunct faculty.

Another concern is that we rely on grant money—but we have also planned to how we will function without this funding. We do have a decent reserve of funds right now to act as a "shock absorber." We are in much better shape than we were during the last budget crisis.

If you have questions or want to provide feedback, please contact Arielle, Jan, or Steven.

Mike Claire, Tiffany Zammit 3:45

#### **Dual Enrollment**

Some background information about dual enrolment: although AB 288 is a state initiative, Mike Claire wanted us to see how our local context is relevant to this goal: we have strong connections with local high schools, but Mike has long believed that we have to do a better job of connecting with them. He mentioned that he has been upset that we have so little connection with high schools in the past to help the students who come here.

We have had discussions and some projects with some of our local high schools, specifically Hillsdale, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo high schools, as well as having middle college on campus. But our involvement has been fairly small. The goal of AB 288 is to significantly increase our presence on high school campuses—beyond middle college.

Tiffany clarified the differences between concurrent and dual enrollment: concurrent enrollment is when students take course outside of high school, on the college campus, and receive college credit if they pass these courses—what we currently offer as middle college. Mike noted that the students who take these middle college classes are often bound for four year schools and are just getting a jump on the classes. They are not the traditionally underserved students that AB 288 is focusing on.

In contrast, dual enrollment classes take place on the high school campus; students earn both high school and college credit; classes are taught by college OR high school faculty. Ideally, this would reach students who are *not* trying to get a jump start on college—and who may not have considered college at all. In this sense, AB 288 seeks to address equity issues.

On the issue of equity: Tabitha noted that the current "vision" statement for dual enrollment may blur the goal of AB 288, which is to focus on traditionally underrepresented students—our current vision statement uses the language "all" students, which often buries the equity gap issues in overall success rates. Mike suggested that we could revise the vision statement to clarify this goal.

We had time to discuss a few more issues relevant to dual enrollment:

- AB 705 allows us to take pre-transfer courses eliminated or reduced by AB 705 back to the high schools so that students can earn dual credit. We are not currently doing this.
- AB 288 has two pathways: non CCAP (college and career access pathways) and CCAP. The CCAP pathway focuses on students who may not already be college-bound our who are underrepresented in higher education. The goal is to have "seamless pathways" to community college for CTE and transfer, improving college readiness and high school graduation rates.
- Many other colleges, including CCSF and College of Marin, are already

involved, with most high school students taking courses on their high school campus. Some start as early as 8th grade, asking students not to pick a career or major but to build a pathway so that they can see the path to college graduation. High school students who may not have considered themselves college material are able to explore their options.

Currently, we are focusing on building relationships and tying this more closely to college pathways.

Tiffany presented data showing that students are much more likely to persist at CSM if they start college immediately after high school. Roughly 80% of students persist if they enroll in the fall term following high school, while only 38 persist if they wait two years. We did not have time to discuss the significance or value of this data.

We want to continue to discuss this at future meetings because we were not able to get into the discussions in detail today. Mike wants to make sure that all of our questions are being answered. So we will continue this discussion at out next meeting.

Final note: we took a last minute vote to send to the board to request a delay for the board's equivalency issue we discussed at the beginning—see the first item in" public comment" above.

Next meeting: April 9, 2019 Location: 18-206, 2:30 p.m.

Future Discussion Topics: AS Committees Merger (4/9) FT Prioritization (4/23) Syllabi Student Resources List (4/23) Classroom Technology Educational Equity Enrollment Caps Social Justice Competency Requirement