



ACADEMIC SENATE

Meeting Minutes

April 9 2019
 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	Vice-president
Daniel Keller	Secretary
Rosemary Nurre	Treasurer
Jeremy 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
Kevin Sinarle	Counseling
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
Mike Holtzclaw	CSM Vice President of Instruction
Steven Lehigh	Finance Committee
Madeline Murphy	Language Arts

<p>Jan Roecks Kim Lopez Liz Schuler Tiffany Zammit</p>	<p>Vice President, Administrative Services CSM Cares Professional Development Concurrent Enrollment</p>
--	---

Opening Procedures

Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information/ Procedure
Approval of today's agenda	President	2:35	Approved	Procedure
Approval of past minutes	President	2:40	Approved	Procedure
Public Comment	Public	2:40	<p>Madeleine: The first rough draft of the accreditation report got the thumbs up from IPC before spring break.</p> <p>Now we need to pick a couple of themes that we are going to focus on, and to pick two projects that we want to highlight. The accreditation oversight committee met and chose two projects: The Year One Promise scholars, which shows how we are improving in a number of areas; and CTE, focusing on the career workforce plan. This is still in draft form, but Madeleine will share it with us and would like to hear our comments and thoughts.</p> <p>Jeremy: we got a letter from the CSM Foundation thanking us for donating \$1,000 in scholarships.</p>	Information

New Senate Business

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action (Motion/Resolution)/ Information//Discussion
1	President's Report	Jeremy		<p>a. District Participatory Government Committee met to continue working on the board policies. Jeremy will be sending us more information and we will discuss at our next meeting.</p> <p>b. Equivalency update: See minutes from the last meeting for background on this issue. A second committee approved the candidate. But this is <i>not</i> how this is supposed to work: administration does not just get to form a new committee when they don't like what they heard from the first—let alone in secret, as this seems to have been done. Jeremy was not aware of it, nor were other senate presidents in the district. We may form a standing equivalency committee that will call in discipline experts for assistance. This may reduce confusion, though confusion does not seem to be the reason for this particular decision.</p> <p>c. Program review themes: Jeremy would like to make sure that faculty are aware of the themes we identified. Please share the document handed out today with your divisions and departments.</p> <p>d. Ballot for senate governance: all candidates are unopposed—the positions are unchanged except that Arielle is running for president.</p>	Information
2	Vice President's Report	Peter		We had a regional rep come to the last meeting and we are now coming up with design principles for the meta-majors. All members of the committee held a large steering committee meeting at Skyline on the March 29 flex day—they have a clear agenda for next term.	Information
3	ASCSM Update			No representative present	Information
4	Standing Committee Reports	Sarah	3:00	<p>Library advisory committee is currently short of members. The library is currently working a number of innovations, including updating the search system, catalogs, and electronic resources. There will be a lot of need for input from faculty.</p> <p>Madeleine: the college assessment committee has not been as "fertile" as the library advisory</p>	Information

			<p>committee, but they are working on a new website with forms, a calendar, and a FAQ page. Madeleine will be presenting the new process at an ACJC conference, “Partners in Excellence.”</p> <p>Madeline is also joining with the Year One Promise and learning communities to come up with questions that might help people reflect on what they are doing. There will be a report out in May that will summarize some of these changes.</p> <p>CAE: Liz and Arielle—the March 29 flex day was very full, with over 50 people from CSM and around 90 from Skyline, despite being held the Friday before spring break.. Having the flex day at Skyline allowed us to get some new insights about how faculty work together across campuses.</p> <p>The next CAE meeting will be looking at faculty feedback to get a better understanding of how they can work and plan ahead better in the future.</p>	
5	Discussion Items		<p>1. Dual Enrollment (Mike Claire and Tiffany Zammit) (60 minutes)</p> <p>This is a continuation of the topic from last meeting—see the March 26 minutes.</p> <p>Themes from our continued discussion include the following:</p> <p>Focusing on underserved students:</p> <p>The stated goal of the dual enrollment legislation is to bring to college students who would not be likely to attend. Kim told us that one of the central goals of the CCAP locally is to create pathways for students who would not normally come to CSM—we hope that they will have a sense of purpose when they see how these pathways can lead to college and career goals. One promising way to do this may be to focus on courses such as career planning and development. In Santa Barbara high schools, such courses begin as early as the 9th grade and continue through 10th and 11th grade; students make a ten year plan in a special “exploration course” that helps them see how many more options they have if they attend college. The idea is to create a college-going culture</p>	Discussion

amongst students who may not consider themselves college-bound.

Despite these promising goals, several senators asked questions and expressed concerns: how can we be sure that programs like this do not end up serving students whose parents are highly motivated and connected—in other words, how can we be sure that these programs really do reach underserved students? While it is true that there are already programs for highly motivated and connected students, such as middle college, what evidence do we have that this program will not end up as another way for these students to get ahead? How do we know that high school counselors won't just send any student into these sections?

In response, Tiffany reassured us that CSM is working with high school counselors to ensure that we are reaching the correct students.

Jeremy also raised the concern that these students may be getting tracked into CTE programs, as low-income and students of color were tracked into low-success vocational programs in the past. Arielle also noted that CTE credits are not always transferable. We want to be sure that we do not end up offering only one pathway with courses that may not even apply to a college degree.

However, Chris argued that assumptions about CTE are based on a misunderstanding: CTE includes some of the most popular majors (such as nursing), majors that may lead to high-paying, highly skilled careers that are expected to remain in demand in the future.

In response to Arielle's concern, Tiffany also noted that we are trying to make sure that these courses could be broad enough that they can be applied to other directions and also make sure that students are taking support classes, such as the career courses in Santa Barbara, to make sure they are aware of all of their options and do not feel stuck in a limited track. The main goal is to make sure that these students have early engagement, and part of the goal of the exploration and support courses is to make sure that students see they have a number of options—and that they can use the units that they take towards a college education

in any direction, even if they change their minds about CTE programs. This is an opportunity to engage them early on and help them with college skills such as learning about counseling.

The college and high school environments:

Liz said that one benefit of these programs is that these students are in an environment where they already feel some level of confidence and belonging—on their high school campus. This may be very helpful, despite the differences between high school and college.

But Tatiana noted that high school has often been an inhibitor to having a college experience—do we risk setting up an expectation that the high school environment is going to be the same as college?. In fact, one reason some students decide they don't want to go to college is that they hate high school and believe college would simply be more of the same. If our goal is to convince them that college is really different, wouldn't it make more sense to bring them to the campus?

Tim Maxwell asked whether we can assume that a class taught on a high school campus is really a "college" class. High school teachers would still be contractually obligated for all of the roles of a high school teacher, as would college teachers who come to teach in a high school.

Mike Claire argued that, in a perfect world, dual enrollment would be carefully planned out so that initially we deliver the classes in an environment that students are comfortable in. If it is well-planned, and there is a true pathway built, we can then bring these students to campus where they will see how their planned pathways would allow them to move towards graduation. Mike said that concerns about campus environment can be compared to four year schools not trusting that community college students can handle four year work because of assumptions about what happens here: we are justifiably annoyed by such assumptions, and our students who transfer succeed at higher rates than four year college natives.

But some faculty who have taught at high schools still have expressed concern that high

schools do not really promote critical thinking: so much of the emphasis of a typical high school campus is on ensuring discipline and following directions, so that, at least for courses that require extensive critical thinking, we feel justified in being concerned that these experiences are very different.

Issues about screening, training, and evaluation of faculty

We also discussed concerns about the qualifications, and evaluation of high school faculty teaching college courses—and of college faculty who teach on high school campuses.

The goal is to have the same process for the hiring and evaluation of high school faculty teaching our courses as they would get here: they must have minimum qualifications and be vetted and evaluated through the same process. Discipline faculty will do the evaluations as if these teachers were regular CSM faculty. (It is less clear how the considerable work of screening and evaluation will be compensated.)

Regarding the training of college faculty who are willing to teach in high schools, Arielle argued that we need to be sure we have an “onboarding” process so that college faculty who go to high schools have a sense of what to expect—classroom management is completely different, for example, and while high school teachers go through credentialing programs that focus on these issues, college faculty do not. Without training, faculty may struggle. Tiffany said that there are events for college faculty who want to teach in high schools.

Current status and future plans

Currently, what courses we offer or plan to offer are driven by faculty interest. We have already begun working with Half Moon Bay, San Mateo, and Hillsdale high schools. Interested faculty are (or will be) teaching courses in business, accounting, and criminal justice, as well as a counselling course.

This program could get much larger—Mike Claire noted that there are other colleges that have been doing this for a long time: Santa Barbara offers 100 sections a semester. We

don't want to overextend ourselves or rush into this, but Mike feels we have an obligation to explore every single avenue to get students on a pathway to college.

2. Academic Senate Sub-committee Merger (Jeremy Wallace) (30 minutes)

We discussed this last spring, but we have seen another year where one committee went down in flames due to lack of participation. It has also been hard to get people to serve on the library committee, among others.

In response to this long-standing problem, Jeremy, Arielle, Madeline, and Liz met to work on the bylaw changes. The goal is to bring in the feedback we were given last semester and make sure that the duties and membership are clear.

Jeremy went over the description of the newly proposed Teaching and Learning Committee, TLC—ideally we would have about 21 people on the committee, which would meet once or twice a semester, while the other three committees, made up of 7 members each, would meet once a month.

Laura raised the concern that this may just seem like *more* work, hardly an incentive for more faculty to participate: are we now saying that those people who have signed up for one committee are going to have to participate in one more? Isn't this complicating things, and creating more work when the goal has been to reduce work?

However, the only added work is one extra meeting a semester.

Madeline said that this larger committee *could* actually reduce the work: it could help organize the committees, getting them to focus on a particular theme, for example, instead of many different committees trying to tackle several, sometimes competing or incoherent agendas. As a result, committee work would become both more meaningful and more efficient.

We will discuss this further and have a vote by the end of the semester.

--	--	--	--	--	--

Next meeting: April 23, 2019 Location: 18-206, 2:30 p.m.

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