

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

April 25, 2017
2:30 – 4:30 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	David Laderman
Vice President	Kathleen Sammut
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary (Interim)	Stephanie Roach
ASLT	Theresa Martin
ASLT/Library	Matt Montgomery
Business/Technology	Steve Gonzales
Business/Technology	Vincent Li (Absent)
Creative Arts/Social Science	Steven Lehigh
Creative Arts/Social Science	Margaret Kaluzny
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mikel Schmidt
Language Arts	Jon Kitamura
Language Arts	Mick Sherer
Math/Science	Ellen Young
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin
Student Services	Kevin Sinarle

OTHERS ATTENDING

Tania Beliz, Math/Science	Teresa Morris, Library; Chair, COI
Katie Bliss, ASLT	Madeleine Murphy, Language Arts; SLO Coordinator
Laura Demsetz, Dean, CA/SS	Kristi Ridgway, Language Arts
Dan Kaplan, AFT	Kathy Ross, Dean, Business/Technology
Stephen McReynolds, President, ASCSM	Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Dean, ASLT
	Jeremy Wallace, Language Arts

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm

1. Approval of the Agenda (April 17, 2017)

Agenda:

Proposed changes to the agenda are as noted: The minutes from April 11, 2017 will not be approved today. Additionally, there will be a committee approval added as item A under President's report.

There will be limited time for discussion of today's action item.

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the agenda as amended, and Ellen Young seconded the motion as amended. All voted in favor, and the agenda was approved.

Minutes:

The minutes for the April 11, 2017 meeting were not distributed in time to approve at this time. We will distribute them for review and approval at the next Academic Senate meeting on May 9, 2017.

2. Public Comment (2 minutes per)

AFT is looking for participation on a proposed Workload Equity Committee. Part of resolving the contract has to do with the District wanting more information and data regarding workload equity. Of interest, the contract negotiation teams are moving forward to fact finding. A handout with further details about the workload committee was provided (see appendix). Rosemary Nurre and Margaret Kaluzny are both interested in serving on the committee. It was pointed out that adjunct faculty would also benefit from representation on the committee. We will ask if we can appoint two representatives to the committee. At this point it is unknown how much work will be expected of committee members.

The International Student Task Force has met and has drafted a survey for faculty. Twenty-five faculty members were selected to receive the survey. The survey targeted faculty members whose courses have above average enrollment of international students. Results of the survey will be analyzed, and focus groups will be organized to further explore the issue and impacts.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. President's Report

- a. Appointments to the Diversity Working Group, of the Educational Equity Committee.
David Laderman approved three faculty representative appointments to the Diversity Working Group as follows: Kate Motoyama (Language Arts), Lorena Gonzalez (Counseling), and Sylvia Aguirre-Alberto (Counseling).
- b. Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Update

The themes and trends identified as part of the most recent program review will be shared with faculty soon. Additionally, Institutional Effectiveness Goals continue to be discussed.

c. ASCCC Plenary report

David Laderman attended the ASCCC Plenary Session this past weekend. Additional CSM faculty attendees include Jeramy Wallace and Kristi Ridgway. Distance education, equity and diversity, assembly bills, curriculum, technology, and other academic senate issues were discussed or voted on. There was very little debate on the resolutions. For the most part people were in consensus. Many of the resolutions are in response to the current political climate, and others are focused on the academic and professional 10+1 areas outlined in Title V and featured in the Academic Senate mission.

d. Board of Trustees study session

David Laderman, Tania Beliz, and Rosemary Nurre attended the Board of Trustees study session and discussion. The Trustees seemed appreciative of the discussion. They were genuinely surprised with the impact of technology on our students and faculty, including the expectation of 24/7 student contact. The study session took the form of informal conversations. Approximately 20 faculty members participated. Although workload equity didn't get discussed, many of the issues that were brought up are related. The goal of student success is better served if dedicated time is allocated to faculty in order to meet this goal. The study session was a positive experience. Hopefully more of this is to come, as it helps increase dialog between faculty, administrators, and the Board.

e. Spring election nominations, Executive Committee (Tania Beliz)

The nomination period for the Spring 2017 Academic Senate Executive Committee has come to a close. We had one nominee for each position as follows.

Nominations:

Jeramy Wallace, President
Kristi Ridgway, Vice President
Rosemary Nurre, Treasurer
Peter von Bleichert, Secretary

Elections will be set up for the beginning of May. You are encouraged to participate in the election.

e. Budget update (Steven Lehigh)

Steven Lehigh is sharing a brief summary of this year's budget, including a comparison from last year, as well as some comments on projections. The conversation continued to clarify information sent out about faculty salaries, and about income generated from enrollment of international students, and the need for faculty input.

In general, official projections are very conservative. Our budget is over 50% state funded. The District is proposing our salary structure as a pool. The state has given some money to cover this, and the District is keeping this money separate. This money was given in order to cover the District's portion of the STRS increases.

Regarding the all faculty emails from Chancellor Ron Galatolo (March 31, 2017), Monica Malamud (April 10, 2017), and Kathy Blackwood (April 13, 2017) with information about salary comparison in the Bay 10, the table was linked incorrectly so misinformation was inadvertently shared. The information that is highlighted in the follow up email is the correct information. As was pointed out, the statewide steps don't necessarily serve as the best measurements, because data about money for faculty is skewed due to the demographics of the population. Also, cost of living in different regions impacts the numbers as well. A more holistic evaluation of the information would better reflect comparison data.

The new projection for total international students across the district is 1262, which includes 893 for CSM. Of note, this is a projection only, not a representation of actual enrolled students. We receive 6 million dollars in funds from the District for these students at CSM.

International students bring revenue, and fill additional seats in classes. We need to ask if this represents less space for domestic students and consider the impacts on the student experience. The positive view held by the District seems to be based on revenue only, rather than a view that includes the holistic experience for all students on each campus.

Of the students enrolled in the 1000 sections taught over the last two semesters, 12% of were F1 visa international students. Additionally, there are students who are international but don't require an F1 visa. These additional students represent an estimated additional 10%.

A close look at who are the stakeholders making decisions about issues related to international students is needed. Faculty and Academic Senate should have input and participate in decision making on this topic because 10+1 Title V and Academic Senate mission issues are at stake.

Similarly, Community, Continuing, and Corporate Education (CCCE) needs additional faculty input. We need to make certain that faculty and students are participating in the process.

Of note, there doesn't appear to be preparedness for volatility in projections for international students, and the potential impacts if estimates for enrollment of this group declines unexpectedly. Priority registration, hiring of ESL faculty, and other areas would be impacted. Additionally, the Board has expressed that the priority should be local students. So it is hoped that the working group on the issue of international students can bring these issues front and center.

2. ASCSM Update, Stephen McReynolds, President, ASCSM

Next year's Student Trustee, Alfredo Olguín, Jr, of Skyline College has been elected for the 2017-2018 academic year. He has a lot of experience with the College Rise Up movement.

The ASCSM election is coming up next week, Tuesday - Thursday. Please encourage your students to participate in the election by dropping by Building 17. The ballot results will be tallied on Friday.

An online voting option will be looked at as a possible option for future elections in order to get higher participation.

Tomorrow, Stephen McReynolds is presenting to the Board about the student body fee increase. All three Associated Student groups across the District support the increase.

3. Standing Committee Reports

a. Committee on Instruction, *Teresa Morris, Chair*

No report.

b. Library Advisory Committee, [*Chair position is vacant*]

No report.

d. College Assessment Committee, *Madeleine Murphy, Chair*

No report.

e. Center for Academic Excellence Committee, *Theresa Martin, Chair*

A discussion about textbook prices was held at the last meeting. Cañada has implemented a program to help students get affordable text books. This will eventually benefit all three campuses, through the Inclusive Access program. The partnership is directly with publishers. . Steve Lehigh is using the program this summer with Pearson. Other publishers will also be piloted.

Additionally, there will be funding for the Bookstore so that students don't have to wait for their financial aid to come in before purchasing the books

Of note, veterans also have options that can help cover costs of textbooks through the VA.

Applicants are being sought for CAE. Please contact Theresa Martin if you have questions or are interested.

III. ACTION ITEMS

a. Revisions to the Bylaws

For today's action item, Interim Secretary Stephanie Roach will record each of the votes for the various revision options. These will be recorded in the minutes. Vincent Li is unable to attend today, due to jury duty. He has sent his vote to David Laderman and Rosemary Nurre via email. His votes will be recorded as well.

As a Representative Senate, votes by Senators reflect the views of the faculty in the Division that the Senator represents. Members of the Academic Senate Executive Committee also vote, with the exception of the Academic Senate President.

Brief discussion and comments prior to the vote:

Several members of the Language Arts Division provided feedback to the Language Arts Senators, as follows:

- Most faculty were supportive of the revision to allow adjunct faculty who are classified staff to serve on Senate and Senate committees
- However, three of eight faculty expressed a preference for this support with some sort of qualification. For example, adjunct faculty who serve in a dual role should be required to teach 6 units total over the course of the academic year, in order to be eligible.
- A minority position from Language Arts was expressed: the sentiment that more time should be taken to resolve and consider the issue was also expressed. The vote feels expedient as a result of changes to the organizational structure at CSM. More thought and consideration would be beneficial, as the process feels rushed.
- Faculty from Language Arts expressed a strong preference that Senate members be elected by ballot, by faculty of the Division. In that way the maximum number of faculty can participate in the election process. In this way the process for selecting Senators and committee members would be more inclusive.

Statements of support from a range of faculty and staff were shared with Academic Senate via email as an informational item (Katie Bliss's email and attachments). Because a wide campus community is affected by these votes, anyone is allowed to make statements of support or opposition regarding the issues at hand. These aren't votes, but expressions of how they feel about the vote. The statements were not solicited by the Academic Senate or Academic Senate Executive Committee. Because CSM community members (primarily faculty), took the initiative to draft the statements and requested that they be forwarded to Senators, the statements of support were shared with the Academic Senate in the spirit of transparency. Some Counseling Senators were unclear on the purpose of the statements of support that were shared via email.

Record of Votes:

1. Library Representation

a. Draft 1: Two representatives, one of which includes Library faculty

Instructional divisions shall elect and be represented by two Senate members. If Library faculty belong to an academic division, that division should elect one of its senators from Library faculty.

i. Yes = 10 votes

Senators voting "yes" for draft one are:

1. Kathleen Sammut, Vice President
2. Rosemary Nurre, Treasurer
3. Steve Gonzalez, Business/Technology
4. Vincent Lee, Business/Technology (via email)
5. Steven Lehigh, Creative Arts/Social Science
6. Margaret Kaluzny, Creative Arts/Social Science
7. Mikel Schmidt, Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance
8. Ellen Young, Math/Science
9. Jacqueline Gamelin, Student Services
10. Kevin Sinarle, Student Services

b. Draft 2: Two representatives, plus one representative from Library faculty

Instructional divisions shall elect and be represented by two members. If Library faculty belong to an academic division, that division should elect its two senators, in addition to Library faculty electing a Library senator.

i. Yes = 6 votes

Senators voting "yes" for draft two are:

1. Stephanie Roach, Interim Secretary
2. Theresa Martin, ASLT
3. Matt Montgomery, ASLT/Library
4. Jon Kitamura, Language Arts
5. Mick Sherer, Language Arts
6. Wendy Whyte, Math/Science

2. Adjunct Faculty eligibility to serve (if also a Classified Staff employee)

a. Draft 1: Allows Adjunct/Classified employees to serve

Consistent with Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, Section

53200, and in accordance with Section 53203.d, all full-time and part-time faculty in the College are faculty members with all rights and responsibilities thereunto. The Academic Senate shall include the following faculty members: officers elected by the faculty; standing committee chairs elected or appointed by the faculty committee members or the Academic Senate; Senators and Senate committee members elected or appointed by the faculty of the academic divisions. Administrators, Classified Staff, and students are not members of the faculty. Any employee who supervises faculty is not permitted to serve as division representatives on Senate committees. Classified staff who are also adjunct faculty are permitted to serve as division representatives on Senate committees, provided they are adjunct faculty for the division at the time of service.

i. **Yes = 13 votes**

1. Rosemary Nurre, Treasurer
2. Stephanie Roach, Interim Secretary
3. Theresa Martin, ASLT
4. Matt Montgomery, ASLT/Library
5. Steve Gonzalez, Business/Technology
6. Vincent Lee, Business/Technology (via email)
7. Steven Lehigh, Creative Arts/Social Science
8. Margaret Kaluzny, Creative Arts/Social Science
9. Mikel Schmidt, Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance
10. Jon Kitamura, Language Arts
11. Mick Sherer, Language Arts
12. Ellen Young, Math/Science
13. Wendy Whyte, Math/Science

- b. **Draft 2: Does not allow Adjunct/Classified employees to serve**
Consistent with Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, Section 53200, and in accordance with Section 53203.d, all full-time and part-time faculty in the College are faculty members with all rights and responsibilities thereunto. The Academic Senate shall include the following faculty members: officers elected by the faculty; standing committee chairs elected or appointed by the faculty committee members or the Academic Senate; Senators and Senate committee members elected or appointed by the faculty of the academic divisions. Administrators, Classified Staff, and students are not members of the faculty and are not permitted to serve on Senate committees, even if employed as adjunct faculty.

i. **Yes = 3 votes**

1. Kathleen Sammut, Vice President
2. Jacqueline Gamelin, Student Services
3. Kevin Sinarle, Student Services

3. **Representation by faculty belonging to multiple divisions**

- a. **Draft:** Faculty members belonging to more than one division may be elected to serve on Senate committees by either division, but may

not represent two divisions on the same committee, and must be active in the division for which they are elected.

i. **Yes = Unanimous, no abstentions.**

Vote results summary

- **Library representation:** Draft 1 (Two representatives, one of which includes Library faculty) passes with a majority of votes, ten to six (no abstentions)
- **Adjunct Faculty eligibility to serve (if also a Classified Staff employee):** Draft 1 (Allows Adjunct Faculty/Classified Staff employees to serve) passes with a majority of votes, thirteen to three (no abstentions)
- **Representation by faculty belonging to multiple divisions:** Draft language allowing faculty belonging to multiple divisions to serve conditionally passes unanimously (no abstentions)

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) revisions (Madeleine Murphy, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza)

The current GE outcomes will be revised to become ILOs designed to work for students with goals in addition to GE. Additionally, outcomes for some student services and courses with a creative or arts focus will be better represented in the newly drafted ILOs.

Handout: Draft updates to the Institutional Learning Outcomes document. New text is featured in red and changes to the draft are struck through.

Summary of changes:

- Opening preamble: Changed to reflect the purpose of the ILOs beyond GE
- Independent Lifelong Learning outcome: Some text was removed
- Critical thinking outcome: The text was simplified, and an additional clarifying bullet point was added to reflect suggestions about the overlap with creative thinking
- Social Awareness and diversity outcome: New language added to reflect diversity of artistic and cultural traditions
- Suggestions about adding an outcome linked to creativity were incorporated by spreading creativity themes across many outcomes

Discussion:

The simplification of the language in the *Critical Thinking Outcome* was positively received.

In the *Independent Lifelong Learning Outcome*, the term “Lifelong” may not be as well reflected in other descriptive language for the outcome. It would be beneficial to note how the bullets for this outcome tie in to learning specifically. There is a connotation with the term “lifelong” that seems to apply to non-traditional, older, and/or career track students.

The term “learning” may be more associated with identifying skills and/or tools. However, planning skills and identification of tools to use is a process that requires inquiry by the students. Ability of students to develop planning skills, etc., may get at this better. Additional concepts that may be important to incorporate include design of plans, self-advocacy, and self-development.

Ultimately, learning is lifelong...our students are going to move on to their “next thing,” and at that point, will be without the support services, etc., provided at CSM. Learning how to be self aware and independently overcome barriers that are encountered as they plan their path forward is important.

An important difference to consider between words like “learning” and “skills” relates to process. Learning specific skills can be limiting, as the need for a given set of skills changes depending on the situation. This is more of a how-to and does not reflect learning that is deep. Independent learning is a process that requires metacognition and development of other habits of mind and mindset. Students must identify and learn the threshold concepts that will get them to the next level, past the barriers they encounter. Limiting the language of the outcome to skills is too finite.

At our next meeting, there will be an action item to vote on and approve the ILO draft.

SLO Coordinator

The role of the SLO coordinator has been to minimize hassle, maximize usefulness, implement a routine for assessment (policies, cycle); and ensure that we are ACCJC compliant. Since last year, Madeleine has witnessed a problematic process of getting assessment data from student work and challenges using TracDat.

The hope is that assessment can become an outgrowth of grading that would ultimately be more efficient. This would change how about half of us track assessment data, though. These changes would particularly impact departments such as English.

Of note, ACCJC is in transition, and we want to make sure to stay abreast of changes resulting from the transition, in case there are better options to take advantage of. As of now, however, a better system hasn't been found. For the time being, it is recommended that we move forward with the new approach by Fall 2018.

This involves collecting data that can be disaggregated. This year, we should work to troubleshoot these efforts. If it is taking you more than 15 minutes to record this data (not necessarily to assess the SLO) during the semester, a conversation about the process is warranted. The new approach should involve less work, and be similar to filling out a grade sheet. There are interesting SLO assessments that are

more complex and challenging to scale up. These approaches should be limited (not necessarily abandoned), and not relied on for assessments with the disaggregated data requirement.

On the plus side, we now have a data entry person to support this, and there are plans to rework TracDat so it is easier to use.

TracDat will be used until a better option is available. Hopefully by Fall 2018, the reworked TracDat will be implemented. If the process isn't easy, we'll make sure to address it. Ease of data entry will make a huge difference. If this works in TracDat successfully, we will have a stronger case to move the process into Banner, as some have suggested. It would be an involved project for ITS to accomplish this.

It seems that faculty members are confused by the assessment process, which is at times inconsistent or inaccurate. We want to build something that is sustainable and consistent. Cabinet is supportive of building a new structure.

Information about this effort will be shared at Division meetings and other venues as appropriate.

SLO Lead positions will likely remain in place, but would change and hopefully become a more interesting role, requiring less haranguing of colleagues to turn in their assessment data.

Examples of assessment methods that are easy to track include quizzes or exams with specific questions aligned to course SLOs. Grading rubrics can also be aligned to SLOs.

Madeleine Murphy has been very helpful about assessment when problems arise—you are encouraged to reach out to her with your assessment questions or challenges. Additionally, faculty are encouraged to attend the Division meetings that have assessment on the agenda, and to bring your questions.

b. Strong Workforce Grant update (Kathy Ross)

Kathy Ross, Dean of Business/Technology and our Workforce Grant coordinator shared an update about the Strong Workforce Grant. The District was allotted money for the grant based on CTE student populations. There are two types of allotments: \$600,000 to be used within the college, and a second allocation to be used in regional investments.

For example, programs such as the Fire Academy, Fire Technology, and Administration of Justice can be expanded. Funds can be used to bring back the Police Academy, which has been on hiatus for approximately nine years. Because it is a regional project, we don't have to spend money out of our funding pool. The college would be responsible for delivering certified training for these programs, which becomes expensive due to requirements to have all of the most current equipment. With the training program qualifying as a regional program, that prevents us from having to foot the bill for frequent replacements of equipment.

At our campus, the Electronics Program, Entrepreneurship Program, and other programs will benefit from the grant. Additionally, a Biotech Assistant Position can be hired.

Absolute numbers are still unavailable for this grant, because of delays for the grant from the State. The regional deadline to submit comes at the end of May. The second round of money will be released July 1, 2017. There are a number of challenges working with several partners, and this can cause delays as well.

Hopefully, rules for use of the money will be released in a timely fashion by the State. Our new Director of Workforce Development, Raymond Kaupp, will be working on this program. The goal is to get this money renewed in the future.

Fortunately, measurements for the money will rely on an increase in the number of CTE students. As we expand, we will be eligible for more money. Additionally, part of the grant can be put toward letting people know about our programs.

Measurements of those who complete the program while working in the field include whether they attain a living wage and how much of a wage increase they see after completion of the program. Of note, we have outperformed the entire state, according to the State Chancellor's office.

We have five clusters, and will be featured at the CCOE conference. Electronics, Management, Entrepreneurship, and others will be featured. Ultimately, the superior performance of these programs comes down to hard work. Faculty members teamed up with the industry partners to develop relationships and strong curricula for our students. For example, the employment statistics for those completing Electronics certificates is incredible. The statistics regarding increases in wages after completion is good, too.

If we are unable to make gains as required by the program, grant funding for the will be cut. We must continue to build industry relationships. The Police Academy has good potential, as does an expansion of the Fire Program. We are in the process of hiring our first full time Fire Technology instructor.

It is important to note the differences found in terminal educational experience and transfer experience. Certificate programs put people to work right away, so certificate earners can improve job and wages. Some do have transfer options as well. We need to continue to look at what leads to short term employment.

More information will be presented when the state has put out more information.

Additional dialog is needed—we will continue this conversation and synergy.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, May 9, 2017.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman

Appendixes: Documentation and Handouts

Appendix 1: Proposal for Workload Committee – 4/19/17

AFT and the District recognize that faculty perform extensive duties outside of the classroom. Some of these duties are enumerated in Appendix D. The parties would like to distribute those duties among all faculty. Sometimes the distribution is not even, and one or more faculty members end up doing more than their fair share. The purpose of this committee is to develop a mechanism for distributing those duties, and when a faculty member ends up with too many, a mechanism for compensation and when a faculty member ends up with too few, a means to address that.

This committee shall consist of 3 members appointed by AFT, 1 member appointed by each of the 3 Academic Senates, and 3 members appointed by District Administration. The committee shall make a recommendation to AFT and the District, to be subsequently negotiated.

Appointments shall be made no later than May 1, and the committee shall commence its work no later than May 19. The goal for the committee will be to make recommendations to the negotiating teams no later than Dec. 15, 2017. District shall provide support to the committee in the form of notetakers and any data gathering that is requested (surveys, etc.).

The committee will need to identify a process for ensuring that, if extra pay is assigned to faculty as a result of a very large work commitment, it can be paid and tracked as required by payroll guidelines, state, and federal law.

Appendix 2: CSM Academic Senate Vote on Changes to the Bylaws

CSM Academic Senate
Vote on Changes to the Bylaws
For April 25, 2017

I. Library representation

Present

Instructional divisions with 16 or more members shall elect and be represented by two Senate members. Instructional divisions with 15 or fewer members shall elect and be represented by one Senate member. Library faculty shall elect and be represented by one Senate member. Student Services faculty shall elect and be represented by two Senate members. Library faculty shall elect and be represented by one Senate member.

For a vote:

Draft 1 (new text italicized & underlined; see also strikethroughs)

~~Instructional divisions with 16 or more members shall elect and be represented by two Council Senate members. Instructional divisions with 15 or fewer members shall elect and be represented by one Council Senate member. Library faculty shall elect and be represented by one Council Senate member.~~ *If Library faculty belong to an academic division, that division should elect one of its senators from Library faculty.*

Draft 2 (new text italicized & underlined; see also strikethroughs)

~~Instructional divisions with 16 or more members shall elect and be represented by two Council Senate members. Instructional divisions with 15 or fewer members shall elect and be represented by one Council Senate member. Library faculty shall elect and be represented by one Council Senate member.~~ *If Library faculty belong to an academic division, that division should elect its two senators, in addition to Library faculty electing a Library senator.*

NOTE: the approved version (Draft 1 or 2) will be incorporated into all the “committee structure” sections, regarding all Senate committees.

OVER

II. Adjunct faculty eligibility to serve (if also classified staff employee)

Present

Consistent with Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, Section 53200, and in accordance with Section 53202.d, all full-time and part-time faculty in the College are faculty members with all rights and responsibilities thereunto. The Academic Senate shall include the following faculty members: officers elected by the faculty; standing committee chairs elected or appointed by the faculty or academic senate; senators and senate committee members elected or appointed by the faculty of the academic divisions. Administrators, classified staff, and students are not members of the Senate.

For a vote:

Draft 1 (new text italicized & underlined)

Consistent with Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, Section 53200, and in accordance with Section 53202.d, all full-time and part-time faculty in the College are faculty members with all rights and responsibilities thereunto. The Academic Senate shall include the following faculty members: officers elected by the faculty; standing committee chairs elected or appointed by the faculty committee members or the academic senate; senators and senate committee members elected or appointed by the faculty of the academic divisions. Administrators, classified staff, and students are not members of the faculty. Any employee who supervises faculty is not permitted to serve as division representatives on senate committees. Classified staff who are also adjunct faculty are permitted to serve as division representatives on senate committees, provided they are adjunct faculty for the division at the time of service.

Draft 2 (new text italicized & underlined)

Consistent with Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, Section 53200, and in accordance with Section 53202.d, all full-time and part-time faculty in the College are faculty members with all rights and responsibilities thereunto. The Academic Senate shall include the following faculty members: officers elected by the faculty; standing committee chairs elected or appointed by the faculty committee members or the academic senate; senators and senate committee members elected or appointed by the faculty of the academic divisions. Administrators, classified staff, and students are not members of the faculty Senate, and are not permitted to serve on senate committees, even if employed as adjunct faculty.

III. New text: multiple divisions

Faculty members belonging to more than one division may be elected to serve on senate committees by either division, but may not represent two divisions on the same committee, and must be active in the division for which they are elected.

Appendix 3: Institutional Learning Outcomes

Institutional Learning Outcomes

The Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) describe the knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes that students should develop through any sustained experience with the college – whether courses, degree or certificate programs, pre-transfer general education pattern, or academic and support services.

Independent Lifelong Learning. The ability of students to develop, evaluate, and pursue academic and/or career goals. Students will be able to:

- Articulate realistic and achievable academic and/or career goals;
- ~~Create manageable plans for achieving academic and/or career goals;~~
- Identify and make use of college and community resources (academic and student support services).

Effective Communication. The ability of students to write, read, speak, and listen in order to communicate effectively. Students will be able to:

- Comprehend, interpret, and analyze written and oral information;
- Express ideas and provide supporting evidence effectively in writing and speaking;
- **Express ideas creatively through verbal and non-verbal media (e.g. music, art, dance, etc.)**
- Communicate effectively in a group or team situation.

Quantitative Reasoning. The ability of students to perform quantitative analysis, using appropriate resources. Students will be able to:

- Solve a variety of problems that require quantitative reasoning;
- Interpret graphical representation of quantitative information.

~~The ability of students to analyze information, reason critically use analytical reasoning and creative thinking to formulate and analyze arguments, ideas and concepts, and information; to assess values and use different perspectives; carefully and logically from multiple perspectives and to make connections and across and between disciplines.~~ **The ability of students to think creatively, analytically, and logically, in order to assess ideas, formulate arguments, develop multiple perspectives, and solve problems.**

Students will be able to:

- Develop and evaluate arguments;
- ~~Develop the capacity to conceive of, and explore, different perspectives;~~
- **Analyze, synthesize and evaluate ideas as part of the creative process;**
- Assess the validity of both qualitative and quantitative evidence;
- Apply diverse disciplinary approaches and perspectives;
- Understand and employ the scientific method.

Social Awareness and Diversity. The ability of students to recognize cultural traditions and to understand and appreciate the diversity of human experience, past and present. Students will be able to:

- Identify the benefits of diversity and respect the range of diversity;
- Work effectively with others of diverse backgrounds;
- Recognize the importance and analyze the interconnectedness of global and local concerns, both past and present;
- **Identify and analyze a diversity of artistic and cultural traditions.**

Ethical Responsibility / Effective Citizenship. The ability of students to make judgments with respect to individual conduct, based on systems of values. Students will be able to:

- Recognize ethical principles;
- Identify possible courses of action in response to ethical dilemmas and evaluate their consequences;
- Behave ethically and respectfully when working with students, instructors, and the campus community.

April 19th, 2017

Katie Bliss

College of San Mateo

1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.

San Mateo CA, 94061

Dear College of San Mateo Academic Senate Representatives:

We hope this letter finds you well, and we encourage you to read with care the outpouring of strong support for CSM dual-role employees to have the chance to serve on Academic Senate. This document is a compilation of dedicated CSM faculty and staff who have unified together to share enthusiasm for this opportunity. Dual-role employees serve in multiple disciplines and departments across campus in both a staff position and as adjunct faculty. We urge Academic Senate to consider that those serving in these dual-roles are often in positions that assist some of our college's most underrepresented students, and it is imperative that they participate actively in our institution's governance so that these student's needs can be represented. Additionally, the voice of these employees provides an opportunity for more diverse perspectives in our Academic Senate.

The statements below encapsulate the strong value that having dual-role employees serve has for the college. We also encourage you to consider what impact a message further limiting the role of adjunct instructors, a group comprising the majority of faculty on this campus, will have on the morale in this institution. The legacy of innovation, growth, and diversity is one we want to continue, and this opportunity for new perspectives from dual-role employees is a way to foster that spirit. Below are statements and signatures of support. We hope this leads to forward progress.

"I fully support the inclusion of adjunct faculty on the Academic Senate and all governing bodies for which they are eligible to serve, regardless of other employment status within the college, district, or outside entities. I believe that employees of the district that hold multiple positions, for example adjunct faculty and classified staff, bring a unique

understanding of student needs and can approach decision-making with a broad perspective of the institution as a whole. As educational professionals, we all must work together and support each other in weaving a tapestry that includes the widest possible diversity of voices and perspectives. Drawing lines of exclusion will not serve our students or our institution.”

–Danni Redding Lapuz, International Education Manager (CSM) & Adjunct Faculty (Cañada College)

“I think that classified staff who also serve as adjunct faculty should be invited to serve as faculty representatives on Academic Senate. These individuals are providing great service to the students at CSM in their dual capacities, and we need their voices at the table.”

-Theresa Martin, Professor of Biology, Professional Development Coordinator
Chair, Center for Academic Excellence Committee

“As a long-time adjunct faculty member who has always been vested in contributing beyond the classroom to the vitality of our college, I wholeheartedly support and encourage the inclusion of dual-role employees in the Academic Senate. That a dual-role member wishes to be in service is a positive asset; furthermore, it presents the opportunity for broader perspectives on issues which impact the campus community as a whole.”

-Lisa Suguitan Melnick, Adjunct Faculty, Language Arts and Kinesiology Divisions

“Adjunct faculty fulfill an important role on our campus, providing the opportunity to offer more classes to our students. Classified staff members serve an important and different role, coordinating programs for our students and supporting administration. A person who serves in both of these roles is attending to each one separately. Therefore, there seems to be no disadvantage or conflict of interest for an adjunct faculty member who is also a staff member to serve as a representative to Academic Senate, if so appointed and elected. In that role, the representative would only be representing faculty, as Academic Senate has no purview or interest in classified staff concerns. If the Senate wishes to be representative of all faculty, then all faculty voices should be heard.”

Alicia Frangos, Adjunct Faculty and Program Services Coordinator, Counseling

“As with any other adjunct, I value my role as faculty and desire to serve on faculty committees and gain valuable experience. My position as a classified staff informs my faculty experience, but it does not distract or conflict with my pedagogical approach in the classroom or my ability to function as faculty on committees or in Academic Senate. Serving as a dual-role faculty/staff is similar to any other faculty who serves multiple roles, it involves being able to change focus.”

-Tabitha Conaway, Adjunct Instructor and Instructional Aide, ASLT

“I am writing to express my support for the full inclusion of adjunct faculty, who also have a classified role on campus in Academic Senate functions including committee participation and division representation. It is disheartening to think that one’s contribution to the instruction of students is considered to be in some way different because of a role held as a member of the classified staff. Situations evolve and if campus structures are not capable of adapting and evolving as well, then we run the real risk of one of the more frightening possibilities, maintaining the status quo. Change can be difficult and messy at times but I believe that as individuals committed to meeting the educational needs of our students, we can engage in productive dialogue that makes the Academic Senate a more inclusive and robust body.”

-Ron Andrade, Manager, Learning Center, ASLT

“The Academic Senate should include dual role faculty/staff representation to gain more insight to student needs outside of the classroom, as well as experience on how to build, run and assess services to meet those needs.”

-Joseph Martinez, Adjunct Faculty, Program Services Coordinator, ASLT

“The exclusion of adjunct and dual-role employees from Academic Senate is a small part of a much larger issue. Educational equity, which is truly equitable spaces for ALL students and ALL employees, is kept at bay largely because of the structure of our institutions. Despite well-meaning people, not all voices are heard or honored at CSM. Faculty serve a unique, essential purpose in community college, but equally important and essential are the student services staff provides. The majority of our student body are marginalized and hyper-marginalized students. Research has shown how important both pedagogy and support services are for the success of CSM's students. When we exclude dual-role employees, we minimize the importance of staff and, by proxy, the

importance of student services. I have been adjunct faculty, tenured faculty, and staff. All three roles are important and essential to the success of our students. Creating equity requires a sea change. That sea of change begins with small changes to the structure of our college, which may make some of us initially uncomfortable. I hope the professors of CSM prove to be brave and up to this challenge of dismantling the status quo and working toward educational equity.”

-Autumn Newman, Program Services Coordinator, Career Services, Counseling

“I support having individuals with dual faculty/classified roles serve on Academic Senate. Inclusion is to the benefit of faculty, students and the institution as a whole as Academic Senate makes recommendations on academic and professional matters.”

-Allie Fasth, Year One Coordinator, Adjunct Faculty, ASLT