



**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**Meeting Minutes**

November 22, 2022  
 Zoom Meeting ID: 442 779 680  
 1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.  
 San Mateo, CA  
 2:30 – 4:30 pm  
[Website](#)

**Executive Committee 2022**

Arielle Smith  
 President

Jesenia Diaz  
 Vice-President

Stephen Heath  
 Treasurer

Daniel Keller  
 Secretary

**Executives Present**

Name of Officer	Executive Committee Role
Daniel Keller Arielle Smith Jesenia Diaz	Secretary President Vice President

**Senators Present**

Name of Senator	Division
Rene Anderson Michelle Beatty Michelle Brown Yvette Butterworth Leo Cruz Manny Delgado Valeria Estrada Susan Khan Edgar Mojica Villegas Vincent Li Todd Windisch	Language Arts Math Science CASS Math Science Counselling Counselling Librarian ASLT CASS Business-Technology Language Arts

**Others Present**

Name	Representing
Jennifer De La Cruz Julieth Dias Donna Eyestone Jennifer Howze-Owens Chris Walker Jeremy Wallace Erica Reynolds	Counselling DEAC DEAC DEAC Curriculum Past president DEAC

### Opening Procedures

Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information/ Procedure
Approval of today's agenda	President	2:37	Move to approve: Todd Second: Daniel Approved by all	Procedure
Approval of past minutes	President	2:39	Minutes approved	Procedure
Public Comment	Public	2:40	Valeria: on December 5, the library will be having therapy dogs come to the maker space from 12-1: I will email the flyer so that we can promote this. We are also going to have a "relaxation station" for the rest of the semester.	Information

### New Senate Business

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action (Motion/Resolution)/ Information//Discussion
1	President's Report	Arielle	2:41	<p>a. VPI hiring committee: <b>The announcement went out recently; we are looking for four people</b> to state interest, and we are able to compensate adjuncts who wish to participate. All committee members must have the unconscious bias training up to date by the time of the first meeting.</p> <p>b. We have been asked to provide <b>questions for the chancellor's forums</b>. Please let your divisions know and get questions to Arielle by Monday at noon, she will share and pass them on.</p>	Information
2	ASCSM Update	ASCSM	3:05	No representative present	Information
3	Standing Committee Reports	Chris	3:06	<b>Curriculum Committee, Chris Walker, Chair</b> We will have one more meeting in December, which should be one of our busiest. There are also a few other issues: at the district level, we have been working through various policies that are different across the campuses and looking at whether it makes sense to make them the same: for example, we need consistent policy and language for what meets the associate degree for math competency. We now have more	Information

students than in the past who are taking classes at all three campuses, so it is particularly important that we update these. We are trying to find the places where we might need to make things consistent.

Secondly, we will be working on the associate degree requirements around majors, grade, and GPA—it isn't that there is disagreement so much as different wording. We want to make sure we have consistent language.

Finally, we are working on a database cleanup: over the years, the Banner database (which includes classes that exist and those that are inactive) gets messy to the point that it can become almost unusable. Our curriculum specialists are working on a massive database clean-up. We hope to have this done by early spring and then begin the slightly harder work of looking at classes that have not been taught in three years and talking to departments—there may be valid reasons why these courses need to be on the books, but in other cases we may need to be a little more strict about how long we can keep the class on the books.

Todd: we discussed this at district senate-- looking back at classes that have not been taught in five plus years or that have been banked at one college (banking a course doesn't deactivate it on Banner).: should we meet with faculty to discuss these to ensure we aren't eliminating necessary courses?

Chris: there is a difference between not being taught and being inactive—it turns out that about 80% of the courses were deactivated by one or more schools, but we did not finish the process. This happens because if all three campuses teach a course with the same course number, they can't deactivate it in the system. So the courses are still on the record in some cases when they have not been taught in a long time. We are also looking at courses that have not been offered and courses that have been offered but have not filled.

On flex day in January, the curriculum chairs are having an alignment summit. Last year when we were doing the AP exam project, we identified

		Susan	<p>four departments that are the most different across the campuses with the idea of bringing them together to see if it makes sense to make some changes: biology, poli-sci, computer science, Spanish. The faculty themselves suggested that we start the work now.</p> <p><b>Committee on Teaching and Learning, Susan Khan &amp; David Lau, Co-chairs</b>          CTL has not met since the last senate meeting. At our next meeting, we are planning for flex day: the deadline is December 2<sup>nd</sup> for submitting proposal ideas –we also welcome recommendations if you would love to see something on the flex program.</p> <p>The coordinators from all three colleges have gotten together to discuss how we can provide more support at the district level. I will have more to share next time. Phillip: the business department is planning to do a business competition in the spring time and would like to introduce business competitions as a flex day event—what do I need to send you? Susan: first just an email letting me know what you are thinking about and then a more detailed survey about what you need, would be the next step.</p>	
		Jennifer	<p><b>Distance Education Advisory Committee, Jennifer Howze-Owens</b></p> <p>Most of my update will be discussed later in the meeting, but two topics we recently discussed are worth highlighting: we are working towards alignment with the EMP and distance education plans for next year. EMP alignment with the distance ed plan for the next year. We are still working on this.</p> <p>Erica: the DEAC committee will work this year and in spring to draft another three-year plan.</p> <p><b>OER Update, Jennifer Howze-Owens:</b>          I met with the district textbook affordability group last week about one of the resolutions forum a few weeks ago: we tried to determine what low text cost was—and the district agreed that \$40</p>	

				<p>was reasonable. Students, however, initiated a resolution saying the cost should be lowered to \$30. We can assume that with the classes being free next term, we can expect more students to be asking about free books. I think we may start the conversation again about low cost definitions. This is a student-led effort. We are looking for insights in how to move forward, but we will be looking at moving to 30.</p>	
5	Action Items		3:03	None	
6.	Discussion items		3:03	<p>1. SB 893-Free College (Presenter: Arielle Smith) (15 min)</p> <p>Arielle shared slides that were presented to the board in August. SB 893 allows the district to waive fees and use funds to provide for total cost of attendance (including fees, books and supplies, living expenses, transportation expenses). All students who live in the county will have their tuition costs waived and, for students who meet certain financial restrictions, there will be other fees covered.</p> <p>The big issue is residence: students must reside in San Mateo County. If a student has a mailing or permanent address in our system, they should automatically be assessed the waiver. Students who move to the county after they sign up for classes will get a refund. If it is after the start of the term, my understanding is that it would be the same process. The district will need to determine student eligibility for costs to be cut beyond the fees.</p> <p>To be eligible, students must be CA residents living in San Mateo. Anyone who does not live in the county is not eligible, as are out-of-state students who are not residents for at least a year and a day. Once those students go through residency verification, they will be made eligible. International students are not eligible.</p> <p>Todd: I know the residency reclassification can take some time: will students be eligible for a refund if they have already paid? Arielle: Yes, they will—it can be retroactive.</p>	

Other costs, beyond fees, can be covered if students meet requirements. For all residents, tuition is waived. Level two qualification, which requires evidence of financial need, includes waiving health, student body union, material fees, and inclusive access fees.

After Spring, we will likely see an expansion of what is covered—including textbooks. Financial aid will also be an important component of this—eligibility is already needed for the level two support.

For undocumented students: those who are San Mateo residents will qualify to get enrollment fees waived, but not the additional fees for level two unless they have completed a Dream Act application.

Right now, we have a six units or fewer non-residency fee waiver—students will need to compete this every semester. Once they have, there is no unit cap, so students can enroll in as many courses as they need without paying tuition.

Arielle also shared a slide for additional resources and information. District senate and the board of governors are working on a permanent policy over the next few months, which they hope to have ready by February.

Todd: Do students still get told that they have to pay for classes? Arielle: The process should be seamless—the fee waiver should automatically apply when they sign up.

Philip: What about academic standing? Arielle: It is not tied to eligibility—even for students who are on probation. Students can withdraw or fail from classes and not be held to blame. Only moving outside of the count would affect their status.

Phillip: do you think there might be some unintended consequences?

Jennifer: I think it might help for those who cannot take as many classes because of cost barriers. Arielle: If we do see students in academic probation, they will still have limits on

		Carla Grandy	4:00	<p>their units and registration date and will have to meet with a counselor regularly. Phillip: I am thinking more in terms of psychology and motivation—how we may value things that are free less— especially if there are no consequences. But I guess we will find out.</p> <p>Arielle: Community college was initially free with only nominal increases before bringing it up to what it is now, which did put college out of reach for a number of students. I think it is meant to mitigate barriers in our system.</p> <p>Julieth: the idea that we value what we pay for makes sense, but value does not have to be only about tuition—they still have to work and go through all of the requirements.</p> <p>Philip: I have a small portion of students who just don't want to be there. I try my best to keep them engaged, but at some point, if they don't show up or do the work, I have to drop them. I guess I'm concerned that this portion of my class will increase because of this. I'm just concerned about the unintended consequences.</p> <p>Vincent: To add to what Phil is saying, when I taught at a four-year school, employers were willing to pay for classes, but only if students received a B+ or higher, which gave them an added incentive to get reimbursed. They had consequences if they don't succeed.</p> <p>Chris: I don't think financial motivation is going to change that. I think we need to take the barrier away. For some students, it is a very burdensome cost, but for other students it doesn't even matter—so this would be inequitable. We will have students who don't want to be there whether it is free or not.</p> <p>Rene: Agreed: I don't think we will have a groundswell of students taking advantage.</p> <p>If your students have questions, refer them to admissions and records.</p> <p>2. DE training policy (Presenter: Jennifer Howze-Owens) (30 min)</p> <p>Welcome to the DE team: Erica and Donna are the other chairs of DEAC, Julieth is the</p>	
--	--	--------------	------	--	--

instructional design faculty. Susan also works with us quite a bit.

In the spring of 2020, senate passed a policy that faculty needed "quality online teaching and learning training." DEAC has been working with the distance education team to think through a few things: the audience, including the number of participants; the content; the pathways for faculty to take; how all of these things will be communicated; and a potential schedule as well as the budget and administration support. This will be a group effort, as it has been from the beginning.

Our audience will be faculty planning to teach online (or hybrid) for Fall 2023. We also invited faculty who have not had online training since 2020 (not those who took QOTL2). This is approximately 85 faculty, both adjunct and full time.

The proposed pathway is QOTL2: this is for faculty who are ready to dig deeper into aspects of their courses, including micro design and pedagogical reflection over five weeks. Two proposed cohorts are scheduled for spring and two in summer. QOTL1 will only be running in the summer so that we can have two sections in spring and summer. Typically, this means about 22 folks in a cohort, with 2-3 facilitators. We have not yet determined Fall 2023.

A second pathway is for faculty who want to do an in-depth review of their courses following the CVC OEI course rubric. This will be self-placed during summer—a redesign of a course working one on one with an instructional designer. The process will include an initial review by an instructional designer, then faculty will make updates, using exemplary course models as additional guidance. There will also be mid-point check-ins and a final review by the designers. Julieth: there will also likely be a cap for this one.

Todd: is the time commitment for both of these similar? And are faculty being paid at the same rate for both? Jennifer: our goal was to stick with the 25 hour requirement. This will be more of an honor system. Faculty will be paid at the same rate for both courses.



Jennifer also presented the budget numbers on slides, with a total cost of the whole program of \$323,604. Todd noted that the slide does not include the cost of faculty attending QOTL1. Erica: we estimate about 55 faculty could be attending, but this was covered by a stipend.

At our last meeting, we discussed tracking how faculty will know when they need to update training. Tracking will be somewhat like the unconscious bias training, where you get regular reminders to update training. We may use the Vision Resource Center. Susan Kahn will work with DEAC to set up registration. The pilot is for Spring 2023

To communicate to faculty, the senate president will email faculty to provide an overview of QOTL2, available dates for participating, and have registration links ready one month out. We also need to make sure we get support from the deans and the VPI.

3. VPAS Forum Questions (Presenter: Arielle Smith) (5 min)

The administrative services forums are happening next week. I have been asked to forward questions from faculty by the end of day tomorrow. Admin services oversees budget and facilities.

If you have questions, email Arielle by noon tomorrow. Todd: I don't have a fully formed question, but related to budget: one concern that was raised in our union in regards to SB893 is that the money coming out of fund one—how will it impact the budget of the college going forward? Chris pointed out this may not be a question to ask incoming candidates, but Todd said they could at least hypothetically discuss possible implications.

4. Telework Pilot (Presenter: Arielle Smith)

The district has proposed this pilot, which would allow classified managers and non-instructional faculty to work remotely up to two days a week. There has been some pushback from the board

on this proposal. Objections included suggestions that it should only be one day a week; otherwise there may not be enough coverage to meet student needs. Implicitly, there is a concern about trusting people to successfully complete remote work. Todd: In the ESL department, we have experienced some trouble with giving students access to in-person services—and I have heard that it is sometimes difficult to find someone for help on campus. Maybe we could add a provision to ensure that the online presence is more transparent, so that we know where people are at different times? Rene: concerns about lack of coverage also were an issue before COVID—it is not just remote, but coverage period.

Chris: it has also been difficult to replace positions with more instances of job openings being left open. This might actually be an incentive to allow us to bring people in. Another concern is that this continues to treat instructional and non-instructional faculty very differently. Arielle will be speaking to this concern in her public comments at the board meeting. A copy of the draft is here:

[https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/smccd/Board.nsf/files/CKEQZY6BC837/\\$file/DRAFT%20Admin%20Procedure%20re%20Telework%20Pilot%20Program.pdf](https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/smccd/Board.nsf/files/CKEQZY6BC837/$file/DRAFT%20Admin%20Procedure%20re%20Telework%20Pilot%20Program.pdf)

Todd noted there is not a lot of language about how students are impacted. Jennifer De La Cruz: do we have data about how students access services, remotely or in person? Arielle: we don't have a lot of data on this. In counselling, 70% of students access services online. There is no language that dictates what needs to be done in person versus online for non-instructional faculty.

5. Committee service/recalls for non-participation (Presenter: Arielle Smith) (15 min)

Arielle: Today I am just going to introduce this topic—we can come back for a more robust discussion in a future meeting. One of the things that is evident to anyone who has chaired a committee—and that has been thrown into stark relief with the workload pilot—is that people sign up for committees and then they don't participate in those committees. But we have not done much about it in the past. We see this in senate when certain groups are not represented because they are not physically present. We can discuss if we want to make a recommendation about replacing non-participant members on committees. If they do not participate in the first semester and there are no extenuating circumstances, would we replace them?  
Jeremy: it would be helpful to know this before people start signing up.

Rene: why would you not want a replacement if representatives are not present? If we don't do anything, and things continue the way they are, who will be happy with that situation?

Todd: we do have to be really careful about the policies and procedures and the language we use—it can go beyond just people not attending but not being active, not being prepared—it could snowball into taking people away who are not productive. I just worry this could be something that we don't want.

Jeremy: I don't think this would ever be a situation with chairs kicking people off committees since appointments must go through senate.

Arielle: it sounds like it makes sense to bring this to a future meeting for more robust discussion and potentially drafting a policy around it.

Chris: this could also help with the issue we have with quorum at senate. Arielle: Zoom has helped with this, but we can't count on it in the long run. That will be another update I will have for you all in the next meeting.  
Meeting adjourned at 4:32