



ACADEMIC SENATE

Meeting Minutes

February 14, 2023

Zoom Meeting ID: 442 779
680

1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.

San Mateo, CA

2:30 – 4:30 pm

[Website](#)

Executive Committee 2023

Arielle Smith
President

Jesenia Diaz
Vice-President

Stephen Heath
Treasurer

Daniel Keller
Secretary

Executives Present

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

Senators Present

Name of Senator	Division
Rene Anderson	Language Arts
Michelle Beatty	Math Science
Michelle Brown	CASS
Yvette Butterworth	Math Science
Leo Cruz	Counselling
Manny Delgado	Counselling
Susan Khan	ASLT/CTL
Vincent Li	Business-Technology
Matt Montgomery	ASLT
Edgar Mojica Villegas	CASS
Gil Perez	Counselling
Tim Tulloch	KAD
Todd Windisch	Language Arts
Lale Yurtseven	Business-Technology

Others Present

Name	Representing
Jennifer De La Cruz	Counselling
Donna Eyestone	DGME
David Lau	CTL

Tim Maxwell Teresa Morris Stephanie Roach Phillip Tran	Language Arts Library ITS Business-Technology
---	--

Opening Procedures

Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information/ Procedure
Approval of today's agenda	President	2:34	<p>We have addition to the agenda, an action item to approve two hiring committees that were just finalized and submitted. These are the last of the approved faculty positions this year. We are also adding a discussion item, and, for now, we are tabling the discussion of SB893—free college. We will have Aaron McVean come to us to discuss this in the future.</p> <p>Move to approve the agenda with these changes: Todd Second: Chris. All approve</p> <p>We also are adding the consent agenda: we are continuing to meet in hybrid mode in a time of emergency. Move to approve: Chris. Second Vincent. All approve</p>	Procedure
Approval of past minutes	President	2:35	No changes to the minutes. Approved.	Procedure
Public Comment	Public	2:36	<p>Tim Maxwell: I am here because of dual enrollment, something I talked about on senate quite a lot. Over time, the district has changed how we promote this program, from maximizing enrollment to addressing issues of equity and justice—claiming that the program exists to build a bridge to college for underrepresented students.</p> <p>I am skeptical about these arguments. I think it is time we recognize that this is a transformation of the K-12 system to a K-14 system— and I think we need to be concerned about that. We have concerns about the students and how they will be placed; about the nature of our jobs, including how teachers will get professional development and how many of us will be assigned as teacher evaluators. And there is a question about whether students in high school, in that culture and at that age, are really prepared. Additionally, what will academic freedom be at high schools? There are so many questions there.</p>	Information

			<p>The district plans to extend by 3,0000 students next year—this is about a third of our population. I am concerned that this will be the creation of secondary system. I am just calling for this to be ajenized for a future meeting—there are many issues that the district does not seem interested in talking about. The district does not seem to be hearing our concerns.</p> <p>Daniel: the first AI workgroup meeting took place on Zoom last Monday. The goal was just to create questions that we agreed are worth addressing in future meetings. At our next meeting, we will begin trying to refine and answer some of our questions. We had excellent participation for a workgroup at this time, with 22 people attending—given how booked most faculty are, particularly with the workload pilot program, and how low attendance often is at these kinds of meetings, that number suggests how concerned faculty are feeling about these issues. I will send a reminder to faculty before the next AI workgroup meeting. Please feel free to join us if you are interested in discussing the impact of the new technology.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

New Senate Business

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action (Motion/Resolution)/ Information//Discussion
1	President's Report	Arielle	2:50	<p>We had a district senate meeting yesterday: the group voted to reduce the minimum number for class size down to ten—as opposed to twenty. This has been forwarded to the board for approval. Aaron McVean will be presenting at a future senate meeting on the economic impacts. We also discussed class modality, and some items we will be addressing in today's meeting about the bylaws. We also had a first read of the academic calendar, for the 25-26 year.</p> <p>Todd: in the DPGC update, they passed the emergency plan—the processes for declaring state of emergency. No major changes were suggested. There is still a conflict of interest resolution that is up for debate and we will need to discuss having an interim chancellor.</p> <p>At the next DAS meeting, we will be discussing dual enrollment: March 13, 2:15-4:30</p>	Information

2	ASCSM Update	ASCSM	2:50	No representative present	Information
3	Standing Committee Reports	Chris Walker Susan Khan and David Lau Jennifer Howze-Owens	2:50	<p>Standing Committee Reports</p> <p>a. Curriculum Committee, Chris Walker, Chair</p> <p>We did not have our meeting last week because we did not have any courses to review. The only thing I will bring up is something that just came across, the formation of a state level work group around the new CSU general education plan; the plan has a fall '24 deadline for implementation. It has been approved at this time, and the choices that were made will have an impact on us, so this will be worth paying attention to.</p> <p>b. Committee on Teaching and Learning, Susan Khan & David Lau, Co-chairs</p> <p>Susan: We spent our last meeting reviewing feedback on our last flex day and discussing academic honesty in the age of AI. We are hoping to include a forum on that during flex day. We are also submitting a proposal for more district level flex day support—we currently don't have much support for inter-district collaboration. The long term professional development work group began working on a five year plan.</p> <p>David Lau: We have scheduled a working group that is reviewing assessment and the great read and program review. We are also taking a look at a recent revision to program review that was done at Cabrillo College.</p> <p>I attended the annual SLO conference last month—we did discuss AI and Chat GPT. There was also an ACCJC person at the conference—she seemed knowledgeable and faculty-friendly. Her approach to meeting the outcome standard was very much in line with what we are doing.</p> <p>c. Distance Education Advisory Committee, Jennifer Howze-Owens</p> <p>Update on distance ed policy/QOTL: on 2/6. Arielle sent out an email that let everyone know what the current distance ed policy is and what the options are. Registration has been strong for</p>	Information

				<p>QOTL2. We were also doing division meeting messaging last week to see if there were questions about DE training.</p> <p>With both spring cohorts being packed, we are suggesting that people consider taking the course in the summer, though we are also going to try to add a second cohort for spring. We also had a question at the math-science meeting: we were asked if this included synchronous online courses or only asynchronous classes needed updating at QOTL—currently we are saying that both kinds of courses should require updated training. Todd, Rene, and Michelle Brown agreed that this policy makes sense— asynchronous classes, despite being “live,” require faculty to build a course online.</p> <p>If there are questions, please send them to Donna Eystone and Jennifer.</p> <p>d. OER Update, Jennifer Howze-Owens</p> <p>OER week is March 6-10. We have been working on the activities. We asked trustee Lisa Petrides to come talk to us about OER. We are also working on another student and faculty ZTC survey to get data district wide—to understand where faculty are in need of support.</p>	
5	Action Items		3:00	<p>1. Committee Appointments a. Leo Cruz, Campus Wellness Committee Move to approve: Todd Second: Daniel Discussion: none Approve: All</p> <p>b. Teresa Morris, IPC Faculty Representative at large Move to approve: Jessenia Second: Leo Discussion: none Approve: All</p> <p>2. Peer Evaluation Committee a. Counseling: Arielle Smith, Michael Vargas, Mary Valenti Move to approve: Todd Second: Vincent Discussion: none</p>	Action

Approve: All

3. Hiring Committees

- a. DRC Assistive Technology Specialist (faculty position) • Kevin Sinarle – Counseling
- Julieth Benitez – Instructional Design
 - Jon Kitamura – English
 - Hiranía Gonzalez – DRC PSC
 - Carol Newkirk – DRC Director

Move to approve: Chris Second: Yvette
Discussion: none
Approve: All

- b. Assistant Athletic Director (Administrative position) • Tim Tulloch – KAD
- Nicole Borg – KAD
 - Katie Goldhahn – KAD
 - Mike Marcial – KAD
 - Josh Rhodes - Math

Move to approve: Todd Second: Vincent
Discussion: none
Approve: All

- c. LAD Office Assistant II • Mick Sherer – English

Move to approve: Yvette Second: Todd
Discussion: none
Approve: All

- d. LAD Instructional Aide II • Teeka James – English

Move to approve: Todd Second: Yvette
Discussion: none
Approve: All

- e. Canada College Personal Counseling Hiring Committee • Makiko Ueda – Personal Counseling

Move to approve: Todd Second: Chris
Discussion: none
Approve: All

- f. General counselor—Academic and Career communities

				<p>Jennifer De La Cruz Doris Garcia Manny Delgado Matt Montgomery and Krystal Duncan</p> <p>Move to approve: Yvette Second: Leo Discussion: none Approve: All</p> <p>g. DRC Counselling Faculty, Dual Enrolment and high school transitions Leo Cruz, Alex Guiriba Roxana Ruglinachich Gil Perez Krystal Duncan</p> <p>Currently we have no one who has high school expertise to advise on these positions</p> <p>Move to approve: Todd Second: Yvette Discussion: none Approve: All</p>	
6.	Discussion items	Teresa Morris and Arielle	3:12	<p>1. Non-instructional Faculty Statement – Teresa Morris and Arielle Smith (30 min)</p> <p>Arielle: yesterday in district senate, Skyline shared their senate-approved statement in support of non-instructional faculty.</p> <p>Teresa: what they have asked for is a larger change across all the district to the language around the faculty labels, focusing on eliminating the “non-instructional” and instructional terms for faculty. I District senate did accept the letter. We may want to consider this for CSM.</p> <p>Skyline started in December with their work group. At the end of February, Cañada will also begin. All three senates do not need to agree on everything, but I do think we should consider. I suspect we will get more leadership on this from our local senate than from DAS. I hope we will get better involvement and conversation.</p> <p>Arielle: we are asked to support all faculty as professional equals; stop designating faculty as instructional or non-instructional, and remove this language from other areas where it is currently codified. A lot of the content of the letter speaks to the divisiveness of the language—how</p>	Discussion

these two categories have created a division. At times, non-instructional faculty feel that they do not have as much representation. These statements are basically in response to a public statement made at DAS in September calling for separate leadership of instructional and non-instructional groups. There were several admin hiring committee discussions when one or two people spoke out against having non-instructional faculty be part of an instructional administrators hiring committee. It has had an impact that has reverberated through all three campuses and has necessitated a response. The Skyline statement makes it clear that they see this as demeaning and harmful.

We are at the point of crafting a response that addresses the impact of the comments and work to repair the damage, and also raise the issue of how we support and see diversity among faculty leadership on the three campuses and in our governance group, including district senate. I can speak to this for the last four years—and Teresa for longer than that: our leadership has been overwhelmingly white and male.

Teresa: as curriculum chair for almost ten years, I had people question if I was faculty. We need everyone to learn more, but you can't just ask the people who have been creating the problem to create the solution. A workgroup could work on is what CSM values in its leaders. Another thing is the intentional inclusion of diverse voices in our leadership. There have been times when things would not be said if I had not been sitting there as the only Black woman present. So I think the senate needs to think about what leadership looks like. I did communicate with the faculty who have this label on "non-instructional" faculty—we need to think about what we value in our leaders. if the senate supports it, maybe we need a visit from the state senate to talk about this.

Arielle: I requested a visit but haven't heard back.

Stephanie (via Zoom chat): these categories lead to attitudes that non-instructional faculty are somehow less-than or incapable of taking leadership. I would like to see a workgroup

review senate bylaws. I personally support the changes that Skyline has suggested.

Michelle Brown: is this contract language?

Teresa: It is not title V, but it is contract language. I suspect that it came from other places, but it is enshrined in our contract.

Todd: It makes it more complicated when we have things like the workload pilot and the work from home pilot—when Skyline had their letter about removing the language, I thought that might be pretty complicated without revising the bylaws.

Teresa: I like the idea of looking at the bylaws again.

Arielle noted that we are supposed to look at them every five years.

Teresa: Statements are nice and necessary—but actually affirmatively doing something regularly is essential. We need more people to commit to this work—the work of being leaders on campus. If you have other ideas for action I would like to hear.

Arielle: as a corollary to this discussion, I really have been thinking about how we could change the space of faculty leadership so that they are safe and welcoming and more open so that we continue to get more participation.

Todd: I support creating a workgroup—but also taking a look at bylaws, partnering with professional development for leadership conferences.

Arielle asked if anyone is interested in being on the workgroup—Todd, Rene, and Jesenia, and Susan all expressed interest.

Teresa: This cannot just be a one and done thing—this discussion has been a long time coming, and it will strengthen our faculty to have this discussion. So I ask when you want to talk about this? How often should we talk about it?

Todd: this is an election year, so that is a perfect opportunity. Teresa: We could ask the candidates to write to this point, to speak to this.

		<p>Arielle and Susan</p>	<p>I think this will lead to more mutual respect among faculty. I have deeply benefitted from leadership roles, so I am passionate about his particular issue.</p> <p>David Lau: I totally support this effort. I wanted to add that it would be good to have someone from AFT on the workgroup just to lend something to the conversation. All faculty are present at different levels of leadership.</p> <p>Arielle: A related issue on leadership: Tim mentioned that KAD faculty could not attend due to the time of our meetings. So this raises the question of whether we should consider moving the time. Teresa noted Cañada is moving their time earlier.</p> <p>Tim: is there any “no-go zone” for times? Is an hour earlier or later the best? To avoid the problem, we are going to try to just rotate folks that are in the off-season who might have better availability try to slot in to the senate. This is one way to change it without changing meeting times.</p> <p>Arielle: We just want to see what could work for as many as possible. We are open to changing the times if needed</p> <p>2. CSM AS proposed bylaws changes – Arielle Smith and Susan Khan (20 minutes)</p> <p>The changes are in two specific areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Filling Vacancies: our bylaws don’t speak to this currently—which became very apparent last year. b. The Committee on Teaching and Learning has proposed some changes to their committee structure, which is enshrined in our bylaws. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. We have made proposed changes to quorum: instead of 6, we should have it be 50%+1 of the committee’s voting members. Chris: are the voting members explicitly listed in the bylaws? Arielle: we will need to update this 	
--	--	--------------------------	--	--

			<p>4:08</p> <p>On vacancies: we have two potential options: in the first, the vacant presidency will be filled with an “interim member.” In the second, the role will be filled by the past president if the vice president is not willing or able to do so.</p> <p>Todd: related to the last decision, why would the executive committee make the decision rather than the whole body?</p> <p>Arielle: It was partially based on the last time—the voting process takes a month if we bring it to the entire senate. It may also be a problem in that we are required to have public votes.</p> <p>Todd: having past presidents come back also prevents diversity and change in leadership.</p> <p>Daniel: it seems better to use “interim” since this could potentially include past presidents—why not use a category that is more inclusive?</p> <p>Teresa: this language also covers when a secretary or treasurer leaves. The second option makes it sound like the past president was going to fill <i>any</i> role. The first option makes it clearer.</p> <p>Arielle: we will need to vote on this at a later meeting—but is there any objection to taking out option two?</p> <p>No objections—we will strike option two.</p> <p>Michelle Beatty: can we put in the statement. “In the event of a vacancy, then the senate at large would be the deciding group?”</p> <p>Arielle: If the executive committee isn’t going to decide so that we can do it fast, we may need a second plan. It is important to be fast in some situations. With a vote, the process takes a month.</p> <p>Rene: even in a sudden situation, we can call a special meeting, even if it has to be posted 72 hours in advance. I still think it is better to have the whole senate do it rather than the executive committee. Todd: the vice president could lead one meeting to hold a vote. Yvette: isn’t that the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

purpose of the vice-president, to serve when the president cannot?

We do need to decide on the policy—whether the vacancy decision should be made by the executive committee or the academic senate.

Keep mulling on this final question: it sounds like option one and the vacancy of over one year leading to a special election of the whole body.

b. Changes to CTL

Susan: the CTL is proposing minimal changes in order to bring the bylaws up to date with the current structure of the committee. We may want to discuss how the committee should be structured in the future, but this is really just about taking out language that reflects an earlier structure to the committee. The text in red is mostly changing the former three-part committee structure that we replaced with CTL as a larger group.

The current structure is very different. At the time, the library was very underrepresented because the ASLT division did not exist. We also made changes to better reflect our committee's goals: in particular, we expanded professional development needs.

Chris: the two year term limit was removed—is that because this is your role now? Susan, yes, it is part of my job description. I'm not sure if there is a term limit on the student learning outcomes coordinator position. Teresa: This is a remnant of the previous structure from when the chair was not a full time position It would be worth looking at whether it is a permanent position. Arielle: We can always change the bylaws if need be: step one is bringing them up to date to reflect the current structure; step two is these other issues about whether we need to make changes... Jennifer: I noted that Susan's role is stated as reporting only once a month, but currently you report twice a month. You might want to update that as well.

Arielle: this is our first read, so it will definitely come back to us for at least a second read before it becomes an action item.

		Arielle	4:25	<p>A note on time: we will not be able to get to the last things we have in the last five minutes of this meeting. I will highlight the DAS proposed bylaws changes.</p> <p>3. DPGC Items – Arielle Smith (15 minutes) a. SB 893 – Free College Proposed Board Policy—<i>held for future meeting</i></p> <p>4. DAS Items proposed bylaws changes:</p> <p>We did look at these briefly, but we will need further discussion, particularly about leave for these positions... Jennifer: Why a two-thirds vote instead of just a majority? We will discuss this at a future meeting.</p> <p>c. DCTL DE Modalities Descriptions</p> <p>On this last item: please make sure you look at the distance ed modality description sent over email—please send any comments to AS. These are public- facing descriptions, and they need to be clear to students.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 4:36</p>	
--	--	---------	------	--	--