



ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved Meeting Minutes

October 11, 2022

Zoom Meeting ID: 442 779
680

1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.

San Mateo, CA

2:30 – 4:30 pm

[Website](#)

Executive Committee 2022

Jeremy Wallace
Acting President

Jesenia Diaz
Vice-President

Stephen Heath
Treasurer

Daniel Keller
Secretary

Executives Present

Name of Officer	Executive Committee Role
Jesenia Diaz Daniel Keller Jeremy Wallace	Vice-President Secretary Acting 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
Valeria Estrada	Librarian
Susan Khan	ASLT
Edgar Mojica Villegas	CASS
Vincent Li	Business-Technology
Todd Windisch	Language Arts

Others Present

Name	Representing

Opening Procedures

Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information/Pr cedure
Approval of today's agenda	President	2:35	Move to approve: Chris. Second: Daniel Approved	Procedure
Approval of past minutes	President	2:35	Minutes approved	Procedure
Consent Agenda			Consent Agenda: Continue to offer hybrid meetings due to ongoing emergency. Move to approve: Todd. Second: Daniel . Approved Note: After January 1 st , we will no longer be able to hold hybrid meetings. The public can still Zoom in, but members will have to be in-person unless members have "just cause"—specific reasons they cannot attend in person. Part of the law does say that it is superseded by declarations of state emergency.	Action: Approved
Public Comment	Public	2:36	Jennifer Howze Owens: I was asked by the distance ed team to bring forth some comments about payment for the fall MOU . My understanding is that we will be changing from payment via a stipend to people being paid at their special rates. This makes it harder for the organizers to predict costs, so we would need to ask for better guidance on budget planning in advance. Jeramy said he will look into this.	Information

New Senate Business

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action (Motion/Resolution)/ Information//Discussion
1	President's Report	Todd	2:50	President's Report District Academic Senate: There is a lot of talk about the upcoming statewide plenary. This Friday, we will be having our local area meeting—you will be getting a list of resolutions we are supporting. The plenary will be November 3-5. We discussed a concern that the Chancellor's Covid 19 advisory committee was appointed without senate consultation. The advisory committee is considering revisions to the vaccination policy as the spring semester	Information

approaches. We had some concerns about how quickly the committee was put together; the group is also being requested to make a recommendation about this policy within a week. However, the committee was approved. We are still concerned that faculty may feel blindsided by any recommendations this group may make.

The rest of the meeting looked at the different policies and structures of the senates at the three campuses. We looked at issues like the structure, reassigned time. If you want more information, let Todd know.

Institutional Planning Committee

Coastside: we now have a physical space and are hoping to continue to grow the program.

Facilities update: we focused on problems that have come up with parking since the board voted to get rid of student permits. There has been some confusion about the change and about the signs in the parking lots: there are still supposed to be staff-only lots. To reduce confusion, the board plans to remove the “visitor” signs from staff parking, to improve other signage as well as enforcement. The original decision by the board (to eliminate fees) is actually a two-year pilot, so we are not going to make major changes if we find out that the pilot was unsuccessful.

We also had an update on building 19—they are working more on the interior remodeling.

The board also discussed faculty, staff, and student concerns about climate after the September heat wave. Robert explained that the logistics are complicated because the best fixes are going to be extremely expensive. Adding AC units on the buildings is an option, but not ideal—they are not very effective.

Aaron McVean presented on the changes we can expect after the passage of SB893. The bill allows the district to waive enrollment fees for

everyone in San Mateo county. Some students will also qualify for extra money for books and materials.

Todd: I would like more clarification on how undocumented students are affected by the new bill. Carla: Undocumented students are covered and that was a priority of legislation.

We also heard about the student equity and achievement plan that is due to the state this month, and Chris Walker presented on projects that curriculum is working on, including common course number policies.

District Participatory Governance Committee

The committee talked about the class limits—but Jeremy plans to discuss this at our next meeting

Full time prioritization meeting

Jeremy: Skyline and Canada involve the senate in the hiring prioritization process, whereas CSM is not. Should senate participate more at CSM?

Carla: At Skyline, the deans present the choices to the whole campus. There is a full committee that works on the prioritization. They then provide a prioritized list to the president and cabinet, who make the ultimate decision.

Jeremy also will be attending the prioritization for classified staff next week. The priority list is not set in stone even after all of the discussions—cabinet and president make the decision. The full list goes to the cabinet and president regardless of prior decisions.

Jesenia: the deans do discuss these things outside of this process. Jeremy noted this can seem like a “horse-trading” process.

Carla: this year I suggested we spend more time talking about positions in more detail—some

				departments get prioritization due to things like title 9 and accreditation.	
2	ASCSM Update	ASCSM	3:09	No representative present	Information
3	Standing Committee Reports	Chris Susan Jennifer	3:10	<p>Curriculum Committee, Chris Walker, Chair</p> <p>We have not met since the last ASGC. Our next meeting will focus on issues of equity in course outlines. Please come and join us at the next meeting if you are interested, Thursday at 2:15.</p> <p>Committee on Teaching and Learning, Susan Khan & David Lau, Co-chairs</p> <p>We have not met since the last ASGC. At our next meeting we will be discussing our draft goals and refining them a little. At flex day, we will continue to discuss the “great read” share-out from David Lau and Madeleine Murphy.</p> <p>Distance Education Advisory Committee, Jennifer Howze-Owens</p> <p>We will be discussing distance ed later in the agenda—see below.</p> <p>OER Update, Jennifer Howze-Owens</p> <p>I am just starting in this role—and have met with a few divisions just to say hi. I will be putting together a weekly summary and we will be working to develop discipline specific OER and also share the anti-racist resources available.</p>	Information
5	Action Items		3:05	<p>Tenure Review Committee – Academic Support & Learning Technologies (ASLT)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan Khan (Professional Development) • Theresa Martin (BIO) –Discipline Expert • Daniel Keller (ENGL—serving as chair) • Jing Wu (CHIN) 	Action All committees approved

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tarana Chapple (Dean) <p>Move to approve: Chris Second: Jesenia Abstention: Susan</p> <p>District Teaching and Learning Committee Appointment – Julieth Benitez</p> <p>Move to approve: Daniel; Second: Chris. All approve</p> <p>Approval of PIV committee: Jeramy, Chris, Lee Miller Jesenia, Kristy Barret from fire tech</p> <p>Move to approve: Susan; Second: Michelle Beatty</p> <p>All approved</p>	
6.	Discussion items		3:18	<p>Workload Pilot</p> <p>At our last senate meeting, we agreed we would discuss how the pilot is going. We will be passing on concerns to our AFT reps, though there are some other concerns that are senate's purview. Three concerns with the project were the focus of our discussion: some faculty may feel that they cannot serve on important committees because they are already "full" on workload points; some faculty are asking for work to do, not out of interest or expertise, but simply to get the points; and some projects may stall due to faculty not being able to participate.</p> <p>Chris: at the beginning of the term, I mentioned that we had some concerns with how points were being assigned for course updates and new courses—the work was being interpreted differently by different people. Most of us assumed that the points were being assigned per class—right now it is .5 for revising and 1 point for a full course.</p> <p>But CTE is required to update every two years (as opposed to departments with a six year review), so there are not enough people to cover the points for some departments. But other</p>	Discussion

curriculum chairs interpreted this as .5 for revising *all* of your courses, not just one. I went through the AFT FAQ document and reached out to Steven Lehigh. Steve said he sees how the interpretation is not clear. We do feel like there is a process to fix problems, but I am concerned that there are courses and programs that no one will be on top of and come November we are concerned that no one will be able to do it.

Jeremy: if this happens—faculty say they have too many points—it will fall on the deans to do it. Deans are already overworked and some faculty may not want deans writing their courses. Jeremy also had questions about the matrix points. There are some deans interpreting it differently. The points seem questionable in other areas as well: serving on the accreditation committee is labelled .5—but it is a *lot* of work. In the PIV committee, we were asking for faculty and many said they already had their points. If people already have their points, we might have to pay for extra work, or we end up asking deans “who needs points?”—which doesn’t seem like the best way to select faculty.

Todd: I think it is important to keep in mind the impetus was to show the work faculty were doing and to help spread out the work. But it doesn’t feel like it is flexible or moveable enough. When everyone has their points set for the whole academic year at the beginning of the year, there isn’t any room for new projects. I feel like if we had not decided to cap faculty at 6-7 and just kept adding points, it would make a better case: we wanted to show how much work we are doing. Instead, we risk work not getting done.

Another issue: there are many committees that start later—should we do appointments in the spring instead of August flex day. Chris noted hiring committees are not even put together until after prioritization. Curriculum can’t wait to have people appointed until the second or third

meeting. Jeremy noted that we can get as many appointments done as possible.

Todd: the concern seems to be that work is not going to get done if people are full already on their workload points. We need to make sure we are documenting these issues—and we also need to know where to take them. There is a committee, but where does this information get stored?

Carla: Evaluations have been very problematic—there are not enough points to go around amongst the full time faculty to be able to do that. One of the things about this pilot is that it doesn't give enough points to be able to do the things that are strictly faculty purview—and in some divisions like business there are not enough full-time faculty available. We need to make sure that is happening. The contract says that faculty cannot be on more than two tenure evaluation committees but there are not enough faculty.

Jeremy: I have also heard of faculty saying “I just need points so what committee can I join?” But we don't have enough committees for all faculty serve. This may have come about because, traditionally, about 1/3 of the full time faculty have done the institutional work.

Rene: The distinction between getting reassigned time and workload points is also a concern. Guided pathways was an important committee, but it was a lot of work already, with 2 units of reassigned time. Also, when students request faculty as foundation instructors for honor projects, do faculty have to refuse if they have too many workload points?

Chris noted that this is a problem for him right now—he is on many committees already, but gets reassigned time. Now he has to get seven points on top of this. Arielle had the same problem.

Can we keep track of what we do without assigning these points? This seems like a “point battle” –and the points seem arbitrary. Rene says she is now parceling out the work she would have done before, without question, but now is forced to track time spent on projects.

Maybe we should track what we are doing instead of keeping the points system? The project seems to be causing more anxiety and confusion than anything else.

Yvette: the system also risks making faculty a little adversarial towards each other. It can lead people to say their contributions are worth more. And again, the system seems arbitrary.

Michelle Brown: I am the only full time faculty in my program, so when I first added up the points I was way over, with something like 12. Even though I am over the points, I decided to take on an honors project—I wouldn’t think of as something I would not do if I don’t get points. There must be a lot of disagreement as far as what our work is worth. It is valuable to document our work.

Todd: I will add—I feel like it is positive overall, even though I’m not ecstatic. I think it has to be quantified. I think it is important to show this work to the board.

Rene: we can quantify in a way other than assigning points. Why does this person get so many points for that? Then we start nitpicking about stuff. I loved your first suggestion: if the point of this is to keep track of how much time we spend, why not just keep track of it? This is how we did it when I taught high school—everyone had to keep track of everything they did. Also: who decides what weight gets put on what activity? Writing recommendations takes time. I would never say no to an honors project student—but as far as assigning points to it, how many do we get? Chris noted honors is paid through a stipend, so it is not awarded points,

but this still leaves the question of faculty time— if we are working on multiple projects for points, we may not feel we have time for other important work.

Jeremy: I will work with IPC to make sure that we can determine the points better, and I also will work with Carla to see if we can get this done in the spring. We will start clarifying the points.

Three-year Distance Education Training (45 minutes)

Jennifer: As a recap, DEAC is bringing back to senate the topic of the three-year training for fully online and hybrid courses. We want to make sure faculty are aware of this, so our first request is that faculty share the information out.

Since the last time we met, DEAC has been able to brainstorm related to this topic. We have some data, though we have not been able to discuss it in detail yet—will report back next time.

There is a document that describes the requirements—Jennifer shared this via Zoom. The document defines who this policy applies to and how the work should be done.

Some have also asked about equivalence—if they have trained elsewhere since their last training here, how do we represent this? We need to develop a clearer process.

Aside from the messaging, what we need in senate is support in developing paths for faculty so they will feel they are not just meeting the requirement but doing it in a way that is useful to them. This includes questions about the areas faculty feel should be offered—what content is most important? Are we talking about compensation or points?

Faculty were interested in QOTL2: here, faculty can choose what they want to work on . There is

a QOTL running now and there will be another one in spring.

Todd: there also needs to be a process to indicate who is up on their training and who needs to take more. There will need to be a list of faculty who are up to date and when they had their last training approved. And there will have to be a process of alerting people when they have reached their three -year process. There may not always be processes to keep track.

Carla: the deans also need to be aware of the schedule and who has been trained—they should know this because they are the ones who assign the courses.

Chris noted that the unconscious bias training is a good example of how we can remind faculty and keep track.

Rene: how much time will the training take?

Jennifer: we are recommending extending the time we offer them. QOTL2 is still about 20-25 hour commitment overall. QOT11 helps you learn Canvas, while 2 allows you to address specific issues. Yvette said that QOTL 2 is not as much work as QOTL1.

Jeremy: we should figure out a more public-facing document that we can put on the senate website.

Jennifer: there were some questions about compensation for QOTL. A prime example of why it would be important for the DE team to have a functioning budget. We can predict with a stipend how much we have to pay. With special rate timesheets it is going to be more difficult to predict.

Michelle Brown: on the equivalence issue, would an equivalent experience also be about 25 hours? Is time the way we decide equivalency?

				<p>Todd: there may be options for equivalency even though we don't have a process for it yet.</p> <p>We will resume this discussion in early November.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 4:25</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--