

Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



Tuesday, October 8, 2024
2:30pm - 4:30pm

Building 19, Room 121
1700 W. Hillsdale Boulevard, San Mateo,
CA 94402

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/85134096982>

Meeting ID: 851 3409 6982

Phone: +1 669 444 9171

Officers	
President	Todd Windisch
Vice President	Daniel Keller
Secretary	Yvette Butterworth
Treasurer	Stephen Heath (not present)

Standing Senate Committee Chairs	
Curriculum Committee	Jeremy Wallace (not present)
Distance Education Committee	Jennifer Howze-Owens (not present)
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Susan Khan

Division & Student Representatives	
Student Representative	Anthony Pena Vasquez / Simon Htet (not present)
Academic Support & Learning Technologies / Library	Matt Montgomery
Academic Support & Learning Technologies / Library	Wesley Hingano (not present)
Business/Technology	Hellen Pacheco
Business/Technology	Kimberly Salido (not present)
Creative Arts/Social Science	Leighton Armitage
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Kajari Burns (in 2:39 and out 4:20)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Sarah Artha Negara (Zoom)
Language Arts	Mick Sherer (not present)
Language Arts	Robbie Baden (4:17 out)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (not present)
Counseling	Emily Cotla
Counseling	Brandon Williams
Enrollment Services and Support Programs	Makiko Ueda

1. Opening Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Approx. Start Duration	Action?
1.1	<p>Call to Order (2:37)</p> <p><i>Senate meetings shall require a quorum of the membership to vote on action items. A quorum for a meeting of the Senate and all Senate committees shall consist of 50% plus 1 of the committee's voting faculty members.</i></p>	President / Facilitator	~2:30pm 2 min	Procedure
1.2	<p>Adoption of Today's Agenda (Leighton Armitage Motion & Robbie Baden 2nd . Roll Call Vote: Jeremy Wallace, Jennifer Howze Owens, Susan Khan, Simon Htet, Matt Montgomery, Hellen Pacheco, Wesley Hingano, Kimberly Salido, Leighton Armitage, Magnolia De Vera, Kajari Burns, Sarah Artha Negara, Mick Sherer, Robbie Baden, Wendy-Whyte, Beth LaRoche, Emily Cotla, Brandon Williams, Makiko Ueda. Lined out are absent. 11 Approved, 0 Nay, 0 Abstained)</p>	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	<p>Adoption of Consent Agenda (Susan Motion & Leighton 2nd . Roll Call Vote: Jeremy Wallace, Jennifer Howze Owens, Susan Khan, Simon Htet, Matt Montgomery, Hellen Pacheco, Wesley Hingano, Kimberly Salido, Leighton Armitage, Magnolia De Vera, Kajari-Burns, Sarah Artha Negara, Mick Sherer, Robbie Baden, Wendy-Whyte, Beth LaRoche, Emily Cotla, Brandon Williams, Makiko Ueda. 12 Approved, 0 Nay, 0 Abstained)</p> <p>There were three requested updates for the September 24th notes. Brandon Williams wanted it noted that he was present for the first vote. Wendy Whyte wanted it noted that her comment on the Proposal to Draft of a Resolution to Support Students Affected by Ongoing Conflicts in the Middle East be noted as a *paraphrased comment. A note was made that the Collegiality statement link is broken in the notes.</p> <p>*The secretary wanted the note made that notes should not be considered exact word-for-word replications of any discussion in the Senate; notes are more likely to be paraphrasing of actual commentary, than a word-for-word transcription of any one person's statements. The secretary is not a stenographer and is doing the best job possible to capture the commentary on agenda items.)</p>	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action

	<p><i>All items on the consent agenda may, by unanimous vote of the Academic Senate members present, be approved by one motion after allowing for Senate member questions about a particular item. Prior to a motion for approval of the consent agenda, any Senate member, interested student, citizen, or member of the staff may request that an item be removed from consent to be discussed in the order listed, after approval of remaining items on the consent agenda.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approval of faculty appointment(s) ● Draft minutes from previous meeting(s)... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 26, 2024 ○ September 24, 2024 			
1.4	<p>Public Comment (Maggie deVera is opening an ice cream café next month in San Mateo. This business will be a place where she can, in addition to offering ice cream, have music and a DJ and celebrate educators.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Questions/comments on non-agenda items ● If more than one public commentator is present, comments may need to be limited to 1-2 minutes to accommodate everyone 	Public	~2:39pm 6 min	Information
2. Standing Agenda				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
2.1	<p>Presidents' Report (Todd Windisch wished to report back on the public comment from Teresa Morris concerning the Collegiality Statement from the Senate discussion on 9/24. Two statements are linked: The first is the our Senate approval passed in April of 2023 and the second is from DAS where a resolution was passed at all three colleges to direct the work in the district. Teresa said that she felt that these statements had gotten lost.</p>	Todd Windisch & Daniel Keller	~2:45pm 10 min	Information

Todd is bringing this back today to make sure we are aware and to reignite the work. [First page of Senate website](#), under OVERVIEW, linked as “the diversity of faculty work” is where this statement is located. Looking at the items under, “We look to Academic Senate leadership to address this division and formally codify the mission, vision, and values of Academic Senate to reflect that:...” it seems that there weren’t actions taken on some points especially in terms of Senate goals and Todd would like to work on this in Senate during the Fall semester. In relation to the statement, “In addition, we request that the CSM Academic Senate take action and commit to the following to support our values:...” Todd is on a task force that has been working on the task. Thus far the group which has representation from all three schools has taken a look at the participatory governance documents at all colleges and is making changes where they saw “non-instructional,” language, making the change to all faculty. The group has also looked at the change with respect to the contract, but that will require AFT collaboration and contract renewal, so the discussion has been tabled for the moment. All of this work aligns with the statement, “Change our local language to describe the fullness of faculty work.” The statement asked that we, “Invest in formal leadership skills training to support any faculty who want to make governance and institutional change,” and Todd has been promoting more leadership opportunities in the faculty newsletter, noting scholarship opportunities for training from various State organizations. Todd also has a request on the next DAS agenda requesting the district to fund ASCCC to come for a formal faculty leadership training for Flex Day. Todd does feel that he has made the effort to, “Actively engage and support faculty from diverse backgrounds and experiences as faculty leaders.” There is an opportunity to revisit this resolution and make more changes this semester, and he called for volunteers to help address the first item which relates to reviewing our mission vision and values and taking action on other items that haven’t been addressed.

At this point Todd asked for Teresa’s input. Teresa is still concerned about the leadership, and while ASCCC is great, she feels that there are still ways to engage and educate on our campus. For faculty who aren’t in the classroom to make the leap to State wide service, it is a burden and she’d like to see the Senate help people get the skills and be able to launch more people up to the State Senate. Teresa is especially interested in launching others into State leadership roles because she served in that capacity for a long time.

Todd made a formal work group request to continue the Senate work on this matter. Daniel Keller, Maggie deVera, and Matt Montgomery are interested in working with Todd Windisch. A report-out will be occur in a future meeting.

DAS is next week on Mon., 10/14. They will be taking a deep-dive into the results of the faculty cancelation survey. Todd will preview his findings of the survey a little later today. Todd feels that if anyone would like to know what others across the district are thinking about the class cancellation policy, that the DAS is the place to learn more.

In the last IPC meeting it was voted upon and decided that IPC will now be meeting twice a month on the first and third Wednesdays, rather than just the first Wednesdays. This decision was based on the amount of action items the committee is now attending to and that means that everything can't occur in a single meeting. It has also been decided that the AOC (Accreditation Oversight Committee) will merge with IPC instead of having two separate committees, since the two committees have similar tasks. More accreditation updates will be shared through IPC with this merger. The resource request form was released and discussed in IPC (presentation linked on [IPC website](#) under the October 2, 2024 Resources). The committee decided to add two steps to the prioritization process. Previously the Deans would all meet and look at their priorities together creating a prioritization with the Faculty and Staff Presidents in the room to observe. After the Dean prioritization, the list went to the President. Now both the Deans and the Senates will prioritize the faculty position requests and submit their findings to PRIE who will send the prioritizations on to the Cabinet and IPC will hold a public forum on December 4th for discussion on Dean/AS/CS Position Prioritizations. The new process will be implemented this year. Since the Academic Senate has been asked to make our recommendations, we may need to dedicate a whole meeting to this process, or add another meeting to accommodate the request. There is another step in the process added where there is a place to ask questions about the process via the IPC open forum meeting. Makiko Ueda wants to know what our AS job will be. In particular, she wanted to know if it is to help prioritize tenure track positions. Todd clarified that it is to approve full-time faculty requests through resource requests. Makiko wanted to know if there would be requests for full-time temporary faculty, but Todd wasn't sure, but thought not since that wouldn't typically go through a resource request.

Additionally, the President of CSM will be doing work on the Educational Master Plan this year since there has not been a lot done with respect to the plan in the year since it was approved. It is linked below.

The next BOT is on Wed., 10/23 in East Palo Alto. The BOT wants to connect with people in other communities, so they will take their meetings to other places. In the Spring

DGPC will be discussed later.

A quick update on the drop for non-payment. Information was requested via email with a copy to Emily Cotla and Brandon Williams concerning the questions raised in Senate. There has not been a response at this time, but as soon as more information is present to Todd, he will share. Todd has also invited either David Crafts or someone else from administration to come for a short update and to answer questions with respect to this question.

In terms of calls for participation we are still looking for representatives to IPC, Technology Committee, and Safety Committee. The technology committee meets 3 times per semester on the second Monday from 1:30 to 2:30. The chair of the Technology Committee is Tarana Chapple, but Senate must approve appointments, so send any names of interested parties to Todd Windisch. Brandon Williams wanted to know about funding for adjuncts on the Technology Committee and the answer is that there is not funding because it is not a Senate committee.)

- Addressing public comment from Teresa Morris on 9/24/2024:
 - [CSM Academic Senate Statement of Values and the Diversity of Faculty Work](#) (4.25.23)
 - [District Academic Senate Faculty Collegiality Statement](#) (10.24.24)
- District Academic Senate (next meeting 10/14)
- Institutional Planning Committee ([10/2](#))
 - [Educational Master Plan, Forward 2028](#)
- Board of Trustees (next meeting 10/23)
- District Participatory Governance Council (DPGC) (10/7)
- Calls for Participation:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Institutional Planning Committee (1 faculty member appointed by Senate) ○ Safety Committee (1 faculty member appointed by Senate) ○ Technology Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Meetings 3x per semester, second Mondays, 1:30pm - 2:30pm 			
2.2	Curriculum Committee Chair Report (There was no update since Jeramy Wallace is absent. Makiko Ueda announced her department had a course approved for self-care.)	Jeramy Wallace	~2:55pm 3 min	Information
2.3	Distance Education Committee Chair Report (No update since Jennifer Howze-Owens is absent.)	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~2:58pm 3 min	Information
2.4	<p>Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (</p> <p>CTL:</p> <p>In our most recent meeting, established our top 6 goals (not necessarily in order):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing system for meaningful assessment of our Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) 2. Finalizing draft of revised ILOS 3. Professional development to support our assessment activities 4. Improving professional development communication and leveraging of existing resources (including archiving and use of tagging) 5. Incorporating student voice in professional development 6. Improving our professional development needs assessment (including improving use of Great Read of Program Review for professional development needs assessment) <p>Looking forward to our next meeting on 10/28/24, when we'll hear about status of goals number 1-3, review feedback on Flex Day, and consider how we want to approach the other 3 goals on our list.</p> <p>Please RSVP for Flex Day which is tomorrow.)</p>	Susan Khan	~3:01pm 3 min	Information

2.5	Student Representative Report (There was no student was present)	Anthony Pena Vasquez / Simon Htet	~3:04pm 3 min	Information
2.6	<p>Other Officer & Liaison Reports (Originally we had planned to hear from Leo Cruz, but since he was just here, the plan will be for an update next month.)</p> <p>Makiko Ueda said that there was not a lot on the list-serves. Todd acknowledged that there isn't often many updates and that has been brought up at Plenary in the past and it has been acknowledged that they could do a better job, but nothing has really happened.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CSM Faculty Dual Enrollment Liaison: Leo Cruz ● ASCCC CTE Liaisons: Christy Baird & Beth LaRochelle ● ASCCC OER Liaison: Jennifer Howze-Owens ● ASCCC Rising Scholars Faculty Liaison: Wesley Hingano ● ASCCC Legislative & Advocacy Liason: Emily Cotla ● ASCCC IDEAA Liaison: Makiko Ueda ● ASCCC Part-time Faculty Liaison: Maggie de Vera 	Treasurer, Secretary & Faculty Liaisons	~3:07pm 3 min	Information
3. Senate Business				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?

3.1	<p>Review of Title V Revisions (Todd is presenter, but Susan Khan and Jennifer Howze-Owens had things to add. In the packet you'll note the page that says revisions to Title V. There are two current pending revisions. These changes come from the Chancellor's office and they let us know that changes are planned and then give a 45-day comment window where comments about the proposed changes can be left. This discussion is to raise the issues here to our attention.</p> <p>The first topic relates the Flex Calendar. It has been discussed in CTL. Susan added that there have been a lot of discussions about FLEX day discussions. The language changes seem to make it clear that the FLEX day activities should be relevant to all employees, faculty, classified, management, administration and student employees. What Susan feels isn't clear, is there a requirement to back up the availability of options. They are wondering if the classified should have mandated hours like we have with full-time faculty. Todd feels that it is probably to make participation mandatory for all employees, but it not necessarily to have the same amount of time required for all groups. It also doesn't seem that the classified or student employees would have to have a certain percentage of their workload. Todd has brought it to the attention of the VP of Classified Senate, Alicia Frangos, and he believes she is taking it to the Classified Senate for discussion. If you would like to add comments, Todd included the link to the submission form in his last weekly update on Fri., 10/4.</p> <p>Burden-free textbooks is the next topic of discussion. Wendy Whyte wants to discuss c4. She is worried about the availability of computers. She also feel that financial aid, in c6, really needs to be available on the first day of class to get all the materials on the first day of class. Todd feels the guidance is just to let us know what the State wants us to do. Wendy feels that the State needs to make sure the State makes financial aid available. She seems frustrated by the process and feels that when people enroll at the last second that all these things aren't possible. She would like a clause in there about the eventualities such as late enrollment. Todd invited her to make a comment if these issues are of a great concern. Matthew feels a) in this section speaks to the extent possible, so he feels that Wendy's concerns might be addressed. Robbie Baden wants to know about a1), OER materials being available and if it is that it needs to be used. Todd feels that there is a lot of criticism in this item from others as well and there are places, like in c) that seem to give the instructor responsibility for their choice of</p>	Todd Windisch	~3:10pm 10 min	Discussion
-----	---	---------------	-------------------	------------

instructional materials and don't seem to be forcing the use of OER materials. Perhaps something that goes through DPGC and policies would need to be made. Daniel Keller feels the quality of OER materials isn't always the best. Daniel also mentioned that the copy of materials on the first day is a violation of copyright laws and the State seems to be saying to do that to make things available. Robbie wants to know about more ZTC degrees. Todd said that this is an entire degree that has all ZTC course. Jennifer Howze-Owens may have additional information on this ZTC degrees. Hellen Pachecho has been working on ZTC courses with Jennifer, and she admits that it is difficulty to work through the course and identify a path that all instructors can follow, but still maintain their academic freedom. Lia Thomas added that [copying a chapter](#) on the first day is fine. She wanted to know where the link is for commenting (see below for the link). Robbie read C3, "Adopting open educational resources for courses in which OER is commonly available and prioritizing courses needed to satisfy general education requirements," and wondered what the "prioritization" means. He's wondering if it is prioritizing for the marketing of a class and finds it interesting that the prioritization refers to GE requirements. Todd thinks that because it is related to c), that the District needs to encourage GE courses to be OER. Todd says that c) still sees that at the top it says faculty has authority over textbooks. Susan Khan added that maybe this is just the choice and support in choosing OER/ZTC. Maggie deVera took the OER/ZTC course over the summer, but feels that it is really important that we have the freedom to choose, especially in Addiction Studies because of the changes that occur frequently. Robbie feels that the idea that quality materials is a burden is not right; sometimes quality costs money and he is concerned with this trend. To close, Todd said the place to send comments is: regcomments@cccoco.edu The comment period ends at 4pm on the last day of submissions which for these two are Flex Cal 10/21 ad Burden Free Texts 10/24. Any more questions contact Todd.)

- [Flexible Calendar](#)
- [Burden-Free Access to Instructional Materials](#)

3.2	<p>Discussion around Revisions to District Mission & Class Cancellation Guidelines</p> <p>(Mission updates from DPGC there was a 2nd read and it is still open for feedback until November. The final vote will be in November and Todd wants to get the Senate's feedback so he knows how we'd like him to vote or what feedback we'd like him to make. Todd asked yesterday in DPGC why the preamble and the values underneath were removed. Todd asked if it was the template from the Community College Lead (CCL) which is similar to the ASCCC but for administration. The BOT was looking for something more simplistic and punchy. To make a simpler statement, it then makes sense to remove the preamble. Todd then asked why the values were removed and Aaron McVean said that the Board elected to approved the values as a separate policy, but Todd questioned whether that makes it the Board's values or the District values. Maggie deVera points out the "putting students first," and wonders if that might compromise the needs and rights of the faculty if the student is always right. She doesn't feel it is about the faculty but about the students, might this be like the customer is always right which can cause chaos. She'd like a balanced message that would state that we are dedicated to the students, but that the goals of education. Wendy Whyte feels that it is very State of California, and while it sounds nice, it can get a little scary in terms of interpretation and implementation. Todd feels that it is not maybe all about the students, but without the original preamble he feels that maybe some of the context is removed about the atmosphere of collegiality and shared responsibility, which could tackle some of the things that are coming up in our discussion here. Sarah Artha Negara feels, speaking from a part-time faculty member, there have been times when her livelihood has been compromised because of the class cancelation policy, and even though she always wants to put her students first, but feels that the faculty might be hurt because of this student first attitude. Matthew Montgomery feels that the pairing down of the from 270 to 25 words with some of those 25 being San Mateo Community College. The wording of "putting students first" is very ambiguous and that wording may be misinterpreted and maybe they are really trying to say "student centeredness." Matthew would also like to see the values stay. Daniel Keller wants the values to stay. In accreditation, the mission statement gets evaluated and this new statement would be hard to validate. Susan Khan feels that students are the primary responsibility of our institution since we are a school. However, she also feels that meeting the needs of our part-time faculty, and not relying as heavily on those employees, especially when they aren't allowed a working wage to</p>	Todd Windisch	~3:20pm 20 min	Discussion
-----	---	---------------	-------------------	------------

<p>feed their families, should be part of that. Sarah Artha-Negara really feels that valuing the part-time faculty in the working environment should be reflected. Todd sees that adding back in the values would address the issues that many are bringing up. Robbie Baden agrees that trying to write the accreditation report with this new statement would be difficult, and that the wording feels like it was thrown out in a quick session and is more of a sales-pitch than a mission statement. He agrees with others that paring down the wording, but not eliminating the values is the best, because there are things in the original statement that are needed. Wendy Whyte feels that adding in putting district resources toward educating our students first, and since faculty are a resource, that might speak to the issue that the mission statement isn't valuing faculty. Todd said there needs to be awareness of the people on the ground in putting the students first, and that the board doesn't seem to be acknowledging the role of faculty in putting students first. Todd summarized what we offered as feedback in the following way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We'd like faculty called out in the verbiage in various ways • We'd like an acknowledgement of the role of faculty in putting students first • We feel that the values do need to be in the statement • We feel this statement is too short <p>Susan asked if he meant faculty and staff, and he would say. Todd wants to know if a "no" vote on this is appropriate. The group said a "no" vote is appropriate and Todd will follow through.</p> <p>The class cancellation guidelines Todd called out the District Senate website (link) you will see a link for the Faculty Survey on Class Cancellation Results. He believes that there were nearly 300 participants.</p> <p>Todd summarized the main themes from the Surveys:</p> <p>"Question 1: Standardization should be increased in how Deans decide to cancel classes" 234 people either strongly agreed or agreed</p> <p>"Question 2: Greater standardization of the class cancellation process would negatively limit a Dean's ability to plan a class schedule that offers a wide range of courses." Not a good consensus (the secretary adds the distribution is "centered" on Uncertain/Indifferent with 94 and more in the agree/strongly agree 129 than in the disagree/strongly disagree 67)</p> <p>"Question 3: Any course that involves a specific meeting time (modalities: f2f, hybrid, or synchronous online) should have lower minimum enrollment number than</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>asynchronous” Strong agreement, but the people that disagreed that left specific comments as to why, which often was the comment that asynchronous classes are the same amount of work and therefore shouldn’t have different limits</p> <p>“Favorite Policy: One Fixed number, Two Fixed Numbers, 50% of the class max, Other” Numbers are skewed because the rank voting was not required for all 4. It is skewing other to seem more popular. 2 fixed is more popular and 50% which is the proposal, and clearly not 20, so Todd would vote for 50% if no option for 2 fixed numbers. Robbie made a clarification about Todd saying he’d vote for 50% over the 2 fixed. Todd clarified that he’d vote that way if there was not a 2 fixed amount. The DPGC is just to make recommendations to the Chancellor, and the Chancellor can take it or not. The Board Policy didn’t get approved last year because there was not administrative procedure. Todd made a recommendation to DPGC that a policy was put forth to make a procedure. Todd discussed with David Eck about the policy and it seems that the popularity of the numbers is because people like the current 10 policy, because they like the predictability of a number, but it needs to be lower than 20. Sarah Artha Negara asked about why Todd would vote 50% over the 2 fixed. Classes in her field sometimes need to run even with less than the required numbers because her students need to complete a certificate and thus there is a fear if the class would be cancelled her students couldn’t complete their certificates. Todd clarified AGAIN that he will vote for 2 fixed if it is presented, he would just take the 50% if the 2 fixed wasn’t offered. Sarah’s point is about a class maximums and maybe developing class maximums to make sure pedagogy is considered too. Wendy Whyte feels that subject matter and the number of teachers is missing. The Lab courses and safety is important, as well things like physical activity and watching for potential for injury. Wendy feels that there is also a concern about how many instructors will be teaching the course. This led to a discussion that the Senate had proposed a policy for class maximums based on pedagogy and what is happening inside the classroom and that was rejected by the Chancellor’s office several years ago. Wendy feels a lawsuit could result if there aren’t maximums considered as well. Robbie Baden discussed the difference between the philosophies of how caps are being made because it seems like we might be making different advisory notes on class cancelation, but at the same time having similar discussions about concerns over cancellations. Sarah also discussed the fact that she is the only teacher that teaches the Pilates certification. There are some core courses that have been cancelled because there weren’t enough to offer it. If there are 12 people in an instructor training courses and that is a lot to train. The students in her</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>program are affected in their entire life because they can't get her classes, then they can't begin their career as a result. Todd said there is flexibility in this policy for these types of exceptions and that Sarah could make an appeal because of degree completion. Todd says that policies have been applied differently across the divisions. Sarah feels that the value for the administration doesn't always match the value for the students. Todd said that ranking needs of students should be included in the policy.</p> <p>"Open comments" Todd categorized these in themes and will report out at DAS. November 4th is the deadline at DPGC, so bring comments and concerns to Todd before that time. Todd wants to know what we feel.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● College Mission:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Current Mission○ Proposed Revision● Class Cancellation Guidelines:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Proposed revisions to BP 6.04○ Proposed AP 6.04.1 tied to BP			
--	--	--	--

3.3	<p>Adoption and Prioritization of Senate Goals (Packet in Senate is slightly different from the Website is what Todd shared. Feedback from the Senate Budget to support funding by campus drives made by Sarah last meeting. He also made notes of projects that are happening across Senate and other subcommittees like ILO Revisions, Program Review Redesign, Resolution on Addressing Sexual Harassment Policies and Procedures, and the Resolution from Teresa Morris' on the Statement of Values and the Diversity of Faculty Work that we should keep tabs on throughout the semester.</p> <p>Todd asked if there are any goals the Senate would like to see removed, added, or changed? Robbie Baden has one thought about adding in the OER discussion that we were having earlier in the meeting, the discussion about the impact of Title V revisions on material adoptions. We will add this into clarifying options for faculty under textbook options. Wendy Whyte wonders if the financial aid question about the bookstore needs to be removed. Daniel Keller feels that the AI conversation may need to be moved to an advisory committee of Senate. He doesn't feel that it should be pushed off to DEAC. Robbie feels that the first 4 bullet points of the AI policy and workload are urgent and should be prioritized. Susan Khan wants to clarify the AB-705 and AB-1705 information. Todd feels that the faculty want to know the data for our students pre and post AB-705. The question of standards is potentially about the lowering of standards by pushing students through. Susan feels that the standards may have to do with SLOs. Daniel wants to move the suggested Book "Cost of Completion" by Robin Isserles be moved to AB-705 and AB-1705 since it has to do with pushing students to complete rather than fostering success. Yvette Butterworth shared that the data used by the state to support AB-705 and AB-1705 may be missing key information about loss of students and how that loss is effecting the supposed success metrics. She said that some schools in the state were able to keep their courses because they used their own metrics to prove that their courses were more successful than what the state claimed. She said that our math faculty feels that we could do a better job than the state of showing that our courses are successful and should not be eliminated. Robbie Baden also brought up the 10-year study from Tennessee that shows this type of course elimination isn't working as touted. He feels that our school needs to do our own studies. Susan says that she agrees that there is controversy about the states data, but she wants us to be sure that we are tracking long term, though that can be difficulty. She cautions that we don't want to lose any of the conversation that</p>	Todd Windisch	~3:40pm 30 min	Discussion / Action
-----	--	---------------	-------------------	---------------------

<p>can help guide the work. Makiko Ueda feels that communication and integration of the personal counselors and otherwise unrepresented faculty into the AS and into the campus is an important on-going goal. This group of faculty is a new addition to the Senate and that makes it very important to keep up the work of integration and communication with the campus and this small group. Susan wanted to bring up that Kinesiology and Dance hasn't been represented in AS because of the scheduling issues with their faculty requirements. Susan comments about the engagement in the on-line courses has been an issue and wants to make sure that it is addressed. There was some discussion about whether it should go to AI, but it doesn't feel like the appropriate place even though it is impacting on-line courses maybe more than in person. Todd thought he might remove this goal but because with the State survey he left it on. Daniel isn't sure we should keep the item on the list because it isn't something we can assess. Matthew Montgomery said that the QOTL 1 & 2 are already working on this, so we decided not to change it.</p> <p>Todd created a PollEv poll to help prioritize the goals. Motion Wendy Whyte & Hellen Pacheco 2nd. Susan, Matt, Hellen, Leighton, Maggie, Sarah, Wendy, Emily, Brandon, Makiko approved. That was all present at this time.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Flex Day Brainstorm of Senate Goals• Proposed Senate Goals for Prioritization			
--	--	--	--

3.4	<p>IPC’s “Proposal to Adopt Nuventive as Planning and Improvement Software” (Context for this discussion: Last week at IPC Monique Nakagawa and Todd Windisch as accreditation leads are proposing to adopt Nuventive to track SLOs. It is formerly known at TrackDat. We previously used this software to manage SLOs and about 8 years ago, we moved away from it. Because we don’t have a way of storing the data it is hard to track and analyze the data because it is stored in different places and in different ways. It would have impact on SLOs resource request and program reviews. We would be saving the information in the software instead of saving a pdf and sending it to a repository. The question will be do we opt to go with Nuventive and the other is do we change our processes. Todd will bring this back to Senate. Anyone who would like to be a part of potential conversations if we decide to move forward with Nuventive was invited to join. Daniel Keller would like to be a part of a group in exploring. Maggie deVera feels that if we were using this before and if we moved away there is a reason. The President is asking for a decision at IPC on December 3. Sarah Artha Negara added that TrackDat was difficult to use and if it wasn’t updated, she’d hate to see it re-instated. Sarah would be interested in joining the group. Guillermo Cockrum and Madeline Murphy will be invited to discussions.)</p>	Todd Windisch	~4:10pm 15 min	Information/ Discussion
-----	--	---------------	-------------------	----------------------------

4. Closing Procedures

No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	<p>Final Announcements (none) <i>President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.</i></p>	President / Faciliator	~4:25pm 5 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (4:38)	President / Facilitator	N/A	Procedure