

Academic Senate of College of San Mateo



Tuesday, December 10, 2024
2:30pm - 4:30pm

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

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/88966774567>

Officers	
President	Todd Windisch (absent)
Vice President	Daniel Keller
Secretary	Yvette Butterworth
Treasurer	Stephen Heath (3:00)

Standing Senate Committee Chairs	
Curriculum Committee	Jeremy Wallace (absent)
Distance Education Committee	Jennifer Howze-Owens
Committee on Teaching & Learning	Susan Khan

Division & Student Representatives	
Student Representative	Anthony Pena Vasquez / Simon Htet (absent)
Academic Support & Learning Technologies / Library	Matt Montgomery
Academic Support & Learning Technologies / Library	Wesley Hingano (absent)
Business/Technology	Hellen Pacheco (absent)
Business/Technology	Kimberly Salido
Creative Arts/Social Science	Leighton Armitage
Creative Arts/Social Science	Maggie de Vera
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Kajari Burns (absent)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Sarah Artha Negara (Zoom)
Language Arts	Mick Sherer
Language Arts	Robbie Baden
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (absent)
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 (2:36)</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 (Motion to adopt with the removal of the 3.5 and BOT, DPGC, and IPC by Mick Sherer & 2nd Leighton Armitage. 13 Approved. 0 Nay. 0 Abstained. Roll call vote.)</p>	President / Facilitator	~2:32pm 2 min	Action
1.3	<p>Adoption of Consent Agenda (Motion to adopt as it stands Maggie de Vera & 2nd Kimberly Salido. 13 Approved. 0 Nay. 0 Abstained. Roll call vote.)</p> <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"> ○ November 12, 2024 	President / Facilitator	~2:34pm 5 min	Action
1.4	<p>Public Comment (There was a question about the Finals schedule.)</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 (Zoom Bombing Follow-Up: There have been multiple meetings with IT and the President concerning the incident. The resolution to prevent further intrusive, unwelcome behaviors, is to have a Webinar style meeting available to the public, and private links sent to panelists. Panelists are Senate members and anyone who has requested to speak at the Senate meeting.)</p> <p>Budget Update for Adjunct Pay in Spring 2025: \$10,000 budget and we have \$4656 left for the Spring. We'll need to look at the number of meetings and see if we will have enough to fund all the adjuncts currently serving on committees of Senate, since we have spent over 50% of the budget. Wendy Whyte asked if the attendance of Senate could be a Flex credit. Stephen Heath said it is a possibility, but that would need to be investigated. At this time the budget can't be increased. (update at 4:05pm and not within the timeline of the 2:45pm agenda timeline)</p> <p>DAS: Last night the meeting was about assuring that everything that was ready for the next semester. There was an update on Aaron McVean's plan for support of Undocumented students in preparation for January 20th. They are seeking legal advice in this matter and asking students to apply for the Dream Act. They have a couple more meetings before preparations will be complete. They will have cards for students to get info again and more of an update will be given at opening day. Curricular alignment goals were discussed. Class cancelation process is going the way that we hoped, even though it is not yet finalized. The faculty interview process was also discussed. The process for interviewing prior to 2020 is one choice. There was further discussion about allowing committees to make their own choices based on the needs of the position, and that may change how interviewing is done in 2025. The interview process shouldn't have been changed without Senate approval. There is a detailed document on AI and plagiarism that will be placed on the webpage for this purposed; it has been voted on and approve for the Spring. The DAS wants to allow curriculum</p>	Todd Windisch & Daniel Keller	~2:45pm 10 min	Information

	<p>committees to allow appointments for external exam review workgroups without waiting for Senate approval because there may be delays since senates only meet less frequently and may take several meetings to approve the groups, thus delaying important work.)</p> <p>IPC: No update due to Todd's absence.</p> <p>BOT: No update due to Todd's absence.</p> <p>DPGC: No update due to Todd's absence.</p> <p>Participation: Appointments were made to IPC, Safety Committee, and the Technology Committee.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Follow up after "Zoom Bombing" ● Update on adjunct budget for spring ● District Academic Senate (DAS) ● Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) ● Board of Trustees (BOT) ● District Participatory Governance Council (DPGC) ● 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 (1 faculty member appointed by Senate) 			
2.2	Curriculum Committee Chair Report (Jeremy Wallace was not present to give a report.)	Jeremy Wallace	~2:55pm 3 min	Information
2.3	Distance Education Committee Chair Report (No update because the update will be given as part of Agenda item 3.6)	Jennifer Howze-Owens	~2:58pm 3 min	Information
2.4	Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair Report (The committee has not met since the Senate's last meeting on 11/26. Susan provided an update for Flex Days. The District is postponing the AI sessions scheduled for District Flex Day on 1/9. There	Susan Khan	~3:01pm 3 min	Information

	will be other sessions including supporting undocumented students. College Flex Day on 1/10 is waiting for updates from Administration. Contracts for Gina Garcia who also spoke in 2019 session are being finalized; doing keynote and session to follow up. Regular and substantive rubric will have a session.)			
2.5	Student Representative Report (There was not a student representative present.)	Anthony Pena Vasquez / Simon Htet	~3:04pm 3 min	Information
2.6	<p>Other Officer & Liaison Reports (Leo Cruz report on Dual Enrollment: See Agenda item 3.1)</p> <p>Emily Cotla reported for Legislative & Advocacy. Update about budgets were provided. There has been an increase in funding from Governor Newsom. He granted 1.5 billion for stability of the CCC's. ADTs for STEM and Promise Fee Waiver, BA in Nursing program, Dual Enrollment, Equity, and the election and how that will effect things. Not too much to report except budget and legislative.)</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>Dual Enrollment Update (At the beginning of the semester Senate was given an update on Dual Enrollment (DE). The DE team was recently attended an IPC meeting since the team felt like they are not communicating to the faculty and college clearly, so they are trying to get out more. The biggest news from DE is that all high school partner teachers have been evaluated this year. The Chancellor gave a directive to have this happen and we were the only school in the district to get 100% evaluation this Fall. There will be 6 partner teachers evaluated in the Spring. Leo has no slides or any further data to share, but invites questions.</p> <p>Some questions that arose from the meeting: Mick Sherer asked about questions or concerns from the partner teachers and how they are getting their answers. Leo said that they are working through the conversations that come up from evaluation since they are in their contracts.</p> <p>Robbie Baden wondered if the evaluation form is posted, and Leo said that it is the same as the adjunct form found on the AFT website. Robbie also wanted to know about the evaluation committees are done the same way. Leo was not sure, so 2 counselors, an instructor, and a person from the high school were asked.</p> <p>Daniel Keller asked about compensation, and Leo said that the faculty are being compensated for paperwork time and mileage.</p> <p>Guillermo Cockrum wonders about the compressed calendar and how that would effect the dual enrollment calendars. Leo doesn't really know, but he said there is already a lack of alignment, so it would probably be similar. The high schools have more hours of instruction and the instructors are compensated accordingly, so that would probably be similar. Leo noted that this is something to think about when and if the compressed calendar discussion becomes a reality.)</p>	Leo Cruz	~3:10pm 15 min	Information

3.2	ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education (Removed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review of the ACCJC Distance Education Rubric ● Discussion of how to utilize rubric to inform our work ● Call for participation in a DEAC work group 	Jennifer Howze-Owens & Donna Eyestone	~3:25pm 15 min	Information
-----	---	---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------

3.3	<p>Resolution in Support of Undocumented Students (See the attachment linked below for details. There is a sense of urgency because we'd like to have something in place by January 20 with a vote hopefully occurring in the January 14th meeting. This is to be a discussion today.</p> <p>Guillermo Cockrum was unaware what the District is doing and he became concerned about what he will do with the effected students after January 20th. If we run into an unfortunate cost of allowing the student to continue to take classes in the event of deportation shouldn't prevent us from allowing the students to continue.</p> <p>Makiko Ueda thanked Guillermo for bringing this up and asked to add to #2 in a part c about well being and mental health support.</p> <p>Jennifer Howze-Owens wanted to know if anyone else was consulted, especially anyone on the Equity committee. Guillermo said no, he only sent this resolution Todd Windisch and asked about getting this done prior to January 20th Jennifer feels the Equity needs to see this to review it as well.</p> <p>Mick said that the resolution should be moved forward sooner and then could be updated right after if it is found to be imperfect. He wants to encourage the college to do something in #4. He wants to distinguish between what the college and faculty can do.</p> <p>Wendy Whyte wants to make sure that privacy is taken care of. She feels that we should always be sending students to "specialists" to get the assistance that they need. She was discussing work permits and sponsors. She doesn't feel we should move on this, and that we should wait and see what happens. Wendy feels that they (the authorities) are only going to go after criminals. She wants to send undocumented students to other resources. There was a discussion about being a sanctuary school and that puts a target on us, by not only government, but also by other other organized crime.</p> <p>Susan Khan feels that we do need move on this because making assumptions about who is abusing could be harmful.</p>	Guillermo Cockrum	~3:40pm 20 min	Discussion
-----	--	-------------------	-------------------	------------

<p>Jennifer Howze-Owens...</p> <p>Maggie de Vera feels a statement is very important. She works with immigrants and she affirms they are not criminals and they feel targeted, and therefore we need to show our support.</p> <p>Daniel Keller brought up a college employee that is the person to coordinate with the (#2 word smithing. Emily Cotla said that there is a counseling request for someone in this area.).</p> <p>Brandon Williams said that Guillermo needs to collaborate with the people who already work with our undocumented students so they have a voice in this document. Emily feels we can't get this input before January 14th. Guillermo wonders if we could circulate and ask for feedback. Mick Sherer said that maybe we have a committee take this to others and get feedback before January 20th. It was decided that due to Brown Act we can't do that informally, so a committee would be appropriate.</p> <p>Sarah Artha Negara wonders if it can become a working document before January 20th. If there is the ability to look over it in the free time, it would be nice to look at this.</p> <p>Mick feels Guillermo's point of just truncating the resolution to #1 and then saying that the Senate will continue to work on the resources is a good idea. Mick spoke to Wendy's concern and said that the anti-immigrant sentiment is real, and we need to show support to all who are effected, even people who aren't immigrants and who aren't undocumented.</p> <p>Sarah liked the two-step approach. She, like Mick, had negative personal experiences during the last Trump administration. She explained the fear that when her husband was flying home from abroad and they weren't sure if he would be able to come back into the US.</p> <p>Robbie also likes the two-step approach. He sees more than just #1 would be important to add to the first step. He'd recommend adding #3 and maybe #5. He wants to decide how the students can be accommodated if they were to be deported.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>Guillermo didn't think as far ahead as what Robbie proposed, but merely wanted to support the students as a part of our community no matter what.</p> <p>Daniel would like this to be a working document. He would like to vote on January 14th for a first portion, and then continue to work on the remainder of the resolution. Wendy wants more language added as to why we are making the resolution, saying that due to students coming forth with concerns.</p> <p>We will use the 1st part of the statement for a vote on January 14th.</p> <p>Jennifer asked Guillermo to allow access to people outside Senate that are involved in helping these students. Emily and Brandon made suggestions of people to add.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft Resolution for Feedback/Suggestions			
---	--	--	--

3.4	<p>Discussion around Full-time Interview Modalities & Next Steps (From DAS, Daniel discussed these with us</p> <p>Key Questions about the Faculty Interview Process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mostly virtual first-level faculty interviews: Should most first-level faculty interviews be restricted to virtual/zoom interviews? (Special exceptions would be made by Human Resources for faculty positions that involve special hands-on skills demonstration.) 2. Mostly virtual first-level faculty interviews with an option for in-person skills demonstrations in the second-level interviews: Should most first-level faculty interviews be restricted to virtual/zoom interviews only if second-level interviews can be in-person, could involve a skills demonstration, and would officially involve feedback from the screening committee? (Special exceptions would be made by Human Resources for first-level interviews for faculty positions that involve special hands-on skills demonstration would still be allowed.) 3. Screening committees choose one modality: Should screening committees be able to choose one and only one first-level modality for all faculty interviews? 3. Screening committees choose one modality: Should screening committees be able to choose one and only one first-level modality for all faculty interviews? 4. Screening committees choose one or multiple modalities: Should screening committees be able to choose one modality first-level modality or multiple first-level modalities for faculty interviews? 5. Default Option is Multiple Modalities: Multiple modality options are offered to applicants. If screening committees wanted to only use one modality, then they would need to request limiting to one modality. 6. All first-level faculty screening committees are only in person: Should faculty screening committees only interview applicants in person? [This option was added on November 7 based on feedback.] <p>This is a discussion item.</p>	Todd Windisch	~4:00pm 15 min	Discussion
-----	---	---------------	-------------------	------------

<p>Jennifer Howze-Owens wanted to know if budget is involved in this conversation. Daniel said that the only way this came into play was paying for people to fly in. Attracting a diverse pool is a concern if we can't bring others in.</p> <p>Guillermo Cockrum said that his concern is that if the teaching demonstration doesn't show the modality of instruction then it would be very difficult to evaluate the applicant appropriately. Kimberly Salido agrees with the idea of interview modality following the modality of teaching; she pointed out that they've had disastrous results from hiring via Zoom for a very hands on Cosmetology instructor.</p> <p>Matt Montgomery feels that the applicant shouldn't be in charge. Makiko Ueda feels that some situations such as illness would be OK to have Zoom, but says that the interviewee should have the ability to ask for the modality of preference of the committee.</p> <p>Jennifer wonders if the 2nd round could be a skills in-person and not be with the President.</p> <p>Robbie Baden said that separate skills and President visits wouldn't be possible. If we did a 3 round process there may be time constraints. Kimberly Salido said connections may be a big deal.</p> <p>Mick Sherer said that it would be important that the committees are allowed to decide on modality. If we hire a professor for in-person courses, then an in-person interview should be conducted to give the best idea of what the professor can deliver in-person, since the experience on Zoom could be very different.</p> <p>Matt said that the hiring process is very fast and you want to have the certainty that your candidates are faculty that will fit into the department.</p> <p>Daniel said that #2 is biased from someone not in the state is already in existence, so this may be hard to counteract.</p> <p>Robbie felt he was able see what a person can do in person but not via Zoom. He does feel that a Zoom interview may be good for different reasons than seeing the teaching.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>Mick says that flexibility is important. From an equity standpoint, flying everyone to come that we want to offer a position to is a great idea and Matt agrees that this would remove geographic bias. Mick said that a reverse bias would exist with Zoom interviews for people who are really good at teaching in person but not via Zoom.</p> <p>Emily Cotla wanted to know if it OK to give a heads-up to people who are chosen that the preference is in-person and that some people will be coming in-person and that they could remove themselves if they believe there would be bias.</p> <p>Brandon Williams was flagged as a Zoom candidate during his first interview with CSM because he lived in Southern California, and if they would have offered a stipend it would have allowed him to come to the interview. He would certainly have come in person if it would have been offered, and thus felt his first interview was biased.</p> <p>Matt Montgomery said that if we are talking about geographic bias, then perhaps we should add that to training.</p> <p>Jennifer Howze-Owens wants to know next steps. She noted that there were comments on the side of the shared document. Daniel said that we are looking to bring this back to vote on the preference on this body.</p> <p>Mick Sherer wondered if the work of AS should be to create scholarships for interviewees to come to the interviews if they can't afford to come.</p> <p>Guillermo Cockrum talked about the importance of a community member actually getting a position that will help the college and student body. Mick argued we shouldn't confuse bias with preferences.</p> <p>Robbie Baden's concern is setting up the best scenario to get the best candidates to choose from.)</p>			
--	--	--	--

3.5	Syllabus Equity Statement (Removed from agenda.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last discussed October 22 • Review of updated draft with feedback integrated • After several rounds of discussion, if not approved, Senate may send the statement back to the Educational Equity Committee (EEC) to start from scratch 	Todd Windisch	~4:15pm 10 min	Action
4. Closing Procedures				
No.	Item / Description	Presenter(s)	Time	Action?
4.1	Final Announcements (None) <i>President or facilitator elicits final announcements about upcoming deadlines, events, scheduling changes, etc.</i>	President / Faciliator	~4:25pm 5 min	Information
4.2	Adjourn (4:05)	President / Facilitator	N/A	Procedure