



## Governing Council Officers 2016-2017

Leigh Anne Shaw  
*President*

Diana Bennett  
*DAS Past President*

Doug Hirzel  
*Cañada College AS President*

David Laderman  
*College of San Mateo AS President*

Kate Williams Browne  
*Skyline College AS President*

Dani Behonick  
*District Curriculum Committee Chair*

Sarah Harmon  
*Cañada College AS Vice President*

Kathleen Sammut  
*College of San Mateo AS Vice President*

Stephen Fredricks  
*Skyline College AS Vice President*

### Agenda

Monday, November 14, 2016  
2:15 – 4:30 pm  
District Board Room  
3401 CSM Drive, San Mateo, CA

### 1. Opening Procedures

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information
1.1	Call to order	President	0	2:23	Procedure
1.2	Roll/Introductions	Secretary	5	Present: Laderman, Fredricks, Shaw, Sammut, Harmon, Malamud, Behonick Note-taker: Fredricks	Procedure
1.3	Consent agenda	President	0	Policy 6.13 and Procedure 6.13.1 (Both pulled from consent and moved to new business)	Action
1.4	Adoption of today's agenda	President	1	M: Laderman /S: Fredricks U	Action
1.5	Adoption of the minutes of previous meetings	President	1	Adopt minutes of Oct 10, 2016 M: Fredricks /S: Harmon U	Action
1.6	Public Comment	Public	3	None	Information

### 2. Standing Agenda Items

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information
2.1	President's Report	President	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Participatory Governance Council updates</li> </ul> <p>Discussion of Diversity Training which will be starting up soon with the goal of reinvigorating training that used to occur prior to appointment to selection committees, aimed at Diversity Awareness. Minutes up on Sharepoint, some concern about who will facilitate the training (external facilitators were suggested).</p> <p>Discussion on Employee Rights and Protection Policy 2.12 led to a failed vote due to the definition of "improper conduct:" CSEA/AFT felt that negotiations should be complete before continuing this discussion and approving the policy.</p>	Information

				<p>Collegial Consultation – As the SSSP plan, Equity Template, and Basic Skills Report are on a one-year suspension while the state works on combining them, this is a good year to reflect what we require in CC; what does it look like, what does it entail, what does it mean, what does its timeline look like – is adequate time allowed for the voting bodies to process and make informed decisions? DPGC Shaw asked members to talk to their constituents about suggestions to be discussed at the December meeting. Shaw suggested that we have a pro-active process of approval to allow for “good-faith” timelines - and be mindful that “Quality work takes time.”</p> <p>Professional Development: Shaw: The visibility of PD funds still seems obscure. We have a culture of “no money in the pot” from many years of living under cuts. What’s lacking is a “Birds Eye View” of what PD funding looks like “around the campus”.</p> <p>Administrators PD funding is limited as is Classified. Let’s look at an “umbrella view” of the PD process across the district.</p> <p>Vision: Task force and forums to find out more about this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board of Trustees meetings updates Race/Class/Equity discussion at Board on 10/26</li> </ul> <p>Curriculum presented by Community Ed. A trustee was concerned that courses in this curriculum may be better placed in the credit offering and asked that the topic be agendized for January or February 2017.</p> <p>Malumud: Who develops curriculum for Community Ed? Does this curriculum require Board Approval? A: These are pre-packaged courses purchased from educational companies and/or taught by private providers. They do not go through the college curriculum process because they do not fall under the purview of CCCCCO curriculum approvals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	
2.2	College reports	College Senate Presidents & DCC Chair	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cañada College First year for SPOL (new software) for Program Review; Strong workforce program was also discussed; SS &amp; Equity. Hiring justifications presented last week, rankings will be in December.</li> </ul> <p>On-going discussions re: athletics bldg., science bldg., new science building will have an astronomy observatory – bulk of bond funds going for this</p>	Information

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• College of San Mateo No Report at this time</li><li>• Skyline College *Plenary Events – 14 resolutions on Strong WorkForce (big concern that these were written by Chancellor's Office personnel, not by college faculty)*</li><li>• District Curriculum</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

3. New Senate Business

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information
	Policy 6.13 and Procedure 6.13.1			<p>Hirzel (via email) "It seems that item 2 in 6.13.1 procedure is not consistent with the policy 6.13"</p> <p>Policy and procedure remain imperfect, as a trigger mechanism to begin the Program Improvement and Viability process is not clearly identified.</p> <p>Laderman: Strike item 2 from procedure 6.13 and approve both policy 6.13.1 and procedure 6.13</p> <p>Approval: M: Harmon S: Behonick U</p>	
3.1	3.16 Minimum Qualifications (revision of 3.15)	President	25	<p>3.16 is a response to the need to separate policy 3.15 into two separate topics, as they are different purview and focus and should not be in the same policy: Faculty Service Areas (FSAs) and Minimum Qualifications (MQs).</p> <p>Laderman brought revised language from the CSM senate that clarified the constitution of the committee; asked that it be reflected in both policy and procedure.</p> <p>Discussion: Approval by governing body/appointment of committees particularly when discipline experts are not readily available;</p> <p>Concern from CSM about the removal of FSAs from the policy; has there been joint agreement with AFT? A: The mention of FSAs is not disappearing entirely, but will appear elsewhere in our policies.</p> <p>Comment: The desire to separate FSA from equivalency creates a potential issue; someone either has FSA or has an equivalency, which means that through the equivalency the faculty would have FSA.</p> <p>Response: This is a misunderstanding of FSA. FSA is assigned upon hiring based on the areas in which a faculty could teach: this is determined by the MQs they happen to meet upon hiring (i.e., a faculty could be hired to teach one subject but may also possess FSA in another.). FSA is not invoked again except in cases of a Reduction in Force (RIF), in which case faculty who may be in a department that may be downsized might receive notice that they are invited to apply for additional FSAs. This is only in relation to hiring and contract status; it has nothing to do with determining whether one is qualified to teach.</p> <p>MQs are the process by which it is determined a faculty member is qualified to teach in the discipline. There is no single-course equivalency for MQs; a faculty member who meets MQs can teach in the entire discipline.</p>	Information and Action

				<p>Further discussion over FSA vs. Min Quals, how they work, what they are used for, how they are separate.</p> <p>Shaw requested from DAS unanswered questions and suggestions for language: they included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equivalency policy separated from 3.16 and/or placed into a procedure 3.16.1</li> <li>• FSA policy and procedure moved, perhaps to 2.08</li> <li>• Need clear language about the trigger for MQ, equivalency, and for FSA - What are the circumstances for each?</li> <li>• Clarify that the only purpose for FSA is determining which faculty get RIFed in order</li> <li>• Equivalency – no single course</li> <li>• Add CSM’s language to the policy and procedure</li> </ul> <p>Shaw: We will craft new language and revisit this.</p>	
3.2	Senate of the Whole to Representative Senate update	President	5	<p>Votes proceeding at each campus.</p>	Information
3.3	Policy 6.27 Procedures 6.27.1 and 6.27.2	President	25	<p>Guest – Peter Bruni</p> <p>Shaw: 6.27 is the DE policy. One procedure, 6.27.1 Distance Education: Regular Effective Contact (Hybrid and Online Courses) is in draft form and DAS asks DEAC to review it.</p> <p>The other, 6.27.2 Distance Education: Course Design/Rubric Standard, does not yet exist and DAS asks DEAC to initiate it and work with DAS on its development.</p> <p>Harmon and Shaw reworked the language of 6.27.1; much of the language was vetted from a rich discussion of DE faculty at Canada.</p> <p>Issues that arose – tying to a specific LMS, rather than keeping open;  Instructor contact was updated; developing language that demonstrates an equivalency to face-to-face contact; language was made specific, and vagueness was removed.</p> <p>Shaw: Is this consistent with the policies for face-to-face classes, since DE classes are supposed to be the “virtual equivalent of f-t-f classes?”</p> <p>Bruni: DEAC has faculty well-versed in the state standards for things such as f-t-f contact equivalency, “turnaround time” for contact, etc. Important to tie to Title 5 language.</p> <p>Behonick: Concern over approvals process; curriculum at Canada approves Online/Hybrid, but there isn’t actual evaluation of course content. If online courses are equivalent, why are they given a more rigorous review than face-to-face courses? Furthermore, who is going to do the work of checking to see that these courses really are following the rubric?</p> <p>Harmon: No campus has specified how a rubric will be used for the evaluation of DE courses.</p>	Information

				<p>Bruni: Do we have a DE evaluator that is qualified?</p> <p>Shaw: There are questions as to why DE merits scrutiny that is different from face-to-face. We are seeing a blurring of language and requirement, etc. A policy could help clarify.</p> <p>Areas for clarification: Who is going to wield the rubric?</p> <p>Who is the evaluator, and what are their qualifications?</p> <p>Is there supposed to be a different level of scrutiny for DE, and if so, Why?</p> <p>The language should be crafted that this is course material, and not evaluation of faculty.</p> <p>Should this be part of faculty duties?</p> <p>Regular and Effective Contact: DEAC to look at modifications and provide feedback/recommendations.</p> <p>Course design and rubric standard – request DEAC to structure policy based on OEI rubric</p> <p>PD for reviewers and faculty teaching DE</p>	
3.5	Update on Grant-funded vs. Fund 1 faculty hires	President	10	<p>Shaw: Grant-funded and fund 1 are hired differently, evaluated differently, and clarity needs to be brought to this.</p> <p>We will be re-visiting the guidelines for hiring and evaluation.</p>	Information
3.6	Review of DAS goals	President	10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conversion from Senate of Whole to Representative Senate/By Laws revision.</li> <li>2. Senate leadership and succession planning</li> <li>3. Sharing of best practices (CSM, Cañada, Skyline) and review of Local Senates Handbook</li> <li>4. Development of DE policy, Application of OEI rubric &amp; Regular and Effective Contact hrs</li> <li>5. Canvas migration</li> <li>6. Proposed: review of evaluation forms for face-to-face and online classes</li> <li>7. Proposed: review and revision of Faculty Selection Guidelines document to clarify hiring and evaluation processes</li> <li>8. Proposed: Recommendations from DCC on lab definitions in Appendix F</li> </ol>	Information

#### 4. Final Announcements and Adjournment

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information
4.1	Announcements		5		information
4.2	Next meeting/Future Agenda items		5	<p>Next DAS meeting is F 12.</p> <p>Item planned for December agenda: Discussion of Local Senates Handbook and areas in which local senates can be more effective.</p>	information

4.3	Adjournment				action
			135		