



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

Minutes
Monday, December 12, 2016
2:15 – 4:30 pm
District Board Room
3401 CSM Drive, San Mateo, CA

Meetings of the SMCCCD Academic Senate are open to all members of the SMCCCD community.

1. Opening Procedures – 10 minutes

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information
1.1	Call to order	President	0	2:15	Procedure
1.2	Roll/Introductions	Secretary	5	Present:L. Shaw, D. Laderman, K. Sammut, K. Browne, S. Harmon, D. Behonick, D. Hirzel, D. Bennett Absent: S. Fredricks Note-taker: Doug Hirzel Guests: AFT President Monica Malamud; CTE Liaisons: Barbara Corzonkoff and Ronda Wimmer (Skyline), Patty Hall (Cañada) and Vice Chancellor Kimberly Messina; Dean James Carranza, Cassandra Jackson, Supinda Sirihekapong	Procedure
1.3	Consent agenda	President	0	none	Action
1.4	Adoption of today's agenda	President	1	M: DB /S: SH; unanimous approval	Action
1.5	Adoption of the minutes of previous meetings	President	1	Adopt minutes of November 14, 2016 meeting M: /S: Abstain: Not all were able to access the minutes in time so they will be approved next meeting	Action
1.6	Public Comment	Public	3	None	Information

2. Standing Agenda Items – 35 minutes

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information
2.1	President's Report	President	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Participatory Governance Council updates: (a) Board Policy 2.12 Employee Rights and Protection did not pass and future action on it will wait until after contract negotiations are completed. (b) Update on professional development from Jan Roecks; taskforce to examine this 	Information

				<p>topic from a bird’s eye view but is focused primarily on staff and administrator professional development. (c) Collegial consultation was briefly discussed. Local senate leaders should go back to top governance body at your campus and form a schedule for calendaring consultation on 2017 SSSP, Equity and Basic Skills plans. Goal is to avoid last-minute requests for approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board of Trustees meetings updates: (a) Board is working on a “Affirmation of Core Values and Principles...” statement in response to two study sessions on equity and social justice issues. Trustee Mohr has inquired twice about possible curricular responses to social justice concerns. He asks whether we can ensure that there is a social justice intelligence is imbued in coursework. Pres. Shaw will invite Ttee. Mohr to DAS to discuss. KB suggests including Equity Deans from each college. • Other: (a) LS hasn’t been able to regularly attend every college’s AS meetings but has found these meetings very helpful. Please provide LS with your meeting dates for spring. (b) Update on Common Assessment from ASCCC – all 3 colleges are aware and in agreement on how to move forward. Each local senate may want to invite local assessment gurus to share. (c) EEO Committee – reconstituted for this year but LS unable to attend any meetings as they conflict with DAS and DPGC. Despite request, the committee has not yet scheduled an alternative meeting time to accommodate Pres. Shaw. The result is that there is no regular faculty voice on this committee. Teeka James rotates with Dan Kaplan for AFT. The DAS charges LS to meet with Chancellor to ensure a way for consistent Senate representation, preference is for DAS president LS to represent faculty separate from any AFT representation. (d) LS proposes that DAS focus on Z-Degrees and OER. DB shares that limitations exist for EOPS to use book vouchers for “low cost” books. Need for bookstores’ involvement. Note that some students don’t have credit cards. Propose study session with at least one EOPS representative. KB reports that Skyline has applied for a system office grant regarding OER. DH and SH report little interest to-date in OER from Cañada faculty. DL reports that CSM is very interested. (e) CCCC survey from Eloy Oakley – encourage local senates to complete (f) ASCCC’s AP credit survey: Cañada’s transfer center coordinator is completing; Skyline and CSM have not yet forwarded; DB recommends that Curriculum Committees be involved; KS recommends counselors be involved. 	
2.2	College reports	College Senate Presidents & DCC Chair	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cañada College: (a) suggests future DPGC review of procedures for presidential screening committees and possible new policy and procedure on shared use of instructional facilities by CCCE; and (b) CTE Transitions team is suggesting changes to grade designation for credit-by-exam articulation agreements with high schools; need district-wide discussion and coordination on this proposal; and (c) vote on bylaws revision is complete. 	Information

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• College of San Mateo: will conduct vote on bylaws in spring• Skyline College: (a) first Equity conference was outstanding with clear enthusiasm from faculty; (b) Canvas training is ongoing and people are realizing the requirement for high level training to meet local requirements to teach online; (c) ongoing discussions about book <u>Redesigning America's Community Colleges</u>, B. Thomas, has created a significant amount of roiling but no action plans; (d) vote on bylaws is complete.• District Curriculum: (a) delighted to report that DCC now has a constitution and bylaws for the first time ever! (b) CurricUnet audit is ongoing; (c) verified that reassigned time for CC chairs is unequal between colleges despite same responsibilities; recommends that DAS require consistent amount of reassigned time be agreed upon and documented for posterity.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

3. New Senate Business – 80 minutes

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information
3.1	Faculty Diversity Internship Program	Carranza	15	<p>Dean Carranza is asking for an affirmation of support from the DAS for the FDIP. See materials in handouts folder.</p> <p>Ad hoc working group from EEO Committee with faculty reps from each college was tasked with creating a FDIP for graduate students and part-time faculty in need of training. Implement pilot in spring 2018. Each college implements. Handout description provided. Program has been designed to comply with MQs for faculty interns which differ from the MQs for faculty positions. DB asked about concerns regarding whether adjunct faculty could participate. Title 5 internship regulations apply only to graduate students and those who meet faculty MQs but have no experience. Since current adjuncts have experience, they would not qualify unless they are changing disciplines for which they have no experience. Concern expressed by DB and KS that we can equip current adjunct to make them just as competitive as those who complete the internship program. It is possible that the PD resources could be made available to people who do not qualify for FDIP. Training would make it clear that completion of the program is not a guarantee of future job. Title 5 identifies specific qualifications for faculty interns which differ from the MQs for discipline faculty. Employed as an adjunct and evaluated as an adjunct. KB asked whether FDIP interns qualify for seniority rights which gives rehire preference. DC confirmed that they would have these rights. Need for AFT contract to distinguish FDIP interns from adjuncts who meet faculty discipline MQs. Title 5 does not allow us to have adjunct faculty who do not meet MQs but does allow interns to not meet MQs. Once completed internship and education MQs then you are eligible to apply as an adjunct faculty. Concern about not having a faculty discipline expert as instructor of record; what is direct supervision? does intern have any union protection?</p> <p>M: DB / S: SH A workgroup of Kate Browne, Leigh Anne Shaw, and an AFT representative will work with the team to identify how interns are classified, instructor of record, direct supervision, union protection. Unanimous</p>	Action
3.2	Reassigned Time for Senate (re-ordered to follow 3.3)	Shaw	25	<p>Insufficient time for discussion; continue next meeting.</p> <p>Three college presidents have agreed to provide 1.0 FTE reassigned time for “senate work” to be allocated by the local senate president. Administration has the “right of assignment” that is an understanding, not a contract, between the college president and senate president. Skyline President Stanback Stroud will share “letter of agreement” with her colleagues.</p>	Information
3.3	Strong Workforce Program	Messina and CTE Liaisons	25	<p>VC Messina provided overview of SWP; 60% local share, 40% regional share. BACCC decided to give the majority of the 40% to local districts. SMCCCD district office is not taking any share – all funds go to 3 colleges. Little guidance from CCCCO on what funding can be used for. Cannot supplant existing funding. “More and better” CTE programs and outcomes are required.</p> <p>Cañada report – Prof. Hall is working closely with CTE Dean Heidi Diamond; Workforce Development Director Alex Kramer hired in October; VPI and Diamond are spearheading the plan development; CTE Data Unlocked working workshop training for</p>	Information

				<p>CSM and Cañada faculty on Nov. 18 (such training has not been provided to Skyline faculty); faculty need training in procedures for new CTE program development; plan may include reassigned time for CTE Liaison; local deadline for faculty proposals is Dec. 15; plan will include “big bucket” items such as marketing, PD, high school integration. AS will review the final draft plan on Jan. 26.</p> <p>CSM – some faculty participated in Data Unlocked workshop held at Cañada; there is no CTE Dean so DB is working with Dean of Technology but is not getting satisfactory answers; requesting development of a website of resources for faculty but won’t get it until January which is too late for use in current design of proposals; faculty are supposed to submit proposals to Dean of Technology by deadline of Dec. 14; conflicting answers as to whether CSM is hiring a workforce director; concern whether there’s been adequate notification to CTE faculty; questions about roles and responsibility for CTE Liaisons.</p> <p>SKY – helping individual faculty develop plans but need education about dual/concurrent enrollment/articulation with high schools; Director of Workforce is engaging departments to create videos which will be posted onto a new CTE website to promote programs to students; reassuring KB that plan does not have to be very specific; only one senate meeting to see plan before deadline. BC will be working more closely with Andrea in spring. RW shares several concerns regarding the need for better understanding of the differences between CTE programs and non-CTE programs; the District needs to be aware of historical context in which many private post-secondary schools are closing because students are suing alleging over-promising; concerned that labor market data is highly flawed so must include validated local data</p> <p>VC Messina – supports conversations about similarities and differences between CTE and non-CTE; plans that are due in January are to be very generic/inclusive big picture items like PD, marketing, etc.; since the plans due in January can be broad, there will be more time in spring to follow up on specific faculty proposals; for all new CTE programs, the college administration is required to verify that the college has resources to afford/support the new program; this is the beginning of performance-based funding for CCC; colleges may choose to support existing programs rather than start new programs out of concerns regarding how outcomes will be measured/evaluated; state approves whether plans meet the criteria of the SWP</p> <p>DAS concerns – there does not appear to have been Data Unlocked training for Skyline faculty; need to clarify role of CTE Liaisons so that colleges will make better use of these resources and senates can be kept informed</p> <p>P. Halls requests that DAS recommend CTE liaisons to receive some reassigned time from SWP funding</p>	
3.4	Update on BP 6.27 and Procedures 6.27.1 and 6.27.2	Shaw	5	BP 6.27 was presented to DEAC at meeting on 11/30/16. See materials in handout folder. Postponed to future meeting	Information
3.5	Final examination of BP 6.13 and 6.13.1	Shaw	5	This policy and procedure were approved at the November DAS meeting. Postponed to future meeting	Information

3.6	Update on draft BP 3.16 (revision of 3.15)	Shaw	5	See materials in handout folder. Postponed to future meeting	Information
-----	--	------	---	---	-------------

4. Final Announcements and Adjournment – 10 minutes

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Action/ Information
4.1	Announcements		5		information
4.2	Next meeting/Future Agenda items		5	Next DAS meeting is scheduled for February 13, 2017. Agenda items for 2017:	information
4.3	Adjournment				action
			135		

In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act and SB 751, minutes of the SMCCCD Academic Senate will record the votes of all members as follows: (1) Members recorded as absent are presumed not to have voted; (2) the names of members voting in the minority or abstaining are recorded; (3) all other members are presumed to have voted in the majority.

All agendas, minutes, and handouts can be found at <http://smccd.edu/academic senate/agenda-and-minutes.php>

All SMCCCD Board Policies and Procedures can be found at <http://smccd.edu/boardoftrustees/policies.php>

2016 – 2017 District Academic Senate Goals

1. Conversion from Senate of Whole to Representative Senate/By Laws revision.
2. Senate leadership and succession planning
3. Sharing of best practices (CSM, Cañada, Skyline) and review of Local Senates Handbook
4. Development of DE policy, Application of OEI rubric & Regular and Effective Contact hrs
5. Canvas migration collaboration
6. Review of evaluation forms for face-to-face and online classes
7. Review and revision of Faculty Selection Guidelines document to clarify hiring and evaluation processes
8. Proposed: Recommendations from DCC on lab definitions in Appendix F