



Governing Council Officers 2020-2021

Jeremy Wallace
2020-2021 DAS President

Kate Williams Browne
2020-2021 DAS President-Elect

Leigh Anne Shaw
DAS Past President

Jessica Hurless
District Curriculum Committee Chair

Diana Tedone-Goldstone
Cañada College AS President

David Eck
Cañada College AS Vice President

Arielle Smith
College of San Mateo AS President

Peter von Bleichert
College of San Mateo AS Vice President

Leigh Anne Shaw
Skyline College AS President

Jesse Raskin
Skyline College AS Vice President

Minutes

Monday, October 26, 2020
2:15 – 4:30 pm

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/99150382063>

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

1. Opening Procedures

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Description
1.1	Call to order	President	2:17	Call to order	Procedure
1.2	Roll/Introductions	Secretary	1	Jeremy Wallace, Arielle Smith, David Laderman, Kate Brown, Leigh Anne Shaw, David Meckler, Diana Tedone-Goldstone, Jessica Hurless, Malathi Iyengar, Peter von Bleichert, Nick DeMello, Sarah Harmon, Nicole Porter, David Eck, Liz Schuler, Sarah Aranyakul, Monica Malamud, Natalie Alizaga	Procedure
1.3	Consent agenda	President	0		Procedure
1.4	Adoption of today's agenda	President	1	Approved unanimously	Action
1.5	Adoption of the minutes of previous meetings	President	2:20	Sept 28 minutes: accepted with no changes Oct 12 minutes: accepted with no changes	Action
1.6	Public Comment	Public	3	David Laderman: Spring 2021 MOU and issue of class caps, possibly modifying/having new language in there as a result of informal conversations with faculty (CSM AFT rep) – time is of the essence, as registration starts Nov 4. AFT is trying to both finish regular contract negotiations and draft spring MOU. Would like to give language around class caps more teeth – current proposal is very tentative, but currently reads: all course caps reduced 20% from pre-pandemic offerings, so would not impact any courses that have already had caps reduced. Caps should be reduced by course, not instructor – if instructor wants a higher cap, will need to justify that in writing (opposite of what it is now), appeal process put in place; want to allow sufficient flexibility for faculty to ask for lower/higher cap based on background. Oversize class pay would remain the same as current MOU.	Information

			<p>20% is a modest ask (many other districts/institutions have 25%).</p> <p>Jeremy: Next steps/ask? Next meeting on Nov 9</p> <p>David: Is there a way for DAS to respond offline?</p> <p>Jeremy: I will forward to the rest of DAS and will discuss on Nov 9 as well</p> <p>David: This applies across the board, fully online and converted courses</p> <p>Leigh Anne: Other campuses had the ‘reality check’ that there is a decent likelihood that we will be mostly online in fall 2021? Doesn’t look like anything will radically change in the next year</p> <p>Nicole Porter: Message was that we will need to do a phase in approach to returning to in person instruction, especially as we have not been consistent in staying in a specific ‘color’ category. Came from Dr. Moreno, Aaron McVean, Ray Hernandez</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

2. Standing Agenda Items (15 minutes)

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Description
2.1	Campus reports	Senate presidents, DCC, DEAC, TTL	15	<p>President’s report</p> <p>Senate presidents will briefly share critical, non-agenda items only.</p> <p>Jeremy: Board meeting 2 weeks ago was on strategic plan, updating board on the work that committee has been doing, and update on Promise program. We are very restricted on which funds can go into the Promise program, if we want to continue to expand the program, we will need to rely more heavily on outside funding sources (SMAC, employee housing funds go into it, but can’t use Fund 1 for Promise scholarships). Meeting this Wednesday on SMAC again – seem to be spending more time talking about that than student success, which is concerning. Making really good progress on Ethnic Studies task-group we put together; have ETHN faculty at CSM working with SKY and CAN to get ETHN curriculum over to sister campuses to go through curriculum approval and artic processes. Lezlee Ware let us know that CAN prioritized ETHN faculty position as part of prioritization, which is huge. CSU guidance document mandates ETHN dept in order to be able to cross-list any courses.</p> <p>Kate: DAS resolution supporting ECE that went to the board, brought to State area meeting, passed unanimously by Area B, now on the consent agenda for Plenary</p> <p>Leigh Anne: Resolution looks radically different bc of constraints of ASCCC (much shorter)</p>	Information

			<p>Diana: Also passed class cancellation guidance, modified from SKY guidance, looked at DAS ETHN resolution as well, getting feedback.</p> <p>David: CAN was STRONGLY in favor of hiring ETHN faculty this upcoming fall</p> <p>Leigh Anne: Looking at ETHN resolution and getting feedback. SKY engaged in ‘intergroup dialogue’ – implications for ‘training the trianer’ type model, has implications for improving dialogue, especially around equity.</p> <p>Kate: That’s a BIG thing.</p> <p>Arielle: CSM Prez committee membership settled, though there are concerns over lack of inclusion of EEC members, discussing with Fauzi and Mike C. Have ETHN resolution, FT temp faculty policy, and Credit by Exam BP on the agenda.</p> <p>Jessica: continued conversation around ETHN curriculum and new CSU GE Area F</p> <p>Nick: Nothing new to share, working on CVC and new tools.</p> <p>Sarah (TTL): Working in different taskforces to try and create different materials for spring for students and faculty to ensure as much clarity as possible</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

3. New Senate Business (30 minutes)

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Description
3.1	District Professional Development	PD coordinators	30	<p>Discuss potential topics and speakers for all-district flex days</p> <p>Nicole Porter: Plan to meet next week to further discuss programming</p> <p>David M: Student panels in general are very popular and wanted, around COVID but also comparing experience at different campuses. No shortage of information on resources for teaching online and anti-racism, but want to see more about implementation (putting it into practice).</p> <p>Liz S: Some things that are naturally district-wide – GOL program, for ex, and ITS has already been doing district-wide trainings, but partnering w them would be helpful, and bringing in DE and Equity. AFT also came up in our meeting, what MOU means, how it’s going to be done. Equity is across the board. Agree – student panels. We’ve been doing student panels at each flex day so far – could piggy-back on those students who have already identified as taking classes across district. Also emergency services – part is self-care (smoke, fire, PG&E) how is that impacting</p>	Discussion

			<p>us, plan to make sure we are safe/working safely in our homes. This is longer term, how are we staying healthy and safe in the long haul.</p> <p>Jeramy: feedback on speakers, but also want feedback on what an all-district flex day would look like?</p> <p>Liz: Speakers, and what we can do</p> <p>Nicole: Are there discussion to move flex from Friday to different days, have admin been roped in? Is that on the table for discussion? Some of comm I saw was about changing flex day to not fall on the Friday before a holiday.</p> <p>Jeramy: I did bring up with Calendar committee that we should stop that practice, but we can't do anything about this year</p> <p>Liz: We also have Div/Dept meetings that usually get scheduled on the Friday afternoon, but also have seen more engagement for some of these.</p> <p>David: cool thing to take advantage of is being able to have all-district flex day, opportunity for things like a counseling specific session, which we would like to have space for</p> <p>Kate: what do you need from DAS – ok with district-wide day? My opinion is that we should do district-wide, but need support for convincing admin? What else can we do?</p> <p>Liz: initially, thinking about funding – if we want to bring in a speaker (since we don't have discretionary budgets), we need resources for that. With DAS Plenary, seemed like there were resources</p> <p>Jeramy: would need to ask Mike C for money</p> <p>Leigh Anne: Are we at a point of soliciting topics for district-wide focus? One I'd like to explore is directly connected to issues of leadership succession – would love to start up communities of practice around leadership development and support, issue of concern at Skyline</p> <p>Nick: Day 2 - Maybe discipline meetups ... a chance to get around a virtual table and talk about the challenges and opportunities for each discipline. Some one (or zero) faculty departments may value the support opportunity.</p> <p>Nicole: If you can email us topic ideas, that would be helpful. At SKY, how are we looking at 'What's next?' and that may be an opportunity to expand conversations</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Sarah: The OER groups at all 3 campuses last year were planning on having an OER/equity workshop, with faculty and student perspectives. That might be something that we could bring in, esp now with the DE focus</p> <p>Liz: Dr. Caroline Finney – more of a STEM speaker, but possibility. Bettina Love, abolitionist teaching</p> <p>Nicole: Would be great to look at speakers we currently have and leverage those, perhaps extend contract so that we don't have to go through as many logistical hoops</p> <p>David M: We are all doing different things – CAN has USC CUE, doing interesting different things, would love to hear about what other campuses are thinking</p> <p>Jeremy: Want a speaker each day or just one speaker? Mike C will probably want time the first day</p> <p>Kate: Maybe there is a place for district-wide depts. to meet</p> <p>Peter: Could we leverage Museum of Tolerance speakers?</p> <p>Liz: I like that idea, and also like what Nicole suggested given the short time-frame that we are looking at. Each college is doing different things around equity – CAN is CUE, CSM with impact grid, and SKY U of MI. Speakers that can be leveraged also have some context of the district and some of the challenges that we face</p> <p>Arielle: Sounds like we should try and leverage some of the Equity Summit speakers</p> <p>Chat suggestions: Pedro Noguera, Gloria Ladon-Billings, Sal Khan (online teaching, flipped classrooms), Ben Nelson (founder of Minerva Project), Ge Wang (Stanford, online music collab), Angelica Stacy (UCB, dual enrollment)</p> <p>Jeremy: reach out for help and support, esp in securing funding/support</p> <p>Kate: idea of district-wide thing that would get all 3 colleges engaged is really strong, and opportunities for cross-pollinating ideas (work in smaller groups to percolate) and come back together to come up with constructive next steps</p> <p>Jeremy: happy to send out survey to all faculty to see if folks want to have discipline meetings</p> <p>David M: some do and some don't, so just need to identify who they are</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				Jeramy: happy to reach out to VPs to find out about division meetings too	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4. Old Senate Business (80 minutes)

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Description
4.1	DAS Task Group Descriptions	All	30	<p>Compile, discuss, and approve the descriptions and charges of the District Academic Senate 2020-21 Task Groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiring procedure revisions • Faculty evaluation revisions • Equity audits of 10+1 • Compressed calendar • Article 13 Professional Development • By-laws revisions <p>Jeramy: compile descriptions to then be able to send out to all faculty to request participation.</p> <p>LAS motions to start discussion on descriptions, PVB seconds, open for discussion</p> <p>Jeramy: Diana and I met last week and came up with faculty evaluation task group description</p> <p>Leigh Anne: Will be really important not to frustrate work that has already gone into this, would be good to acknowledge in the description the work that was done as part of foundation this group will build on. Librarians and counselors drafted evaluation forms that worked for us, and AFT refused to negotiate it.</p> <p>Leigh Anne (chat): Work on the evaluation forms is here: https://smccd.edu/academicsenate/work.php TONS of work done by librarians and counselors as well as specific language revision to focus on equity in the instructional observation form</p> <p>Diana: That is why we made sure to include a librarian and a counselor, though vision is that it will be even more equity focused.</p> <p>Jeramy: Hiring group</p> <p>Leigh Anne: Me and Arielle – I was in EEO group, which is also talking about revamping hiring procedures. We reached out to Mwanaisha and have a meeting coming up</p> <p>Jeramy: timeline – don't all have to go out at once, can be staggered as they get approved.</p>	Action

			<p>Arielle: Compressed calendar – we will have short description and suggested committee composition, think we will need 2 faculty and 1 classified from each campus, already have interest from Daryan Chan, Jesse, and I, and Carla Grandy (SMT dean at SKY)</p> <p>Jeramy: ETHN taskforce/degree requirement, taskforce already moving forward and making progress</p> <p>Jessica: Equity audits – able to talk with Jesse, part of conversation was around if we pull a group of people together, what kind of support/influence do they have to make this actually happen?</p> <p>Jeramy: Forgot to mention in president’s report, mention it now re: clarification on anti-racist chancellor’s council. Group that is meeting now is essentially the same type of group we were on originally – new group has same task that we had (framework, tasks). Once that is established, then can look at working on specific tasks. Say that bc then perhaps Equity Audits falls better into that area</p> <p>Jessica: Jesse and I both concluded that we would need to have the same framework to work from to be able to do that work. I just don’t want that group to come up with a separate framework – don’t want to replicate the work, so just wanted some clarity around where those intersect. Equity audit group goal is to audit just Academic Senate?</p> <p>Kate: I see it as bigger than that, though yes, necessary to do our own AS equity audit of 10+1 issues</p> <p>Diana: Echo what others are saying – starting local anti-racism taskforce, and equity audits/making sure that we apply equity framework to the college is one of their main scopes, but just need to work with college and district on that</p> <p>Jeramy: I think it makes sense to wait until district taskforce finishes their work and are up and running, then can circle back</p> <p>David E: we are hoping the district establishes an equity framework, which we can then apply to 10+1</p> <p>Jeramy: Work with AFT on short and long term PD policies – any progress?</p> <p>David E: I will email AFT to try and get that in motion, hopefully we can get progress in the spring, but will try to get something at least set up.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Jeramy: what we need from everyone is a short blurb to solicit faculty participation so that we can replicate TTL model to get folks who are interested in participating, though we can also intentionally tap people on the shoulder. For ex, Vince Chandler with faculty hiring</p> <p>Jeramy: DEAC is taking on CVC-OEI</p> <p>Nick: We are working on integrating our systems to export our WebSchedule to be able to integrate with CVC – some of the stuff in our system has html embedded, and needs to be cleaned up before being able to upload to CVC</p> <p>Kate: By-laws – Peter and I sketched out something and sent it to Jeramy.</p> <p>Peter (chat): To revise DAS By Laws in order to increase organizational clarity; Diversify representation/participation in faculty governance; greater Adjunct Faculty representation.</p> <p>Kate: We are trying to focus on organizational clarity, and in doing that, our second goal is to diversify representation and participation in participatory governance at the district level, and adjunct involvement. Reviewing, comparing, contrasting current DAS and college by-laws, draft changes. Would like 4 members, 1 from each AS, and immediate past president, sketched out a timeline with goals. Would ask 3 AS presidents to bring this to the senates, since we think not all faculty would be interested in revising AS bylaws, but those who are on AS may be more interested.</p> <p>Jeramy: part of that is making sure we make DEAC and TTL permanent subcommittees. For the next meeting, would be great to have all of the task groups to have short blurb ready to send for all faculty. Any revisions to the faculty evaluation and bylaws revision task group charges?</p> <p>Description: Faculty Evaluation Task Group</p> <p>The scope of this task group is to continue the work of the 2018 DAS evaluations task group and to continue to revise the faculty evaluation procedures and forms in order to promote educational equity and social justice for both our students and colleagues. Responsibilities of task group members will include conducting research on best practices in equitable evaluation processes, collaborating with other members of the task group to revise the procedures and forms, and soliciting feedback from colleagues on draft documents. This Task Group will consist of four faculty (two instructional, one librarian, and one counselor), one AFT representative, one administrator, and one student. The</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>target completion is May 2021, and all evaluations revisions will be given to the AFT for use in negotiations.</p> <p>Jeramy: Vote on those 2 items</p> <p>Motion passes</p> <p>Jeramy: Leigh Anne, Arielle, Diana – if you could get someone from your senates to work with Pete and Kate on by-laws revisions</p>	
4.2	Policies on Full-time Temporary Faculty	All	50	<p>Look at Ed Code for full-time temporary faculty; discuss and revise policies governing the hiring and evaluations of full-time temporary faculty</p> <p>Jeramy: 2 parts of ed code I want us to talk more specifically about. I am becoming more and more moved to interpret and abide by ed code completely, which means that we would only have FT temp faculty for higher enrollment of students during sem/qtr, faculty leave, or long term illness.</p> <p>David E: I'm curious if you have floated it by anyone at the district level – if they would accept that reading, that would impact other things we have developed</p> <p>Jeramy: this document was developed by me, David Feune, and Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza (district appointee). A lot of faculty have concerns around FT temp faculty in general – I have asked district counsel to interpret this since January, and DAS is not a priority for them. Admin probably has a different reading than we do, which is why I would like a lawyer to interpret this. They believe grants are exempted from this, and we have had FT Temp faculty for years,</p> <p>David E: For ex, should we include language like 'if it's interpreted that grant-funded positions are exempted from this, then...</p> <p>Jeramy: so put some kind of contingency?</p> <p>David: recommending that if grant-funded positions fall outside of this, we then recommend this kind of procedure</p> <p>Leigh Anne: Grant funded is just the funding source, but nothing defines it as a different kind of faculty – we can check if CFT has different language around that, but don't think so. Stay aware of looking at reasons why FT Temp are hired; second, cases where you hire FT Temp faculty to write curriculum/help with building program. Probably want to talk with VPIs and VPSSs about this, show you where it is in ed code for doing this, and continuing to do this – see where it goes from there, maybe a statement to the board about where to go from here</p>	Discussion

				<p>Jeremy: I can reach out to Mike and admin to put the ball in their court</p> <p>Peter: I do think ed code is quite clear, should advocate for the district that they follow it – we are doing a disservice to some of our faculty by trying to massage hiring and evaluation procedures, etc. Esp know counseling faculty that are impacted</p> <p>Arielle: Non-instructional faculty are disproportionately impacted by this</p> <p>Jeremy: I think it is important to have hiring and evaluation conversation bc there are impacted by this. We have counselors at CSM who have been in these positions for 3 years, but I think it's unfair for them to serve an entire tenure-track duration and still have them start at Contract II, but not sure it makes sense to grant them tenure</p> <p>Jessica: going back to idea of grant funded, I get caught on #3 – positions have to go through local prioritization process for approval. I don't think I've ever seen a grant-funded position go through prioritization process, so that may be in conflict with what is written here. Grant-funded positions should go through the same prioritization process for the purpose of transparency</p> <p>Jeremy: emergency piece to 'prevent stoppage of district business' only covers 20 days</p> <p>Jessica: emergency is what bypasses transparent process, and allows it to be prioritized and hired by that process</p> <p>Jeremy: but ed code says that emergency hires can only work for 20 days, not a semester or a year</p> <p>Peter: how we would give credit for 'time served' – I reiterate that I think ed code is being abused, any attempt that we make to alter systems around that further supports that system. I advocate for a zero cooperation stance – anyone hired outside that mandate should be put on tenure track and get credit for time served in the district. Trying to repair abuse of hiring done under auspices of FT Temp</p> <p>Jeremy: only clinical nursing is exempted from 2 semester limit – is anyone getting a different reading from that</p> <p>Nick: it's basically a 'try before you buy' policy, investing less in faculty going forward</p> <p>Jeremy: I will do what Leigh Anne suggested and go to admin and have them justify why they need these positions.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Still need hiring procedure and evaluation procedure for FT temp faculty</p> <p>Kate: can you help me with #6 – grant funded position shall not exceed 2 years and first phrase</p> <p>Jeremy: that needs to be changed to 1 year</p> <p>Kate: grant piece should be in document or there is no exception for grant-funded</p> <p>Jeremy: there is no ed code to go off of</p> <p>Kate: we have a lot of grants, so if it doesn't get described somewhere, contributing to problematic state of faculty who have their position fully or partially from a grant</p> <p>Jeremy: I don't think we should make exceptions for grants – Paul Rueckhaus, for ex, was in a grant funded position for 7 years, which is awful</p> <p>Jeremy: adjunct teacher w grant coordinator position</p> <p>Kate: do we exclude FT faculty from doing the teaching?</p> <p>Nick: who is doing the hiring – grant is hiring, or college is hiring? Shouldn't be a separate job classification, to hire someone under an expiration, new things that you're starting, that is the college starting them, hiring people, same as hiring someone else</p> <p>Kate: gets tricky with the idea of writing curriculum so new curriculum can be taught, who write curriculum if there are no faculty...</p> <p>Jeremy: adjuncts and discipline experts</p> <p>Kate: new program w admin writing curriculum because there are no faculty</p> <p>Jeremy: I think it makes sense to take out the grant stuff for now</p> <p>Sarah: Counseling at Canada – some of my colleagues have been temp for years, support eliminating it because it</p> <p>Jeremy: Promise counselors are NOT grant funded – that money is coming from the district, and calling it grant funded feels like serious money laundering</p> <p>Leigh Anne: it gets abused in areas of 'high surged need' like in counseling – obscures the need to staff those areas, counseling is huge and can't be equity focused if you only</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>contribute small amount of resources to counseling. I would be for eliminating the whole reference to grants. I want to caution you to take an approach that tries to understand the need for this – what we’re talking about for the creation of new programs, this is often used for that because past deans have told me that part of the incentive is that they don’t have to go through FTEF process, may mean less innovation and speed with developing new programs. Need discussion on how to make outcome possible</p> <p>Jeramy: creation of new programs is under curriculum committee right</p> <p>Leigh Anne: curriculum is not always first stop</p> <p>Jessica: it should be coming from faculty who are wanting to start new program, but if dean/admin have idea should talk w faculty, and if faculty support it, they can bring forward. CAN is much better at putting this in curriculum process, but need conversation of why we are creating this – or we get into problem guided pathways was trying to prevent, by not having cohesive curriculum. I know we have also gone outside and hired folks to write curriculum, then we’re done with them</p> <p>Jeramy: what do we want to do about #3 – prioritization process? Some kind of approval process through the senates?</p> <p>Leigh Anne: you will get push back on that because FTEF process is about fund 1 – I don’t think I’ve ever seen other positions go through that aren’t fund 1. I don’t know how feasible that is. If we are putting restrictions on length of time folks can serve, this may not be a help</p> <p>David: argument for including it, even if grant funded, talking about FT faculty person, so senate purview. Re: challenges, not as nice a process, but better reflects long-term prospects if we say 1 person can write and teach curriculum, then after than can be broken up among multiple adjuncts and reflect that it hasn’t been prioritized under fund 1. At CAN, had someone who wanted to write curriculum but also guaranteed to be hired as FT, which we can’t do. At the end of the day, pain in the front may be better in terms of outcomes at the back end</p> <p>Peter: I think a lot of our problems in the district are just not enough faculty. By us doing this work, we are giving district another change to not hire faculty. Why do we always need to hire temp personnel under grants, when we could hire faculty and release them? Reiterate that we should do the ‘dirty work’ of trying to figure out how we can make this work, we are further perpetuating the problem.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Arielle: make sure to consider implications for non-instructional faculty, as most of the FT temp are non-instructional and don't deal with curricular development, but onus of running a program is on them</p> <p>Jeremy: thoughts on hiring process – FT process twice or adjunct process then FT? Loophole that if hiring needs to be done within 10/14 days before the start of the semester, can do hiring on their own</p> <p>Diana: issue with adjunct process for hiring is that FT temp positions don't go out for everyone – dean just appoints someone (especially with other adjuncts who aren't given the opportunity to apply). I don't think these positions should go through the same process as for tenured positions, but should be more than adjunct process</p> <p>Jeremy: FT positions are a large process, and adjuncts look at pool and call folks in for an interview</p> <p>Jessica: I would like to believe that if you made it a more complicated process, you wouldn't see it as often</p> <p>Jeremy: one of the reasons we have this was because of illness, but not all depts. have the opportunity to have a ready pool to pull from</p> <p>Sarah: 2 diff processes – emergency hire for sudden leave of absence, and person will be in that position for 1-2 semesters, more suited to adjunct process. If we are talking about something longer through, that person will be much more integral to depts., and I can't envision having a quick process because they will be doing so much and be so integrated into the depts..</p> <p>David: I drafted that we need to cover the grant portion, drafted a way of possibly trying to do that. There may be real reasons for a dean moving quickly for hiring on a grant, but key piece there is when it becomes official, implementation, etc (Chat text): Expand emergency hire to include a grant that becomes available only within 10 days of a semester. If access to the grant was known before 10 days of beginning of semester, then should follow normal hire process unless Academic Senate is unable to find faculty to serve</p> <p>Jeremy: Grants have to be board approved first. I think we have to do another discussion on grants. What I'm hearing is that we want a quicker process for emergency hires, but want FT procedure for other positions? Do we want to take out 4A (dean and at least 1 discipline expert) or permanent</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>process (dean and 3 discipline experts)? May be challenging for small depts. I may just take it out</p> <p>Leigh Anne: Senate has to approve hiring committees – maybe just insert language around senate approving committee. If they do garner a year of experience, should come with some senate oversight</p> <p>Jessica: if these are a. I found out we are going to have a hire number of promise students next year, or emergency/leave, I don't think there is time to go through prioritization process. But I do want senate to know/be more aware about these – should have to report out to larger campus in some way; more what I am looking for than prioritization process</p> <p>Jeremy: I will take it out for now, then after I speak with Mike and admin about new program justification</p> <p>Arielle: Also want to address what to do with hires over summer</p> <p>Jeremy: Evaluation – should that happen in first semester?</p> <p>Sarah A: at CAN, we did have FT temp go through evaluation in the first year, but in spring.</p> <p>Jeremy: anyone thing we should do adjunct process? No, ok.</p> <p>Arielle: advocate to allow for FT temp to be evaluated in the whole first year</p> <p>Jeremy: break of service – if you are not hired in the following year of FT temp service, can't claim service</p> <p>Jeremy: let me clean up document, but need to move on this ASAP</p> <p>Leigh Anne (chat): Other things that administration will push back with (so be prepared): Industries that wax and wane and thus create liability for hiring a FT person if the industry goes away and that person needs to be reassigned. Industries where teaching is not lucrative enough compared with the industry pay scale, so it's not possible to get someone FT because they keep leaving the position (i.e. Respiratory Therapy at Skyline)</p> <p>Kate: we want to make sure to articulate all of this so that it doesn't end up with faculty being exploited</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

5. Final Announcements and Adjournment – 5 minutes

	Item	Presenter	Time	Details	Description
4.1	Announcements	All	5		information
4.2				Select note-takers: 10/26: Arielle Smith 11/9: Jesse Raskin 11/23: Pete von Bleichert	information
4.3	Adjournment	Wallace	4:36		action

2020-21 District Academic Senate Goals

1. Work with administrative and student leaders to scrutinize and revise the faculty hiring policies and procedures in order to promote equitable hiring practices and to diversify the District's professoriate
2. Work with the administration, students, and AFT to revise the faculty evaluation procedures in order to promote equity and justice for our students and colleagues
3. Develop and implement equity audits for policies and procedures that fall under the 10+1
4. Research a compressed academic calendar
5. Develop a District-wide ethnic studies degree requirement for local Associate's degrees
6. Implement a process for aligning curriculum across the District
7. Continue to support faculty in responding to academic and professional matters in the current pandemic
8. Work with the AFT to revise the short- and long-term professional development policies and processes
9. Undergo the application process for joining the California Virtual Campus (CVC-OEI)
10. Evaluate and revise the by-laws