Opening Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action/ Info /Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to order</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jesse Call to order at 2:15 pm</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Roll/Introductions            | Secretary | 1    | Quorum is 7/13 voting members: 1 vote/each GC member, 1 vote/each Division and each Group  
We have quorum 9/13  
Present: Jesse Raskin, Jing Folsom, Mustafa Popal, Nathan Jones, Rika Fabian [late], Bianca Rowden-Quince, Courtney Mogg, Dick Claire, Dan Ming, Richard Torres, Jarrod Feiner, Erinn Struss, Amber Steele, Bridget Fischer, Lisa Cresson, Carla Grandy, Ronda Wimmer, Barbara Corzonkoff, Melissa Matthews  
Absent: Kate Browne, Leigh Anne Shaw, Jessica Hurless, Sherrie Prasad, Michelle Haggar, Michelle Chee, | Procedure                |
| Consent agenda                | President | 1    | ASLT Ed Policy Committee change: to Daniel Ng, Library Faculty  
AS accept Daniel Ng as new member. No discussion.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Action/ Materials        |
| Adoption of today’s agenda    | President | 1    | Motion on accept today’s agenda, passes unanimously  
M: Erinn /S: Bianca                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Action/ Materials        |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timekeeper</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of previous</td>
<td>Motion on adoption of previous meeting minutes,</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting minutes</td>
<td>Passes unanimously</td>
<td>Erinn</td>
<td>from the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>M: Nathan /S: Jarrod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timekeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Senate Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 705</th>
<th>Feiner</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Introduction of AB 705

Jarrod Feiner (English instructor) and Melissa Matthews (DRC) co-presenters.

AB 705 is a bill signed by the Governor on October 13, 2017 that took effect on January 1, 2018. The bill requires that a community college district or college maximize the probability that a student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in English and math within a one-year timeframe and use, in the placement of students into English and math courses, one or more of the following: high school coursework, high school grades, and high school grade point average.

This bill works great for 95% of our students. 5% students don’t fit in this AB705 structure. They might have LD or other types of disability, so the accelerated model doesn’t work for them. Other students without a disability might want some English classes below the transfer level to help them prepare for college level English. And most high schools don’t have the technology we have, so the students coming from high schools need time to master those skills when taking a pre-transfer level class.

Removing pre-transfer course[s] as a stepping stone causes huge problem for our students. These students are “highly unlikely to succeed,” for in the fall 2019 there will be no pre-transfer level class offered.

The same problem exists in Math.
Dick: I teach at Canada college, 40% of the students need to take Algebra I and Algebra II, those are non-transferable courses. Those students are affected by AB 705 as well.

The next question is: if those students don’t pass the transfer level classes, where do they go? One place is the adult school, but adult school doesn’t have the resource to support these students with disability at all. From equity frame of work, this is not the solution. It is not right that if our students need the extra time to learn, we have no option for them.

Courtney Mogg: Is there a discussion about supplement English and math courses, such as Math 200 with Math 820?
Jarrod: Yes, it has been discussed but right now we don’t have the money to help them go through, to support the students. The idea is we have Supplemental instructors who are embedded tutors, the Learning Center and technology & the resources, even with all the support we have, still going to take a lot of time.
Technically, the students can take the course three times, but they only have one year to get through, there is a mismatch of AB 705 and the repeatability policy, 3 times takes year and half.

Melissa: Showed a Slide illustrating that our students succeed more if the students were placed in Eng 105 level

The position of California Community College Chancellor’s office, there is no students fall into the “highly unlikely to succeed” category. In a conference, how to determine the “highly unlikely to succeed” students, do we do that by meeting the students, understanding their disability, background, where they are, individually making that determination. The answer is no, it is based on the throughput number, kind of generated as afterthought. They didn’t segregate the data to see if the students with ADHD, how do they perform, they lump all of them together, they will be fine, give them accommodation. The conference created in three ranges based on GPA. The high school GPA is not reflective because there are lots of modifications.

Dan: DRC does help my students. They are succeeding with all the support.

Melissa: Is there enough available funding to support the service?

Dick: Suggestion to move this issue up to district AS meeting and to the California AS levels.

Erinn: Looked at the Americans with Disabilities Act, we may violate some laws here. College may get sued due to lack of service. Legal liability concern.

Melissa: We’re trying to save Eng 846, one level below at this point. Just need one or two section.

Jing: How to place the students in the pre-transfer courses?

Melissa: Counselors help to place, using multiple measures and self-placement to determine which one is better for them. Right now there is no option for them.

### Professional Development: Article 13

**Fabian 30**

Discussion about faculty professional development funding, committee, and processes

Motion to postpone this discussion due to the absence of Rika Fabian.

M: Jesse, S:Lisa
Rika arrived at 3 pm.

Rika, Bianca and Paul: Article 13 impact.
Purpose of this meeting is to start the conversation about Article 13 professional development policies, procedures and committee structure. how to support.

In December, there will be a joint AFT and District AS meeting on professional development. That will be a time when some of the insights, information and discussions that’s happening, if there is any changes, recommendation to be made to article 13, also would happen during negotiation.

Context to local ASenate: give an Introduction to connect some of the dots about what the purpose of that meeting
will be and get local AS input. Asked question: if there is a conference you really want to go, what are the steps that you need to take? Floor answer about the application sequence: find the form, fill out the form, give to the dean, then to the VPI and then to the committee. Basically, we are not sure about the process. How long we have to fill out the form and how long the dean has to submit the form.

Paul: Dean has 5 school days to submit, then what happens, Who makes the decision? Why it got denied?

Floor: Denial of the application due to the lack of information about the meeting, lack of sufficient responses of dissemination of the professional development event to colleagues.

Bianca: The denial is from? Mustafa: VPI.

Nathan: The application may lack of meal plan, description of the conference.

Paul: What make sense about the process, what are some gaps?

Bridget: What is the process after the dean?

Bianca: Supposed to go to VPI, but doesn’t need to go to the VPI.

Barbara: VPI says yes or no? Or the committee decide?

Rika: Let’s look at the documents I sent out early. Three files, article 13, budget, application process.

Paul: The Article 13 funds come from the Equivalent of 1% of pay of full time tenured faculty and 3rd.4th tenure tracked faculty members to the pot. And it comes back out to each campus proportionally according to the number of FTEF. It is a match from the district, it is not something come out from your check. The funds are available to all faculty. Those are dedicated funds from the district. Your request of professional development should be made independently regardless of other things.

The Article 13 committee. The seats of the committee, who can sit in the committee? For each campus 4 faculty members, 2 administers. The reason for faculty out number of administers because it is part of district money for us, our learning and development, we should be able to judge our development by our peers.

Fabian: Each campus utilizes the money: CSM: 81%, CAN: 83%, SKY: 40%. This indicates that we have internal problems that block the money flow. We don’t know yet the source[s] of the problem- maybe not enough people applied for the money, not many adjunct faculty know about this funds, or got stuck in the procedures, or missing other things.

Jing and Ronda: Applied, but never got approved.

Rika: The process in place at Skyline college right now is:

1. Faculty member fills out application,
2. Application goes to the dean,
3. Dean approves & forwards to ASLT division,
4. ASLT approves & forwards to the VPI,
5. VPI approves and forwards to Faculty PD Committee [FPD],
6. **FPD approves & forwards application results to ASLT division**, 
7. **College president gives final review.** 
8. **Final signed applications back to ASLT division who contacts the Faculty member.**

According to the contract: VPI should not to be in the picture and actually Dean is not specified as the gatekeeper. The application should go to the Dean and then to the committee. The contract article 13.11.4 states: The Committee will submit a prioritized list of projects to the President of the college who will be responsible for granting final approval after consultation with the appropriate Dean. Such approval shall be granted or denied within 15 school days of receipt after all of the project documentation has been submitted. But in reality, Dean is acting as first gatekeeper which make sense because he/she needs to consider a substitution when that faculty is going away. Dean sometimes does judge, returning/deny the application. The role of Dean in the application process is not clear in the contract, it only says review the application and forward it.

Dick: is the process the same cross the district? 
No. This is Skyline flow chart. These two AS are collecting the information about how each can have very different selection process. CSM application, made it clear that Dean’s approval is only based on his/her ability to find a substitution not based on content of the application. There are different places that we can fix the process to avoid the administrators have excessive power

Mustafa: It is very interesting to find out , look at the [10+1] cards, number 8 Policies for faculty professional development activities, who gets to determine the policy, local level, if so, could we write a policy say, we don’t need to talk to such and such.

Bianca: The money should be used for professional development. The money does roll over each year. We need support from AS to use those money.

Dick: District approved the [10+1] finally, we should be the gatekeeper for this process. CAN has less steps in the process. Skyline has more steps in the process.

Paul: Article 13.11 selection process, make it simple.

Erinn: How to share with the peer/campus about the professional development? This is the question in all campus application.

Bridget: Committee has administrator, it seems redundancy in the process.

Lisa: Article 13-12, language is too loose,

Bianca: Need to spend time to draft revised policy ASAP, encourage faculty to use the money. Remove VPI and VPSS office from the process?

Right now, it is easier for full time to get the funds than part time, it is not right. The funding is available for all faculty members.

It is extremely concerning leaving money on the table, we’d like to do can separate out extended leave so that we can guarantee the sabbatical, maybe a year or two
We want that to be in separate pot. We are not competing.
Jesse: Continue discussion about professional development. Email me if you are interested in being a committee member to discuss this.

### Reports, Updates, Business: Standing Agenda Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action/ Info /Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Ready College</td>
<td>Cresson, Fischer, Popal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Next Steps: Constituent Discussions and Survey Mustafa: engage our division to the survey of student ready college concept. Lisa: what is your role as division rep? How your behavior is going to look at AS? Jog down what’s your role on the note card? Bridget: engaging motivate Amber: vet issues Erin: create and craft policy [10+1] Bianca: engagement Ronda: clarify policy information Rika: report what the committee doing, alignment Mustafa: discussion about the hiring process, potentially can be no hiring, personal can shift from one campus to another campus Lisa: part time faculty, go to division meeting. Care about who is the dean. There is no clear way, solution. Mustafa: Approach to organizing the inquiry • Division level discussion (What is your thought? Collect all the info and compile the info, make sure all the voice heard) • Senate level discussion Strategic inclusivity • Create proposal draft • Share with active members of division for revised draft • Share with division as a whole to finalize proposal Administration might act as point of contact What the approach hopes to achieve: -Leverage the power in the spaces you are in -Goals: to develop comfort, confidence and motivation amongst members of your division and senate -Actively engage so faculty is full participants in college governance.</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 40
Jesse: We create the definition of student ready college. We have a survey, there is no background about the survey. Contact the division dean to have some time to introduce the survey to our colleagues.

Dick: Only one division meeting left in this semester, so Spring semester (Feb or March) is better time to do the survey in the division meeting. Propose about 30 minutes in the division meeting.

Executive Council Reports

Why/What does the Academic Senate need to know/do?

Executive Council
- CGC: report postponed
- ASCCC: report postponed
- DAS[10/8] Prof. Dev

Jesse waive the reports.

Treasurer’s Report: Membership
Mustafa: Last Friday, deposited the money from $25 deduction from the paycheck. District takes the money out of the paycheck and then write a check to AS. AS has business saving’s account. AS can write two checks a year without any fees, any check after that is $1 per check. No monthly fees. Old bank has been bought by another bank. Our account is the same the old one. We went from first national bank to tri county bank. Next report will happen after AS write a check for scholarships.

Standing Committee Reports
- Curriculum [10/24]
Carla reported on behalf of Jessica, the curriculum committee. The committee continues to review and approve the curriculum, majority being course modification for comprehensive program review. Committee has engaged in conversations around AB 705 and applications to curriculum, both inside and outside discipline. The committee also discussed placing courses into disciplines; some faculty has involved in this activity. Assigning courses to disciplines, as soon as the process has been determined and approved, the committee will present to the AS.

Jesse: The importance of assigning courses to the disciplines is it could change who is qualified to teach a course. We could have more interdisciplinary courses.

Ronda: It could also has issues with CTE staff. CTE faculty can be consulted with courses may not fall into the category because there is tend to be assumption that faculty member interpret differently vs what those courses are, this will affect the students learning, like two ships pass and they are disconnected. It needs to be addressed how this is going, how this is being handled, who is teaching, what courses could be, who they may talk to. Make sure that they are talking to the discipline expert. In my program, they are not talking to the discipline expert and the decision made by that are inaccurate. We need to make sure this is not happen in others.

- Professional Personnel- Exemplary Award, Hayward Award Rika isn’t here yet
### Governance Committee Reports [10+1 related]:
- Accreditation, ACED, CSI/College Success, FTEF, Outreach, PD, SEEED, SPARC/IEC, Tech

Jesse, ACED discussion about professional development, The role of CTTL, gathering the feedback from members, summary of meetings. No other reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Reports</th>
<th>Reps</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSC No report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT [10/30]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca: New Advocate came out today, check that out. Two other things: we have AFT office hours on Tuesdays, next is Nov 13. People are coming slowly, the committee are organized to start to catalog things, there are some trends are bubbling out, executive committee meeting at Skyline, Nov 14, 2:15-5 pm, all are welcomed. No need to stay the whole time from 2:15 to 5. Rika and Bianca will send out the message Monday or Tuesday to remind people. Paul: New AFT agenda is out. New negotiation, survey has been sent out, not sure when is the hard day close the survey, please finish the survey. We have 125-130 responses collected, nice number, but not even 20% of the entire faculty cross the district. Bridget: compare with the last survey, this is more response or less. Not sure for that. Typically 15% response. Bianca: if we don’t tell people what we are negotiating for, we don’t want them to assume on our behalf. On Monday when the agenda is out, send out the negotiation issue as well. Paul: There will be a link with it. Lots of responses have been in the negotiation item list. Jesse: When does contract negotiation begins? Paul: They began once we sunshine to and to the board of trustee, which will happen in board of trustee November 14 meeting. Jesse: Summary of the survey to be published?? How AS can support? Paul: There will be calling upon ways to strategize the negotiation ways, we’re going to discuss the findings, identify the issues and prioritize them for Nov and through the Spring semester. We’re working on that structure right now. For How to engage faculty more with negotiation process. There is constant feedback between the team doing the negotiation and the faculty on the ground. We can have faculty from different discipline can come to the meeting to testify. Jesse: How AS can support? Paul: Nice presentation at divisions and disciplines. It is a key to disseminating issues to the folks you work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CTE Report**
Ronda: Andrea Vizenor, Director of Workforce Program, and Ronda will be presenting at December meeting about what changes are happening, checking with all other CTE programs about Guided Pathway impact, what has worked and not. Andrea is going to look at from the Strong Workforce perspective. What happened in the post-secondary schools (closing a lot of programs) is happening
at community colleges. Andrea is giving support to faculty to promote their programs, connect with industry, and create internships, paid internships that the interns can help the faculty get the program up and going. What the formula is, how we get money, much more knowledgeable with a lot of inner working.

Jesse: transparency of the funding from and going? Ronda: There is a blank transparency with overall summary. How it’s broken down. I’m not aware of it but it doesn’t mean it isn’t happening.

Bianca: High school dual enrollment impact? Ronda: Yes, Andrea is much more knowledgeable about Dual Enrollment. That seems to be a big push as well as increasing online offerings. The flip side of that is what if the programs don’t support the high school students because they aren’t high school students oriented. If everything is pushed to the high schools, what about adult learners? No solutions yet. Not well thought and there is disconnection from bottom all the way up to the legislation. This is happening across the nation.

*Classified Senate* joint meeting TBD

*SPARC*-[11/8] CPRs to be held Spring

*Guided pathway* Courtney Mogg no report yet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Reports</th>
<th>Reps</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action/ Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division Senators, Adjunct Representatives, CTE Liaison, Guided Pathways Liaison.</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action/ Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>Raskin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motion of adjournment M: Mustafa / S: Jesse Minutes submitted by: Jing Folsom</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 116