### Exec Officers

**2018-2019**
- Kate Williams Browne: President
- Jesse Raskin: Vice President
- Jing Folsom: Secretary
- Mustafa Popal: Treasurer
- Leigh Anne Shaw: Past President

### Non-voting members

- **Committee Chairs**
  - Jessica Hurless: Curriculum
  - Nathan Jones: Educational Policy Chair
  - Rika Yonemura-Fabian: Professional Personnel Chair

### Ex-Officio Representatives

- Sherrie Prasad/Michelle Haggar: Classified Senate
- Bianca Rowden-Quince: AFT Rep
- Sara Benchohra: ASSC Rep
- Courtney Mogg: GuidedPathways/DesignTeam Liaison
- Bianca Rowden-Quince: OER Liaison

### Representatives

- **Divisions**
  - Bianca Rowden-Quince: ASLT
  - Dick Claire/Dan Ming: BEPP
  - Courtney Mogg/Richard Torres: Counseling
  - Jarrod Feiner/Erinn Struss: Language Arts
  - Amber Steele: KAD
  - Bridget Fischer/Lisa Cresson: SSCA
  - Jing Folsom/Carla Grandy: SMT

- **Groups**
  - Ronda Wimmer: CTE Liaison
  - Barbara Corzonkoff/Lisa Cresson: Adjunct Senators

### Opening Procedures [2:10]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action/ Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to order</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quorum is 7/13 voting members: 1 vote/each GC member, 1 vote/each Division and each Group</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll/Introductions</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Approval of Screening Committee: Physics Instructor- Replacement Nick Langhoff (Engineering, Computer Science, Physics-Faculty), Chair Safiyyah Forbes (Chemistry-Faculty) Adam Windham (Physics, Faculty/now Dean) Lorraine DeMello (STEM MetaMajor Counselor) Ray Hernandez (Dean SMT) Approved.</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of today’s agenda</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M: Mustafa / S: Jarrod Pass unanimously</td>
<td>Action/ Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of previous mtg. minutes</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M: / S: Pass unanimously</td>
<td>Action/ Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timekeeper</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Rika Fabian</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Announcements & Actions [~2:15-2:55]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Info/Action/Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Announcements**          | Browne Steele Popal | 5    | - *Exec-Exec Retreat* will be held May 3, with Admin Team and AS Exec [Officers & Standing Committee Chairs]  
- *All-College Celebration* will be held in 6-202 11:30-1:30 before the final ASenate meeting  
- *AS Student Scholarship* funding approval  
  M: Lisa, S Bianca  
  Pass unanimously  
  Carla Grandy - Director of guided pathways :)  
  Kathryn signed on OEI CTE pathways grant (applying for $500K to expand CTE programs, if we get the grant we would be able to deliver all the courses online by fall 2020 for 5 CTE programs). | Info Action           |
| **Elections Certification** | Raskin Browne Divisions | 5    | *Elections for Academic Senate 2019-2020: Divisions, Adjunct, and CTE Liaison*  
Election Certification: Executive officers all have 2 year terms, all moving into 2nd year commitments. Everyone else, one year so what are results so far?  
  Has you division election been completed?  
  Bianca - no  
  Dan - 2 new senators  
  Language Arts - same senators continuing  
  Amber will be continuing  
  Social Sciences - Bridget and Jennifer Merrill (John Ulloa stepping down)  
  CTE Liaison - election is ongoing  
  Adjunct Senators - election ongoing  
  Motion to certify the elections as they stand right now: Motion passed | Action |
| **Awards & Recognitions**  | Fabian Yonamura     | 5    | *Meyer Teaching Award* nominations  
Meyer teaching award – *Nick Langhoff*  
Motion Passed and approved  

*Faculty Marshall[s]* selection  
Faculty Marshall - (usually comes from the retirees) Christine Roumbanis  
Former Faculty Jim Bowsher in English (to be co-marshalls)  
Motion Passed and approved | Discussion |
| **Skyline President process** | Galatolo            | 15   | Chancellor Galatolo will discuss Interim President appointment, introduction to ASenate & College, and plans for permanent hire  
Chancellor - Interim President Dr. Jannett Jackson to begin 7/1/19  
**TIMELINE:**  
  - Appointed Interim: Dr. Jannett Jackson  
  - Fall talk - Knowledge, Skills, Abilities  
  - Oct/Nov. form committee (chaired by AS president or appointee) and a District College President (Michael Claire | Discussion |
(CSM ) or Jamillah Moore ). Will then develop the knowledge, skills, and attributes (KSA) for the position.

- Send out job description closing Jan/ Feb.
- Interviews
- Possible open forums Feb/ April
- Make Recommendation to the Board
- Person starts 7/1

QUESTIONS:
1. How large is the committee?
   **Answer:** Usually 12-18 people. The goal is to make sure we have a diverse committee that is gender balanced. Chaired by AS and one of the college presidents.

2. What is best timing to get most robust pool?
   **Answer:** This timeline will give us the biggest pool. “There is no season when it comes to Skyline College because the compensation is the best in the state and the opportunities are the best”.

3. Why did you pick this person and what about the issues that are presented with this person? First issue: Jackson received a vote of no confidence from the Chabot Academic and Faculty Senate in November.
   **Answer:** As chancellor, my job is to choose the right candidate to meet and support the college culture. Should we name our colleges Sanctuary Colleges - this was a hold up. Jackson was unwilling to have sanctuary college and the faculty at Chabot voted no confidence. Skyline College is not a sanctuary college, we have done lots of initiatives to support student success.
   Second issue: Budget problems. Jackson had a conflict with one person who over spent their budget.

Running overtime, there is still questions. Leigh Shaw: motion to extend discussion 10 minutes, APPROVED.

Questions: One of the several issues with the new candidate, sanctuary is one of those. Spoke with the president of Chabot, letter of concern, participatory government is important for our campus culture, make sure the new candidate understand our culture.

**Answer:** She is quite engaging and she can be a good leader.

**Comments from Mustafa:** Dr. Jannett Jackson was my president when I was a part-time faculty at Alameda College, I felt the positive support from her and her strong leadership.

Question: concerns about Dr. Jannett Jackson’s leadership. Wants good leadership track record.

**Answer:** send email to me (Galatolo), absolutely confidential. Suggestion to all: get to know the candidate at all college events. Do you (Academic Senate) want Dr. Jannett Jackson here next meeting? YES!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE theme update</th>
<th>Popal Grandy Hurless</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Design team will present the GE Theme proposal for first report to ASenate sharie</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening Committee:</td>
<td>Escobar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kim Davalos – Promise Counselor</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promise Scholar Counselor

Melanie Espinueva – EOPS Counselor
Lucy Jovel – Transfer Center Counselor & Coordinator
Ellen Murray – Promise Scholars Program Director
Luis Escobar --- Dean of
Escobar can’t make to the meeting, so Ellen Murray present the committee.
Two positions was grant-funded. One is one academic year, another one is for two years.
Question: There is need to have more promise scholar counselors as college re-design, why not make full time positions?
Answer: It didn’t get through for full time positions request, but grant funding is available at the moment.
Question: This is counselor position, why the chair isn’t a faculty?
Answer: will bring this issue back and change Melanie Espinueva as the chair for this committee.
Motion to pass the committee:
M: Lisa with amendment: The committee will be chaired by faculty, Melanie Espinueva
S: Mustafa
No oppose, no abstention, Pass unanimously.

Student-Ready Resolution

Jones Browne 9
A perfected Resolution is being brought for final discussion and AS approval.
Development of this resolution is one example of collaboration of our faculty, collective efforts of all.
Motion to discussion
M: Dick ; S: Mustafa; Pass unanimously
Discussion:
1. It is long resolution
2. There is no review motion. Answer: it has been reviewed several times, it is the time to approve.
3. Redundancy of profession development, (backside of the resolution), create a funding for PD?
4. Definition of student ready, feel like the definition should be mentioned early in the resolution.
Motion to add two amendments
1. Move student ready definition to very early part of the resolution
2. Remove the Redundancy of PD
M: Dick
S: Mustafa
No oppose, no abstention, Pass unanimously.

Deep Dive Discussion  [~2:55-3:55]  Key Question- Why/What does the ASenate need to know/do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Info/Action/Discussion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Shaw Ruekhaus</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*DAS [Shaw] and AFT [Ruekhaus] will introduce a description of current practices and discussion of modifications. Items included will be all 3 Colleges current processes and structures, Article 13, CTTL, College re-design. Current ideas & concerns will be discussed.*

District AS president Leigh Shaw and AFT president Paul Ruekhaus co-presented professional development. The PowerPoint slides is on AS website under material named “Professional development in SMCCCD 2019”

The PD process in three campus is different. Only CSM has a PD process visualized and implemented that was in compliance with the contract.

Skyline College has administration injected into PD process. The PD committee should have the bulk of decision making authority. The bargaining team received a counter proposal from the district, which is published in the advocate as well.

A change to the composition of PD committees at each campus to 3 Senate appointees and 3 administrative appointees.

“The original proposal by AFT is An increase from 1% to 2% to cover sabbaticals and long-term (Note: both CSM and Can have exhausted PD funding for the remainder of the year until the allocation in October 2019.) However, it was rejected by District. Currently, we have 3 faculty from AFT and 1 faculty from Senate and 2 administrators. So we have more faculty in the committee right now.

Question: even with the structure now (more faculty than administrator), I think we should have more Senate folks than AFT folks, particularly with 10+1.

Answer: We’ll take this idea back to the bargaining team.

Comment: When the contract started 1980s, all faculty in the committee whether you are AFT or not. I feel strongly about that, more faculty should be in the committee.

All faculty are in the bargaining unit, but not all faculty is AFT member.

Comment: position of the law, this is a committee of the AS, so all the members in the committee should be appointed by the AS in California code regulation.

Does California code of regulation say how many administrators should be in the committee?

It doesn’t. It only says that all members should be appointed by AS.

Comment: We’re missing the point, the district proposal is increasing the number of administrator and decreasing the number of faculty. In district proposal, the fact is the faculty isn’t going to be the majority in PD committee.

Comment: AS is the voice of faculty in terms of teaching and learning. In terms of contract, it is the AFT union. AS is the appointing body.

Comment: I have to add on to this. It has to be agreed upon by all three colleges. Based on the language, we could choose to do something else than the other colleagues. We must come up AT Circle to see other colleges feel very strongly about AFT being able to appointing the people to the committee. We need to consider that
because at some point all of us need to come to the consent on what it says in the contract.

Question: What ratio would be comfortable with faculty vs Administrator?

We haven’t had administrator on the committee at Skyline since January. So at the moment, skyline college PD committee is all faculty.

Question: What is the authority of 10+1? Skyline College AS has three standing committees.

Ed Policy committee: majority are faculty, representative from administrator. Curriculum committee: only faculty can vote. There are support staff, they can’t vote. It is confusing that if Professional development committee is an independent standing committee.

Presenter proposed some ideas to move on:

1. What is advantage of being in the AS committee? It is a lot of work being in AS committee. Is there any release time to do such as reviewing the application?

Comments: 1. From equity point of view, how to make this as equitable as possible across other committee members if PD committee get release time? Some committee has heavier weight than other committee such as review application or curriculum.

2. Our problem is process related not personal related. Our discussion isn’t related to our question.

3. Concerns about the sabbatical pays coming out from the same place for profession development for other faculty, it doesn’t seem equitable. Other concerns such as if adjunct faculty wants to representing, to be in the committee, it is complete volunteer based right now, adjunct faculty time and efforts are not compensated, which limits the adjunct faculty representation in those committee.

4. Some adjunct faculty benefited from PD and able to move on as full time.

5. Suggestion to the district to take consideration of our adjunct faculty also is contributing to committee. Need resource to be available to support all faculty to be student ready.

AFT rep address some of those concerns: AFT is trying to address the compensation for adjunct faculty serving on committee through workload issue. One of the points in our proposal is adjunct faculty should be paid for the admin work. PD committee should be faculty representation, no matter from AFT or Senate, faculty should decide how to use the money for PD.

Sabbaticals: AFT and AS work together in the updated proposal, instead increasing from 1% to 2%, using 1% for short term, 1% for sabbaticals. Still ongoing discussion.

Question: Do you have recommendation as to faculty counter proposal and our faculty can think about? What would happen if we reject this counter proposal? What’s next? It is to be negotiated over. We didn’t mention any compensation yet. Now we need to discuss this with three colleges AS and then response to this.
Question: Across our three colleges, is PD committee outside of the three colleges AS?
Answer: don’t have answer for that.

Question for later: When we get to the point, which committee should the AFT hold? Which committee should Academic Senate hold?

### Final Announcements and Adjournment [~3:55-4:00]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action/ Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjourment</td>
<td>Browne</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M: Dick / S: Dan</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Meeting Th 5/16/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes submitted by: Jing Folsom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome new Senators,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro Interim President,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation Equity update,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPI update.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>