CHABOT COLLEGE ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE
SPECIAL MEETING  
Board Room, Building 200  
Thursday, August 31, 2006 – 2:27 p.m. to 4:25 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES
Submitted by Michael Absher and Chad Mark Glen

Senator Attendance:
Applied Technology & Business (Michael Absher); Counseling (Sally Stickney & Vacant); Health, Physical Education, & Athletics (Nancy Cowan & Ross Shoemaker); Arts & Humanities (Diane Zuliani); Language Arts (Francisco Zermeño & Vacant); Library (Norman Buchwald); Science & Mathematics (Dave Fouquet & Ming Ho); and Social Sciences (Barbara Ogman & Michael Thompson); Adjunct Faculty (Anne Brichacek).

Guests:
Dr. Robert Carlson (College President), Dr. Ron Taylor (Vice President, Academic Services), Norberto Ruiz (Curriculum Chair), and Dr. Carolyn Arnold (Institutional Research and Grants Coordinator).

Presiding Officers:
President Chad Mark Glen, Vice President Michael Absher.

ITEM
1.0 GENERAL FUNCTIONS

1.1 Call to Order: President Glen called the meeting to order at 2:27.

1.2 Approval of the Minutes: On May 18th Ming Ho moved to approve the May 11, 2006 minutes and Francisco Zermeño seconded. The motion carried via e-mail voting. The minutes were reviewed again and there were no revisions.

2.0 REPORTS

2.1 College President: Dr Carlson reported to senate on the Facilities Committee’s work handled this summer. The 3 months work included selecting Architects for several projects, which are moving into the next stage for these projects. He discussed the Planetarium’s renovation and the Student Services Building and the Faculty Building planning progress. Also discussed were the concepts being shaped for buildings 300, 500, 800, and 900. He stated that some of the new equipment has been installed and are now operational in buildings like 1400 Shops. Art Gallery doors are installed. The Performing Arts Center has had some work completed and new offices for faculty will be approximately 100 square feet. He reported the 4 revamped “Demo Classrooms” are being used and laptops have been ordered for use in the rooms. Steve
Piatetski is giving training sessions for the new classroom and has been labeling the components and writing instructions for faculty to better utilize the equipment in these rooms which are all configured differently. Michael Thompson remarked that Steve’s training has been done well. There was some discussion around handling of the evaluations of these new rooms and Dr. Ron Taylor would be the point person for contact concerning Classroom Evaluation and Critique. Ming Ho asked if there is a form available for evaluation. He was told that the form would be forthcoming though Dr. Taylor’s office. Diane Zuliani remarked that the facilities committee had requested the Evaluations be ready when the rooms become available and we are behind what was planned for implementation. Michael Thompson asked about the different information that came out at Convocation and Dr. Carlson answered that the Spring ’07 date as presented at Convocation was an update to earlier information. Faculty should be ready to find a new office by Fall ’07 this is about a 6 month change in the move date. The first project is the Pool Renovation. This is not just another patch job which has been unsuccessful in the past. Chad asked that the PowerPoint presentations from convocation be made available online. President Carlson said he would look into getting that done. Dr. Carlson remarked about bringing Signature Pieces of Art on campus. He will be looking for ideas of “What Art would be appropriate” or “What ideas faculty come up with.” Dr. Carlson will be starting a conversation with Diane Zuliani on this matter. Ming Ho asked Dr. Carlson about enrollments and questioned whether they are up in light of the high number of students Ming sees getting dropped because they don’t show up for the first week of class. Dr. Carlson feels we are still up just a bit, but the numbers are still being adjusted. Early numbers look like about 1% increase in enrollment.

2.2 **ASCC Report:** ASCC V.P. Robert Lu gave a report about the ASCC and their effort to recruit new officers. He said anyone interested should contact either him or ASCC President, Bernadette in Room 2311. Robert is in the ASCC Office on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday after 12:00, noon.

2.3 **Senate President’s Report:** President Glen presented and outlined some of the Senate Goals for this year. He indicated that Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) would be one of the major topics of discussion this Fall. Both Chabot College and Las Positas Senates will be trying to take the colleges to a point of implementing and defining what SLOs are and what they are not. We will be at least formulating a plan to help implement SLOACs. They are referred below as SLOs.

Faculty Senate’s charge is to “Formulate and execute a comprehensive plan for implementing student learning outcomes and learning assessments for courses, programs and degrees.”

Senate will formulate a plan that will incorporate the development of SLOs at the course level this year. The plan should include what measures would be used to
determine if the goals of the plan are being met. The “how” will be determined by us.

A statewide conference on Learning Assessment to be held in San Diego this October we are attending to help us reach our goal of college-wide learning assessment. Conference participants will bring back information and disseminate it on campus. Is anyone able to attend?

On Agenda item 4.1, Dr. Taylor will be speaking on the need for Chabot to incorporate a plan for learning assessment due to the statewide accreditation mandates.

Curriculum Chair, Nolly Ruiz will speak on what SLOs are NOT- and diffuse some of the negative myths surrounding SLOs like academic freedom, and even add some positive effects to the whole SLO process. The FA has already negotiated that the results of SLOs cannot be used to evaluate faculty.

Tom DeWitt will be at our next Senate meeting on September 14th to share information from his sabbatical report which is in your binders and details how other schools are responding to the student assessment mandate.

All colleges must implement SLOs, so this is something we have to do. But, we as faculty must take ownership of it, not administrators or the institution. Many programs in the institution are already assessing student learning outcomes and using them to evaluate student success.

A ROUGH DRAFT PROPOSED TIMELINE:

FALL
1) The Senate would gather together “experts” who are already involved in assessment of student learning to train others.
2) Information on student learning assessment could be dispersed via brown bag talks, in division meetings, etc.
3) Develop a manifesto as to what SLOs are and are not.

SPRING
1) Each division program/discipline would choose at least one course that they would work to develop SLOS for by the end of Spring.
2) Codify implementation plan for courses, programs and degrees.

SLOs are about student success, it’s about evaluating what is working and what is not so instructors can make changes to enhance the student learning and student success. Regardless of the impetus for doing this work, it will be what WE make it and we can make something beneficial for our students.

Chad and Caroline Arnold presented the information about the upcoming Assessment conference which will be held the first Thursday and Friday of October and today is the last day to register. Senators are encouraged to attend. Faculty will be reimbursed for the expenses for the conference. Some seats are
still available contact Carolyn for more details. Michael Absher said he would like to attend.

Chad finished by assigning homework for the senate to review their binders and especially the Sabbatical Leave report from Tom Dewitt about SLOs. Tom Dewitt will discuss the report at the next meeting of Senate.

Michael Absher also pointed out that we would also be continuing our work concerning the A.S. Degree pattern and that an important goal for senate would be to guide the efforts to define what an A.S. Degree is before any possible action concerning G.E. Unit adjustment.

At President Glen’s request two Action items were added to the agenda:
   1) Selection of Senate Vice President and
   2) Selection of a Part Time Faculty Representative for the Senate.

After being moved and seconded, Senators asked why the Part-Time Representative had to be handled each year and President Glen explained that the Senate Constitution defines the membership as a 2 year term for all Division Senators, but the Part-Time Rep is a one year term handled by Senate. Approved Unanimously to add the items as 3.2 and 3.3 to the agenda and take the actions immediately.

2.4 Public Comments: There were no public comments.

3.0 ACTION ITEMS

3.1 Board Policy 2260—Political Activity: This item was tabled until the September 14th, 2006.

3.2 Nominations for Vice President of Senate: Michael Absher was nominated to serve as Senate Vice President. No other nominations were made. Francisco Zermeño moved to approve Michael Absher as Senate Vice President and Michael Thompson seconded the motion. It was approved unanimously.

3.3 Adjunct Faculty Representative Selection: Ann Brichacek was nominated to be Adjunct Faculty Representative of the Senate. No other nominations were made. Ann is an instructor from the Applied Tech &Business Division. Norman Buchwald moved to have Ann serve as the Adjunct Faculty Representative this year and Barbara Ogman Seconded the motion. It was approved unanimously.

4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

4.1 Accreditation and SLOs: The new accreditation standards and their background were discussed. Nolly Ruiz and Dr. Ron Taylor lead a conversation
Dr. Taylor discussed where Chabot is in the Accreditation Cycle. Defining and dialogue on SLOs is ongoing, but more documentation is required for the 2008-2009 Self Study Report. We are on target for the 2009 accreditation visit. SLO Discussion ensued.

Nolly Ruiz reported on a Curriculum Conference he attended this summer concerning SLOs. First, SLOs are not Course Outcomes or Grades. They are not about assessments from an outside body or about standardized tests. Faculty will be creating a manifesto of “What SLOs are” and “What SLOs are not”. An example would be for this Spring each Division and discipline should choose one course and try to define a single SLO and how to assess it. There are three levels of SLOs: Course, Program/Discipline, and College. Diane Zuliani stated that all programs are currently assessing student learning outcomes. How is this any different? Francisco Zermeño asked, is this an effort to keep us from teaching? Ming Ho clarified that one difference is that assessment is one part of the SLO Assessment Cycle, so we should actually be referring to them as “SLOACs”.

Dr. Taylor handed out an example of a current Course Outline. It was shown that some of the current outcomes were clear and apparent and some were not. The Course was Accounting 1 the Program was Business Accounting General Degree.

Michael Thompson asked about measurability. Is that the issue? Nolly Ruiz said that the big, top number of outcomes would be no more than 5 or so per course. He added measuring 1-2 outcomes per year and creating SLO assessments to check whether the outcomes are being met would be fine. Dave Fouquet said he has an outcome check called an examination. Isn’t that validation enough? Barbara Ogman asked about how detailed the “Assessment Cycle” needed to be. Dr. Taylor explained that it is not the student record that we want to know about. Nolly said maybe our colleagues could at least agree on one question on a test or maybe more, to show a measured performance outcome. Barbara Ogman stated that it is really the faculty's response to performance outcomes. Diane Zuliani “Where is this coming from?” Accreditation? WASC; (Barbara Beno of WASC)? Dr. Taylor said that in the global sense, some of the questions being asked are from the citizenry and Accreditation Teams from all across the country and also from us. Questions and answers seemed to revolve around systems assuring that our students are achieving successful learning. Nolly said you could read about the documentation on the State Senate’s website in PDF format. Norman Buchwald says he will make a hard copy available in the Library for faculty reference. Francisco Zermeño asked whether one similar question assess my overall students performance. Dr. Taylor responded we need to have “Institutional Feedback Loops”. Michael Absher pointed out what is already happening in the Auto Technology Program. They are heading toward N.A.T.E.F. and G.M.A.S.E.P. Certification where they are required to assess, document and certify over 500 separate assessment tasks and the necessary data collection. Mike pointed out that this is what may happen if we faculty don’t try to control the evaluation of performance ourselves. Mike Thompson asked “just what is
wanted here? Just consultation? Or what?” Dave Fouquet stated that certain aspects of SLOs in Florida have been a bust. He noted that specific language was kept out of the FA Tentative Agreement to keep SLO language out of the faculty evaluation contract package (refer to contract Article 26A0. Dave added, “We are looking for effectiveness and the freedom to try something new to enhance what we teach”. Nolly Ruiz said we need to have short discussions concerning SLOACs. Nancy Cowan stated that some Divisions are asking about the details and the reasons why this is such a big deal? Ann Brichacek stated that vocational areas are in a position to lead by example. Barbara Ogman said that it would be nice to know. “Just tell us what to do”

4:00 PM Michael Thompson leaves.

Diane Zuliani questioned the SLOAC genesis; someone will dictate our Quality Assurance?! I balk at this and this is a hard sell for some faculty. Having second thoughts are a good thing. Who is the ACCJC? Who are they? What are their motives? Faculty resistance is coming from a good place. It's coming from a deep commitment to pedagogy and our Students. Some of the most verbal “Resistance Members” are valued members of the faculty community. Ron Taylor stated that one way to accomplish the goal is to look at examples, like a Capstone learning assessment; or even a Portfolio assessment. This can have a Silver Lining Effect. Nolly Ruiz says we are looking for a less onerous process, not just more paperwork.

4:13 PM Francisco Zermeño leaves
4:15 PM Barbara Ogman leaves.

Bottom Line is that the college needs a reporting system on the assessment cycles and how well our students are learning what it is faculty say they will learn. We will be looking at software packages and LPC negotiated a contract for software to help with the reporting and documentation. We will be talking about this much more this year. As we can see there are many questions to be addressed.

Meeting extended to 4:20 PM. Chad and Mike Absher stated we need to stay on point so we can hold to ending meetings on time.

4.2 Senate Binders: President Glen asked Senators to review their binders and let him know if they had any questions. The binders include information on:

- 4.2.1 Resolution Process
- 4.2.2 Parliamentary Procedures
- 4.2.3 Roles and Responsibilities of the Senate
- 4.2.4 Professional Ethics Statement
- 4.2.5 Academic Freedom
- 4.2.6 Shared Governance
- 4.2.7 Faculty Handbook
- 4.2.8 Acronyms
4.2.9 Allocation of Programs & Services Among Divisions & Full-time Faculty.

5.0 REPORTS II

5.1 CLPFA: No report.

5.2 Senate Committees: No reports.

5.3 Senators: No reports.

6.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

6.1 At-Large Faculty Vote on Senate Constitution Changes— Chad Mark Glen;
6.2 District Faculty Hire Procedures— Chad Mark Glen;
6.3 Administrator Evaluations— Stephanie Zappa;
6.4 Program Introduction Process — Ron Taylor;
6.5 Minimum Qualifications Equivalencies for Faculty— Chad Mark Glen;
6.6 General Education Reciprocity Program Certification— Jane Church;
6.7 Counselors Assigned to Divisions— Mike Absher;
6.8 2006-07 Draft Strategic Plan— Laurie Dockter;
6.9 Curriculum Committee— Mike Absher;
9.10 50% Law State Task Force— Francisco Zermeño;
9.11 Online Instruction— Jan Novak.
9.12 2006-07 Draft Strategic Plan— Laurie Dockter;
9.13 50% Law State Task Force— Francisco Zermeño.

Adjournment— Next Meeting— September 28, 2006

Fall Meetings— 2nd & 4th Thursdays: 10/12, 10/19* 11/9, and 11/30*.
(*Special Meetings— not on 2nd or 4th Thursday).