CHABOT COLLEGE ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE

Regular Meeting
Board Room, Building 200
Thursday, December, 14 2006– 2:25 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES
Submitted by Dave Fouquet/Ming Ho and Chad Mark Glen

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

Guests: Dr. Ron Taylor (Vice President, Academic Services), Dr. Carolyn Arnold (Institutional Researcher and Grants Coordinator), Nolly Ruiz (Curriculum Chair), Curtis Ballard (ASCC Inter Club Council Chair).

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 2:25.

1.2 Approval of the Minutes: Francisco Zermeno moved to approve the November 30, 2006 minutes and Michael Absher seconded. The motion to approve carried.

2.0 REPORTS

2.1 College President’s Report: Dr. Carlson asked the Senators if they had any questions or concerns. Diane Zuliani asked a question about Education vs. Academics staffing. Chad Mark Glen asked about Robert Lu’s concern (from previous meeting) with regards to having input into the decision of how and when classes are scheduled when buildings are undergoing renovation. Francisco Zermeno asked why it didn’t come to Senate. President Carlson said the answer rests with the College Council representative. In fact, CEMC has been working to schedule the displaced classes and other classes that now must meet outside of primetime. Students and others were asked, via College Council, what their preferences are in terms of when they would like to have their classes and College Hour. Zermeno expressed concern in
moving an online class out of room 312, which is air conditioned. Barbara Ogman suggested that the college needs to get used to the likelihood that enrolments will decline during construction. Dr. Carlson answered that they're doing their best to deal with that through creative scheduling, packages of courses, etc.

Curtis Ballard wondered how this is going to affect students who need to take multiple classes in a row. President Carlson pointed out that passing time between classes will be the same. Mike Absher pointed out how students in his area have sequences of express classes offered Monday, Wednesday, Friday, and that students seem to like it after they get used to it. It also gives them more flexibility to take other classes on Tuesday and Thursday.

2.2 ASCC Report: Curtis Ballard attended on behalf of Robert Lu and did not have a report.

2.3 Senate President’s Report: Chad Mark Glen passed out his “End of Fall 2006” Report which details Action Items (along with their resolutions) and Discussion items undertaken by the Senate in Fall, 2006.

**ACTION ITEMS listed in reverse chronological order.**
Passed, General Education Reciprocity Program Certification, 11/30/06
Passed, Distance Education Committee Governance Revision, 11/30/06
Passed, Associate of Science Degree Proposals, 11/30/06
Passed, AS Degree Proposals, 11/9/06
Tabled for more feedback, AS Degree Proposal, 10/19/06
Sent back, Program Introduction Process, 10/19/06
Sent back for revisions, AS Degree Recommendations, 10/12/06
Passed, Board Policy 2260: Political Activity, 9/14/06
Tabled Board Policy 2260: Political Activity), 8/31/06
Passed, Senate Vice Presidential Election, 8/31/06
Passed, Part-Time Faculty Senator Election, 8/31/06

**DISCUSSION ITEMS listed in reverse chronological order.**
12/14/06
Basic Skills Proposal for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
Associate Degree Implementation and Timeline
Administrator Evaluations
eLumen Assessment Software Overview
Accreditation Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle

11/30/06
LDTP (CSU Lower Division Transfer Project)
Accreditation Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle
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11/16/06
Student Learning Outcomes and the Accountability Movement: What Faculty Should Know

11/9/06
General Education Reciprocity Program Certification
Distance Education & Online Instruction
Unit Plan Reconfiguration
Accreditation Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle

10/19/06
LDTP (CSU Lower Division Transfer Project)
AS Degree Recommendations
Accreditation Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle

10/12/06
Program Introduction Process
2007-08 Draft Strategic Plan
AS Degree State Senate Recommendations
Accreditation Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle

9/28/06
AS Degree
Accreditation Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle
2007-08 Draft Strategic Plan—

9/14/06
AS Degree
Accreditation Student Learning Outcomes

8/31/06
Accreditation Student Learning Outcomes
Senate Binder
Resolution Process
Parliamentary Procedures
Roles and Responsibilities
Professional Ethics Statement
Academic Freedom
Shared Governance
Faculty Handbook
Acronyms
Allocation of Programs & Services Among Divisions & Full-time Faculty

2.4 CLPFA: Dave Fouquet reported that we have a newly negotiated preference form by which adjunct faculty indicate their availability for the coming year and request course assignments. Chad Mark Glen asked whether it applies to full-timers
teaching overload, and if filling out the form is compulsory. Fouquet answered that full-timers pick overload classes before adjunct faculty are given assignments; in many divisions that is done informally. Adjunct faculty need to fill out the form if they want to be assigned classes on the basis of their seniority. Fouquet also reported that the District is still in the process of updating the salary schedule document, and that the District and Faculty Association are trying to figure out how to develop a standard rate of pay for faculty members who perform coordinator or special assignment (F-Hour) work on an hourly basis. The new rate will need to correct several long-standing disparities.

2.5 Public Comments: Michael Thompson expressed concern over the recent changes in AS degree requirements, and argued that the recent decision has actually made the requirement less clear. We still don’t have a definition of what differentiates an AS from and AA. The concept of program-based GE seems more like a major requirement than GE. Dr. Carolyn Arnold made the point that the courses fall under the Title 5 GE guidelines and this is the context that a vote was taken. Dr. Ron Taylor said that Michael makes a good point. Nolly Ruiz suggested maybe we should call it ‘program-designated’ GE. Minimal degree requirements are set by Title V, and the only reason the AS degree has fewer GE units than the AA is that the faculty have set it up that way. Michael Absher pointed out the faculty in his division wanted strongly to leave it alone until the AS degree was fully defined. Chad Mark Glen explained the fundamental difference of AS degree being vocationally oriented, as a reason to have fewer GE units. Ming Ho pointed out that some of the engineering-type disciplines have bigger unit requirements within the major, hence the usefulness of having a smaller GE base. Thompson questioned what college-wide learning goals the various GE options seek to satisfy. He asked what knowledge is it that we treasure, that every student should have? Diane Zuliani said the philosophical discussion has not happened here. The work of defining the degree doesn’t appear to have happened. Taylor wondered if Michael is re-opening the issue, and pointed out that we did basically decide not to add units to the degree. The result might be thought of as a ‘fudging’ to avoid a war between stakeholders. He added that there are in fact many ways in which we might ensure that students achieve college-wide learning goals.

3.0 ACTION ITEMS

3.1 None.

4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

4.1 Basic Skills Proposal for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: Chad Mark Glen presented a Basic Skills/Immigrant Education Funds Proposal. (Included in the Agenda package. *See below.) He basically proposes that there be two Faculty Leads with reassign time: (a) a SLO Campus Liaison, and (b) SLO Training and Resource Coordinator. Diane Zuliani thanked Chad for his hard work. Nancy Cowan questioned the low rate of pay listed for classified staff. President
Glen pointed out that of the 23 proposals, many did not give any budgetary information, and some had calculation errors. He gave an approximate estimate of the pay rate. Zuliani mentioned comments made by her division dean (Gene Groppetti), that we seemed to have decided to incorporate Basic Skills requirements in SLOs because they produce measurable skills in incremental steps, which seem to fit the basic SLO model — and further that Gene wondered if the Senate had agreement with Basic Skills faculty, as to whether they were agreeable to tying basic skills so uniformly to the college-wide SLOs. Diane added that she has spoken to Basic Skills faculty, who tell her that their primary goals are not, in fact, measurable skills. Ming Ho suggested that we need to determine how basic skills impact curriculum across the college, that he and the Senate were thinking in terms of basic skills across all disciplines at all levels. Zuliani said she is happy to broaden her thinking with respect to basic skills.

**Activity Plan to Accomplish the SLO Objective:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY (simple description, with a number so as to reference below) Garnered from LPC SLO plan</th>
<th>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>TIMELINE (OR TARGET COMPLETION DATE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish 2 Faculty Leads with reassigned time</td>
<td>See Below</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. a. SLO Campus Liaison</td>
<td>1 TBA</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. b. SLO Training and Resource Coordinator</td>
<td>1 TBA</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Create SLOACs timeline for creating processes and implementation</td>
<td>SLOACs Steering Committee 1.a.</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. College wide information campaign on SLOACs</td>
<td>Campus Liaison</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College wide training on SLOACs</td>
<td>Training/Resource Coordinator</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interested faculty begin Pilot Projects on SLOs and Assessment at course level</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conduct Department/Division SLO workshops</td>
<td>Training/Resource Coordinator</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chabot Learning Outcomes Website available on the Internet</td>
<td>Campus Liaison</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pilot Projects present assignment and/or course SLOACs at Flex day, College Council and/or Division Meetings</td>
<td>Training/Resource Coordinator &amp; Faculty TBA</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Establish SLOACs Steering Committee Work with Administration &amp; Senate President to select Representatives for 2-year term on SLOACs Steering Committee</td>
<td>Campus Liaison &amp; Faculty TBA</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Design Handbook for writing SLOs and Assessment Reports, completed and available to faculty for Spring 2008</td>
<td>Training/Resource Coordinator</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Design FAQ Sheet, completed and available on SLOACs Website</td>
<td>Campus Liaison</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Solicit Pilot Project participants to complete a course Assessment Plan (or complete Report) as an example for Spring 2008

14. Identify SLO mentors or facilitators available for Spring 2008

15. Work with Staff Development and administration to establish times set aside for SLOACs workshops at pre-College Council meetings, division meetings and flex days

16. Plan for 2008 flex days

17. Identify speakers & workshops-- bring to Chabot to assist faculty

4.2 Associate Degree Implementation and Timeline: Chad Mark Glen presented the time line *below. Michael Absher remarked that the timeline for implementing revisions seemed overly aggressive to him, because some tasks require a lot of time. Michael Thompson asked when we’re going to have the discussion of what an AS is. President Glen said he will bring up the matter of philosophical discussion with counterparts at LPC and then it will go to the District Curriculum Council.

*On Friday, December 1st, the District Curriculum Council met to discuss the AS degree proposals ranked by the Chabot and Las Positas College faculty.

The faculty at both colleges and both Academic Senates favored Draft Proposal A. This proposal consists of a total of 19 GE Units: 15 units from Title 5 Requirements + 1 unit of Wellness + 3 units of program-based General Education. (Please see the attached Associate of Science Degree Revision Resolution adopted November 30th, 2006.)

Below is a DRAFT Timeline and Implementation Process for the Associate Degree

January 2007
- College Hour informational meeting
- Curriculum form available for faculty with AS degrees
  - Applicable courses from Title 5 with local options on back
  - Also on Intranet

Spring 07
- Begin pilots
  - Inform advisory boards, learn their expectations (ongoing process)
  - Discuss how to evaluate courses for AS GE applicability
- February 2, District Curriculum Council (DCC) meeting
  - Vet (examine) implementation
- February 20 to Board of Trustees for approval of new AS degree configuration
- Begin training: Counselors, evaluators, student services (ongoing process)
Fall 07
• Submit AS degree courses to Curriculum for approval

Spring 08
• Finalize AS degree information for College catalog

Fall 08
• New AS in catalog, on Web, and on all literature

Chabot and LPC Academic Senate Presidents and Curriculum Chairs are working to create a clear process for programs with AS degrees to determine program-based GE. Note that the program-based GE must be approved by the Curriculum Committee and must fulfill a program-level learning outcome. The Curriculum Chairs will be meeting with faculty whose programs offer AS degrees next semester to discuss the process in more detail.

If you would like to provide feedback on the process or if you'd like to get the jump on determining program-based GE for an AS degree in your program, please let Curriculum Chair, Norberto Ruiz know. In order to get the word out to students in a consistent manner, it would be helpful to complete this process for all AS degrees at the two colleges in time for the 2008-10 catalog. (Given the curriculum process and printing deadlines, this would mean by the end of Fall semester 2007.)

4.3 Administrator Evaluations Chad Mark Glen distributed the Annual and the Comprehensive Administrator Performance Evaluation flow charts and draft implementation schedule. These are used at both colleges and have been approved by the District. Senators should take a look at the handouts and give feedback to President Glen.

4.4 eLumen Assessment Software Overview: (Separate handouts were prepared by Sally Stickney and Chad Mark Glen.) Sally Stickney explained how “eLumen” is a software program that aims to reduce the work involved with tracking SLOs, and also enhance the quality of data collected. She reported that LPC has bought the software and that they are implementing it. She also suggested that we do some fact finding to determine if we would want to adopt it, and how we might want to use it. Chad Mark Glen pointed out that it is understood that SLO data is not to be used to evaluate faculty and that there will be certain anonymity as to who entered what data. Barbara Ogman asked who is it that does the work, and said how difficult it can be to write a rubric. President Glen said that there are pre-packaged rubrics that faculty can use. Dr. Ron Taylor reminded us that the intent of SLOs is to be incremental, meaning we don’t have to develop rubrics for everything at the onset. Nolly Ruiz asked that the anonymity feature of eLumen be verified, as it is tied to Banner, and Banner is not anonymous. Michael Absher wondered how to get adjuncts involved. He also pointed out that in his area; many courses are pass/fail. Would eLumen support that? President Glen suggested that we implement and pilot eLumen at the same time that we embark on implementing SLOs. Ogman commented that we are putting the cart before horse again as we did with AS degree. SLOs need to be meaningful for the faculty who
teach. With regard to eLumen, Dr. Carolyn Arnold commented that we would use it how we want, which is to assess how we are doing. Faculty should not be in the position to worry about if others will see it and use it to his/her disfavor.

**INTERJECTION:** President Glen mentioned that next year, we will make reports before action items **brief**, so we can take votes before senators leave.

### 4.5 Accreditation Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycles:  
Dr. Arnold (Chabot’s Institutional Researcher) reported that she is prepared to do something about SLOs in the Spring 2007. Dr. Ron Taylor said he was glad that the Senate submitted a proposal for basic skills regarding SLOs.

### 5.0 REPORTS II

**5.1 Senate Committees:** Facilities Committee—Mike Absher reported that the outline of Parking lot renovation from the Facilities Committee is not finalized but has been released. The meeting to finalize the plan will be held on January 11. Absher is planning to attend.

**5.3 Senators:** Dianne Zuliani shared a favorite student learning outcome: She had given an assignment which asked students to bring in an image that is important to them. (e.g. a person, or a favorite painting, etc.) The assignment was to make the image meaningful for the rest of class. One student presented his image by lifting his sleeve, showing his upper arm, and that it had no tattoo on it. He explained that he missed his appointment to get a gang tattoo because the class had taught him that the world is bigger than his neighborhood! Zuliani wondered how this type of success can be measured, and what does it mean if only measurable outcomes are assessed.

Nancy Cowan reported that an older minority woman passed a course on medical terminology. That course enabled her to pass a test at work, allowing her to become a coder and to advance in her career when she thought she was dead-ended in her job--another success that may go unreported.

Curtis Ballard lamented that student life is dead on campus. We used to have a faculty member who listed campus events. Dr. Carolyn Arnold suggested that we may have a marquee or bulletin board which students can check. Chad Mark Glen recalled that the Chabot Scribe used to be placed around campus announcing student activities.

### 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 Minimum Qualifications Equivalencies for Faculty**—Chad Mark Glen;

**6.4 Faculty Working With ASCC to Publicize Events**—Curtis Ballard.
Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Next Meeting— January 25, 2007

Spring Meetings— 2\textsuperscript{nd} & 4\textsuperscript{th} Thursdays.
February 8 & 22, March 8 & 22, April 5\textsuperscript{*} & 26, May 10.
(*Special Meetings— not on 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 4\textsuperscript{th} Thursday)