CHABOT COLLEGE ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE

Board Room, Building 200
Thursday, September 28, 2006– 2:18 p.m. to 4:18 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES
Submitted by Nancy Cowan 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 Zerneño & 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), Robert Lu (Vice President ASCC).

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 2:18.

1.2 Approval of the Minutes: Barbara Ogman moved to approve the September 14, 2006 minutes and Michael Absher seconded, with minor revisions. The motion carried.

2.0 REPORTS

2.1 College President: Dr. Carlson was out ill and no report was given.

2.2 Robert Lu, ASCC Report: Robert announced that October 10th at noon will be Club Day in the Caesar Chavez Mini Courtyard. Please encourage students to attend. It will be publicized on 89.9 FM KCRH radio. October 21st will be the Homecoming game. Many fun activities will be offered. This will also be announced on the college radio, as well. Homecoming will celebrate the college’s 45th anniversary with the Alumni Association organizing the events. Michael Thompson wondered if there was any progress on the Activities director at the ASCC. Robert indicated that that position has not been filled yet, but the ASCC government is approximately 1/3 staffed now.
2.3 Chad Mark Glen, Senate President’s Report: Chad is working to get the District Strategic Plan Work Sheet by departments uploaded to the District website so faculty, staff, and administrators can fill them out to provide input to the district.

Faculty Hiring
1. Librarian --Spring 2007
2. History Instructor --Spring 2007
3. Music Instructor --Spring 2007
4. Speech Instructor (generalist) --Spring 2007
5. Health Instructor --Fall 2007
6. Microbiology Instructor --Fall 2007
7. Learning Connection Coordinator --Fall 2007

Two vacancies remain undecided for Fall 07 recruitments. In addition to authorizing the above recruitments, Dr. Carlson indicated he wanted to see a focus on basic skills in any English and math instructor proposals.

Faculty Hiring Discussion: Mike Absher wondered about the “holding” of those positions. Dr. Taylor has asked for additional proposals until October 10 and then later in the month for finalizing. Michael Thompson wondered if the basic skills of math and English... are these going to be privileged over other Divisions. Dr. Taylor indicated that they would be considered with other proposals.

Associate of Science (AS) Degree
Two points on the AS degree from Curriculum Committee discussion:
1. The AS degree is not broken and may not need to be fixed.
2. The statewide Senate is looking at the AS degree and we (Chabot/LPC) may wait to see what action is taken at the state level before we make any changes to our AS general education requirements.

We should discuss sending out a faculty wide survey on recommendations for the AS degree.

AS/AA Degree Discussion: Dr. Taylor doesn’t know if the Nolly comments about the Curriculum Committee’s discussion are counter to the Chancellor’s request. Chad thinks perhaps we need a campus-wide survey regarding this area. The questions of changing the AS, the number of units, etc. may need to be re-examined. Chad feels there is a necessity for clarification on the meaning of and distinction between the AA and AS degree. Rachel Aziminia wondered what the outcome of convocation day work resulted in. Chad said that he would send out the results of the work to faculty to help clarify and that this was discussed at the last Senate meeting. Rachel pointed out that students can get an AS degree even though the degree isn’t offered if the student obtains a special form and completes it. Michael Absher said that many students are confused because they think the AS is related to a particular area. Carolyn Arnold wondered from whence the resolution would
come. Chad said his understanding was that convocation discussions be “culled and parsed down” for discussion. It was important that whatever was decided would be the same for both sets of the faculty (Chabot/Las Positas). If the results are “all over the map” we will need to arrive at a consensus as to what the results mean/infer.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycles (SLOACs)

Course Level SLOs: The Curriculum Committee has formed a subcommittee to work on developing Course Level SLO recommendations. The subcommittee is currently starting with 3 members: Nolly, Jim Matthews and Cristina Ruggiero. Jim and Nolly have already met. They are interested in having others participate in developing the recommendations. Please have interested faculty contact Nolly to get involved.

Program Level SLOs: Program Review Committee Chair, Tom DeWit will be encouraging programs going through program review to work on program level SLOs. Tom is not requiring participants write SLOs.

College-Wide SLOs: Dennis Chowenhill, Rachel LePell, and the Staff Development Committee are working on reading across the curriculum. This could be our 1st college-wide SLO. Carolyn Arnold will be working on the college-wide facet of SLOs. The Reading Apprenticeship the Carnegie participants are working on has assessments already developed that we could use as models as we develop our own assessments. The Carnegie folks could meet with Carolyn to share assessments for reading and how this might be implemented across the curriculum. I look forward to the faculty working together to turn SLOs into what we, faculty need them to be.

We may need to create a Senate Subcommittee to draft what we want SLOACs to be, and not to be.

SLOACs Discussion: Nolly Ruiz said at this point they simply want as much participation as possible. He wants to see what the results of the assessments will be. Hopefully the work will be done in an informed manner. Ming Ho wanted to know how they would work on course level SLOACs? The charge is to look at course level assessment— see what is working and make an informed recommendation to the “body” They want buy- from the different divisions, faculty, etc.

Dr. Taylor said that program level outcomes tends to arise naturally, particularly if you work on courses that are core major courses because this helps look at a cross-section of what the program is going to accomplish. Rachel Aziminia voiced a question about where Student Services is on this. Carolyn Arnold said that Melinda Matsuda was spearheading leadership in this area. Rachel Aziminia wondered why Senate doesn’t look at student services as they do with other aspects of the college courses. Carolyn Arnold said that it has a somewhat different focus and that is why it is held to a different body. Chad said he thought, however, that the Senate would be
happy to hear about their work and offer assistance should it be requested. Michael Thompson noted that he was wondering about whether it would be seen as “just another task.” Chad said we perhaps would do better to focus on Student Assessment than Outcomes. Nolly Ruiz said it isn’t about the outcomes alone, but rather how we can measure the learning that actually takes place here. We “know” we do it, but we’ll need to “prove” it. There is a potential to really improve what we are doing” as well. He also said that we have sort of an open loop system—we teach, assign a grade and let students go on. What we will be focusing on is what that education really means. We need to be at the center of that, take ownership of that. Michael Thompson agreed with Nolly’s statement, but feels there is a difference between introducing it to faculty as a “report” but he would like to see a space and time where we could dialogue at a meaningful level regarding what SLOACs means or how it can be applied. Mike Absher reminded us that, as a point of order, this was the President’s report and too much dialogue had taken place. Dr. Taylor commented he was going to add to the report (not dialogue). Dave Fouquet said that perhaps some of the best discussions are held in the hallway and that it was difficult to re-create the hallway discussions. Carolyn Arnold said that it was important to be able to support the time and resources to share the excellence in teaching/learning here in the college community.

2.4 Public Comments: Mike Absher gave his input regarding the Facilities Committee meetings he has attended. It seems as if it is “re-hashing”. He believes that faculty time is better spent with sharing “new” material. He believes this needs to change so that we can move forward in the best light. The new Vice President of Business Services, Farhad Javaheriipour stated that they needed to really listen to the faculty because they have to live in the designed spaces for a long period of time. Mike Absher is concerned that implementation of the plans that have been developed by the Facilities Committee are not being carried out and conformed to. He will send his sentiments to the chair of the committee.

3.0 ACTION ITEMS

3.1 None.

4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

4.1 Associate in Science Degree: This item was move to later in the agenda.

4.2 Accreditation Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycles: Carolyn Arnold discussed the DRAFT example of a timetable for implementing SLOACs at the course level, program level and college level. Senators were guided through this timetable in relation to the Accrediting process. (See timetable for details) Important to fold it in to the existing evaluative tools we use at the college (program review, unit plans, etc.) Nolly
Ruiz said that some institutions don’t put SLOACs in course outlines, others do. There is no apparent consensus on this. Mike Absher said when we have course outlines he would be opposed to including SLOACs in his course outline because he would have to go to curriculum every time he would need to revise the outcome that didn’t work. Barbara Ogman commented that although we “do” what curriculum committee says we need to do, why can’t we look at SLOs in the same vein… let’s not pretend that we are going to like it. She is thinking about the usefulness of our time… let’s just do it. “Hold your nose and swallow the medicine.” She volunteered to be on the SLOACs committee and Francisco was encouraged to get involved as well, to develop the SLOAC form. Mike Absher said that the “but” was what Tom DeWit said in the last Senate meeting that we could rebel against SLOs and not do them. Mike does not think Tom’s view is the way to go. It’s unrealistic to ignore the accreditation mandates.

In re: College-wide goals Ming Ho feels that different programs/courses may have somewhat different foci/goals. Carolyn Arnold pointed out that there are some goals that the college has determined will be the College-Wide Learning Goals. It can’t be just what “we” want to focus on. Rather, the specific goal needs to be embraced or not done. Carolyn added that it is not an on-the-ground cycle, but rather how our students are learning over time (our learning goals) Chad said his interpretation was that faculty should focus on the college-wide learning goals that interest us in relation to our discipline within the guidelines of the college’s learning goals. Carolyn Arnold suggested we define SLOs in fall of first year, get someone to volunteer measuring it as a pilot in the spring.

Chad suggested we have two committees: 1. Course level SLOs (a subcommittee of Curriculum), and 2. College-wide SLOs (lead by Carolyn Arnold). These two committees would draft a proposed overarching philosophy of what SLOs are and are not for Chabot. These will be vetted at Senate, sent back to divisions for input, and then Senate will vote on it for adoption. This SLOACs philosophy will guide the committees’ work.

Senate discussed how we could work with Staff Development to assist with implementing the strategic plan items on SLOACs. Chad said that there were three points related to this: 1. We want to empower committees to take charge of their work and not interfere. 2. We are not going to complete the SLOACs process right away. 3. We need to keep communication open. Nolly Ruiz said it was important that each committee reports to each other. Chad said he would take responsibility for coordinating communication between the two new SLOACs committees, Staff Development, Program Review, and Senate. The chairs of these committees should keep Chad informed of their SLOACs activities to assist in facilitating information exchange.

Chad asked Carolyn and Nolly to have their SLOACs committees draft their committees’ charges and have them to him before the October 12th meeting.
The Senate will review these two documents and provide feedback and guidance, if needed.

Dave Fouquet wanted to know what the natural relationship is between program review and the SLOACs. Barbara Ogman said her understanding was that program review would result in developing the program level SLOs. Nolly Ruiz said Program Review can be helpful in developing SLOs. Mike Absher said that he felt we were missing something… Not a good idea to palm the SLO off into program review. Dr. Taylor suggested that what we do in program review could be used in SLOs.

4.1 AS Degree
Chad suggested making questions # 3, 5, and 6 from the breakout session summary page part of a college-wide survey.” Question #3 is “Should the AS only encompass the sciences, business, technology, and/or occupational/vocational education?” Question #5 is “What is the appropriate number of GE units for the AS degree? The current 19 or 25 like the AA? Anything in between?” Question #6 is “Should we attempt to change the AS or leave it as is?”

The survey should have a place on it to mark if the respondent teaches in a discipline that offers an AA or AS degree, or both. The goal of the survey is to gather information on the meaning of the AA and AS degrees so the Senate can make an informed decision in response to Chancellor Cota’s directive to reconcile the differences between the AA and AS degree. This survey will guide us in developing a unified response to the directive. When the District Curriculum Council convenes to discuss this issue, we will have had informed input. Other suggestions that were made included: explanation as to why the survey is being done again; make sure that we get LPC’s point of view and Chabot’s point of view separately so we know what the two different colleges’ views are. Dave Fouquet wondered if some areas might have some biases. Mike Absher said that this evidence was on the district website with results from the Convocation break out sessions. Rachel Aziminia reviewed the history of the rationale about AS and AA degree. It was suggested that the survey list the pros and cons and that stakeholders; have input on writing the pros and cons. Chad will look into this and be back with more information.

5.0 REPORTS II

5.1 CLPFA: Dave Fouquet announced that we now have a Board of Trustees ratified faculty contract. The FA is working on the contract appendices. Rachel Aziminia needs the faculty evaluation forms for counseling, ASAP. We do have a Kaiser $5 co-pay and $15 on prescriptions. This won’t be in effect this academic year. This may disproportionately impact the older retirees. The FA Grievance Officer is Daryl Crew from the Mathematics department. Daryl can be reached at 723-7446, office number 2034.
5.2 Senate Committees: No report.

5.3 Senators: Mike Absher asked Senators to submit their door cards so it will be easier to contact, communicate, and set up meetings with others. Chad will e-mail them to all of us so we’ll all have them.

Rachel Aziminia sits on the Statewide Academic Senate Equity and Diversity committee. If you have equity and/or diversity concerns contact Rachel at 723-6724.

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 Online Instruction— Jan Novak.

Meeting adjourned at 4:18

Next Meeting— October 12, 2006
Fall Meetings— 2nd & 4th Thursdays: 10/19* 11/9, and 11/30*.
(*Special Meetings— not on 2nd or 4th Thursday).