

Los Medanos College

Minutes of the Academic Senate

Date: Monday, March 25, 2013

Time: 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Location: CC3-361

**Members Present:** Scott Cabral, Estelle Davi, Louie Giambattista, Erich Holtmann, Morgan Lynn, Joe Meyer , *Michael Norris*, Christine Park, Ginny Richards, Alex Sample, Alex Sterling, Rebecca Talley and Janice Townsend.

**Members Absent:** Theodora Adkins, Lori Biles, Laurie Huffman (excused), Mark Lewis, Lydia Macy (excused), Cindy McGrath, Sophia Ramirez (excused) and Dave Zimny

**Guests:** No guests.

Item	Topic
<b><u>I.</u></b>	<b><u>Call to Order (M. Norris):</u></b>  A. The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.
<b><u>II.</u></b>	<b><u>Public Comment (M. Norris):</u></b>  A. No comment.
<b><u>III.</u></b>	<b><u>Senate Announcements and Reports (M. Norris):</u></b>  A. <u>DGC (M. Norris):</u> Will meet tomorrow.  B. <u>FSCC (M. Norris):</u> The LA District came out with their list of families. FSCC Chair and CCC Senate President, Wayne Organ, is matching the 4cd District families in comparison to LA's. The work on the families will still move forward with a deadline of April 1 <sup>st</sup> .  C. <u>GE Committee (A. Sterling):</u> The GE Committee now has a draft of assessment plan and will roll it out in the Fall. They will have a campus-wide meeting on April 15th, where they will give information and solicit feedback. Alex has continued to go to the different departments asking about GE assessment and the focus for the GE committee, and is concerned by the number of faculty that are unhappy with the Course Outline Approval Process, at various levels.  1. The tension in the process with Course Outline Approval Process, in terms of what does and does not meet the criteria, has not been

	<p>resolved from the past. The Academic Senate should have resolved some of these issues many semesters ago when this came up, and since that has not happened, where does the issue go? There have been frustrations with the delay in approval, and new people on committees making the criteria for approval a moving target, with minute minutia about whether or not a course goes forward. The committees that have heard the frustrations are GE and Curriculum as well as the Academic Senate, but the problems have not been resolved.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. GE may work on tightening the rubric and/or perhaps dropping one of the GE Outcomes #2. Having to get clear info to all faculty is the way to go. The idea of only approving new courses has been presented; however curriculum committee rejected that idea. The issue might be reopened at the Curriculum Committee. The new District Researcher, Greg Stoup, will be attending a GE committee next Thursday to answer questions about the Assessment Plan and research. GE wants to make sure assessment is both doable and reliable.</li> <li>3. Course outlines change and require these changes to be reflected back in the COORs to keep the integrity of GE courses. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Most faculty wouldn't object to change if it was necessary, but to subject faculty to this process when the only thing that has changed is the person evaluating the COOR, is where the source of the frustration is.</li> <li>ii. The author of a COOR should receive a template and know what is expected and shouldn't be subjected to evaluation inconsistencies throughout the process. As models and standards change the old and new should be compared to see if changes are necessary.</li> <li>iii. <u>Estelle Davi would like GE to ask Greg Stoup the following question in regards to the Assessment process:</u> In terms of the aggregate of data that we have assessed General Education courses before (CSLOs)... How can we do an aggregate of data and see where are students with respect to course level? Those course level CSLOs went and tied directly into the PSLOs. We have no aggregate of data to see how our General Education students are doing (aggregating GE information from the CSLOs). Also, Estelle would like Greg Stoup to evaluate whether there is bias and look at the drawing of conclusions from the research. She wants to make sure that the conclusion drawn from the research is not going to make an assumption (through the assessment process) that GE units needs to be increased, based on students who took less GE courses and are no longer at LMC. The concern is that the college will jump to that conclusion based on a previous vote that resulted in a reduction of GE units.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. As GE Chair, Alex believes that the negative feelings about the COOR process is getting in the way of faculty doing other work like community building and professional development. He would like to revise the process so that it is not viewed in a negative way. The GE committee will direct their suggestions to the appropriate bodies.</li> <li>5. It was requested that the issue of the COOR process be put on the agenda in the near future. Michael and Ginny, as Council, will discuss when the item can be put on the agenda.</li> </ol> <p>D. <u>Budget Committee (M. Norris)</u>: The idea was presented to the SGC and they would like more information on it. Ginny will talk to Michael about their request for information and report back to the Senate.</p> <p>E. <u>SGC (V. Richards)</u>: SGC is preparing for RAP. There were a record number of RAP proposals submitted (approximately 50 proposals).</p>

<b><u>IV.</u></b>	<b><u>Approval of Previous Minutes (M. Norris):</u></b>  A. Hearing no opposition, the minutes are approved with corrections to typos.
<b><u>V.</u></b>	<b><u>Agenda Reading and Approval (M. Norris):</u></b>  A. Hearing no opposition, the agenda was approved.
<b>AGENDA ITEMS -----</b>	
<b><u>VI.</u></b>	<b><u>Appointments – Graduation Speaker and DO Student Success Task Force (V. Richards):</u></b>  A. <u>Distance Education Chair</u> : Yao Ming Zhu.  1. Motion to approve Yao Ming Zhu as Distance Education Chair (E. Holtmann); Second (A. Sample); Vote: 12 – 0 – 0. The motion carries.  B. <u>District Wide Student Services Taskforce</u> : The District requested one rep from Developmental Education and Student Services. Paula Gunder and Virginia Richards were the two interested candidates.  1. Motion to approve Paula Gunder and Virginia Richards to serve on the District Wide Student Services Taskforce (J. Townsend); Second (E. Holtmann); Vote: 12-0-0. The motion carries.  C. <u>Graduation Committee</u> : The committee thought that it would be good to include additional readers in this year’s ceremony. The Senate was looking at this year’s retirees (J. Stein, R. Livingston and M. Schweickert) and Hayward nominee (S. Henderson) as potential candidates to read the names at the graduation.  1. Motion to approve forwarding the names of J. Stein, R. Livingston, M. Schweickert and S. Henderson as name readers for the graduation if the committee will accept four people (J. Townsend); Second (E. Holtmann); Vote: 12 – 0 – 0. The motion carries.
<b><u>VII.</u></b>	<b><u>Student Satisfaction Survey (M. Norris):</u></b>  A. The Senate gave their final feedback on the Student Satisfaction Survey. These are the following recommendations and suggested changes:  1. The library would like to keep #26, remove #23 & #25 and would like to add the following questions: What is your level of satisfaction with library services and resources? How satisfied are you with access to library resources from off campus? How satisfied are you with the availability of computers for student use in the library?  2. Question #46. Many students don’t know if they are following a CTE/Vocational Education major. The recommendation is that the question

	<p>be changed to reflect the majors or be removed. Questions #40-43 – On Friday after meeting with Greg Tanaka, Janice will have the data needed to possibly provide four alternative questions to the ones that are currently in the survey. There is concern that the four current questions may not be the best questions to pose for survey diversity. Janice is asking that Bob wait until Friday before finalizing the survey.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Questions #4 &amp; #5 - Concerned about the subjectivity of some of the questions. Is it possible to make a judgment on the quality of something if there is nothing to compare it to? The survey is asking for students to judge the quality of instructors and academic programs, presuming that there is a basis of comparing what's going on at LMC and what's going on somewhere else. The question is asking for a subjective evaluation.</li> <li>4. The Center for Academic Support is neglected in this list. The only question that addresses the services of the CORE is #20; however, tutoring services are offered in many parts of the campus. Alex would like to add a question specific to the CORE: How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Center for Academic Support?</li> <li>5. #4 should be deleted because it is asking to judge the personality of the instructor instead of what the instructor does. For question #32, add "email".</li> <li>6. Add a question about the Transfer Center and changing #45 to a "four-year institution" instead of UC, CSU or private university.</li> <li>7. All questions pertaining to "staff" should be changed to "non-instructional staff" (see #19). Recommends adding a question about the level of satisfaction with email, website and WebAdvisor.</li> <li>8. It would be helpful if the survey was broken down into sections (it's too long). Piloting the survey would help the college see how students understand the questions and help with the formatting.</li> <li>9. An open-ended question: What is one thing LMC can do...? Janice volunteered to read and type out the responses.</li> <li>10. Take out "quality" from #4 and #5.</li> </ol>
<p><b><u>VIII.</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Senate Representation (C. Park):</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Christine added paragraphs on the purpose of the subcommittee and the work that is being done on the representational structure and proposed changes to the bylaws and constitution. The Senate needs to decide on the considerations to both Option 1 and 2 (whether English and Math has two reps) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Counseling department as the next group close to having 10 members, felt that it's currently difficult to get reps on committees, and does not support having two representatives.</li> <li>ii. Motion to have Option 1 have two representatives for departments with 10 or more faculty and Option 2 to have ...; Second (E. Holtmann); Vote 8 – 2 (S. Cabral &amp; J. Meyer); 2 (G. Richards &amp; E. Davi). The motion carries.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

	<p>B. Motion to approve the Senate Representation and updates to the Bylaws/Constitution with the updated considerations (J. Townsend); Second (L. Giambattista); Vote: 12 – 0 – 0. The motion carries.</p>
<b><u>IX.</u></b>	<p><b><u>ECE, Education Minimum Qualifications and Discipline List (J. Townsend):</u></b></p> <p>A. The Association of CA Community College Teacher Education Programs proposed a change to the Teacher Education discipline, which is also being supported by the Executive Committee and Standards, Equity, Access, and Practices (SEAP) Committee.</p> <p>The proposed change is: <i>Master’s in education, teaching, special education, curriculum and instruction or in a recognized K-12 subject matter, <b>AND</b> hold or have held a state approved K-12 teaching credential, <b>OR</b> the equivalent.</i></p> <p><i>The rationale for the change is:</i> This proposal seeks to create a new discipline within the California Community College System titled: Teacher Education. The rationale for this proposal is based on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The expanded role of the community colleges in K-12 teacher preparation has resulted in an expansion of the education curriculum offered and articulated with CSU, UC, and California Independent Colleges and Universities.</li> <li>2) The content of these teacher education courses and the articulation agreements with universities require faculty to possess expertise in K-12 teacher preparation requirements, state content standards, state teacher performance expectations, effective teaching methods and pedagogical practices, and possess experience in a K-12 setting.</li> <li>3) Although a current Education discipline exists within the community colleges, the minimum qualifications are too broad, do not specify K-12 teaching experience and do not align with state and national teacher preparation program accreditation standards. A proposal to change/narrow the minimum qualifications for this existing discipline was previously rejected.</li> </ol> <p>The following are comments concerning the pending resolution:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The California Commission on Teaching Credential’s standards are focused on P-12, and specify P-12 teaching experience. The Council for the Accreditation of Educators Preparation also has a P-12 trend. The Commission on Teaching Credentialing had a PowerPoint that emphasized P-12 education for educators.</li> <li>ii. Would like the Senate to draft a resolution at the Area meeting that includes a person with a Master’s in Education with emphasis on ECE or Master’s in ECE. Michael Norris will check and clarify what the appropriate degree would be.</li> <li>iii. Who was feeding into the proposed minimum qualifications? The reality is that a majority of the ECE courses do not meet the Liberal Arts major for Education at a four-year institution. Did the proposed changes come from the thinking that there are very few ECE courses that are required for a Liberal Arts major? 1:06:49 (JTs response). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Liberal Studies covers many areas but doesn’t give good practice in teaching, so many colleges (all the CSUs) have pathways through Child Development to become an Elementary Teacher because students get more experience with children.</li> </ol> </li> <li>iv. Erich looked into the issue because the third point in the rationale for changing the discipline states that, “Although a current Education discipline exists within the community colleges, the minimum qualifications are too broad, do not specify K-12 teaching experience and do not align with state and national teacher preparation program accreditation standards.” He doesn’t think it’s true and cannot find any documentation or proof that suggests what the rationale is stating. If the current degree, which requires teaching experience, and standards are fine, then why change the current requirements?</li> <li>v. Motion to vote down the proposed change to the Teacher Education discipline and to draft a resolution if there is support for developing</li> </ol>

	<p>one (J. Townsend); Second (E. Holtmann); Vote: 11 -0 -1 (E. Davi). The motion carries.</p> <p>vi. Michael will follow up this discussion by checking what the requirements are for the current Education degree.</p> <p>vii. Estelle Davi is concerned about this this new degree/discipline because it lacks details on what it is and what it entails.</p>
<b><u>X.</u></b>	<p><b><u>Plenary Resolutions (V. Richards):</u></b></p> <p>A. The Senate was asked for their general feedback on the Plenary Resolutions.</p> <p>i. The acceleration group for Math and English wanted to be a caucus and was turned down last fall. There were problems with the caucus creation process and inconsistencies. A key phrase is ARTICLE VI: “Academic Senate caucuses are intended to serve as groups of independently organized faculty to meet, network and deliberate collegiately, in order to form a collective voice on issues of common concern that caucus members feel are of vital importance to faculty, and the success of students as they relate to academic and professional matters.” Michael likes the first paragraph and is leery about striking the procedures and relocating it to a website. It was recommended to support the depoliticizing of the forming of caucuses.</p> <p>ii. 10.01 Not recommending the Kinesiology list. It is strange that the Executive Committee isn’t supporting the Kinesiology degree when it was added as a TMC.</p> <p>a. Michael will check the disciplines list to see if Kinesiology and Physical Education are in fact identical disciplines and also connect with Colleen Ralston.</p> <p>iii. 9.02: Regional Conjoint Programs for Associates Degrees for Transfer – proposing that ASCCC explore the feasibility of district degrees.</p>
<b><u>XI.</u></b>	<p><b><u>Program PSLO Creation (M. Norris):</u></b></p> <p>A. Tabled.</p>
<b><u>XII.</u></b>	<p><b><u>Adjournment (M. Norris):</u></b></p> <p>A. Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.</p>