

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING SUMMARY
04/06/09 Room 222 3:00-5:00 p.m.

Present:

Christina Goff, Michael Norris, Ginny Richards, Clint Ryan, Mark Lewis, Brendan Brown, Brad Nash, Janice Townsend, Judy Bank, Mara Landers, Nancy Bachmann, Cathy McCaughey, Scott Cabral, Andy Ochoa, Casy Cann, John Henry, Lydia Macy

Guests: Richard Livingston, Tue Rust

	Topic/Activity	Summary/Actions Taken
1	Call to Order	
2	Public Comment	
3	Senate Announcements & Reports	<p><u>SGC (Shared Governance Council)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was an all day SGC retreat on Friday April 3rd. Brad and Michael reported that it went really well. Peter Garcia was present and lead the SGC through the plans for LMC in the future, including the plans for SGC for the future. The idea behind the meeting was to decide next year how SGC is going to coordinate all of the plans, how they are going to relate to the Education Master Plan, how is that going to relate to Program Review, etc. The responsibility of SGC is to coordinate the plan for LMC. Some of the meetings will be business meetings, some of them will be looking at results of program review and other plans and some of the meetings will be meetings that will take action of previously reviewed items. • The next SGC meeting will be Wednesday April 8th at which time we will get the RAP results. <p><u>Consultation Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee is still talking and looking at the budget issue regarding the Senate. <p><u>FSCC (Faculty Senate Coordinating Council)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ginny Richards announced that she has sent the budget reports for the Senate to Ann. • The idea is to attempt to categorize all the expenditures in an effort to know who exactly is paying for what. • A question was asked from one of the senators to know when they might be able to see a printed budget report. Ginny Richards replied to this question by stating she would send an electronic copy of it out to the senators. <p><u>CC (Curriculum Committee)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CC decided to have the 900 COORs have all the requirements of what Title V mandates all COORs must contain. The only thing that has changed is there has been another area added that says 'Assessments' and it is just required that you list the assessments. The CC also reviewed and revised the instructional handbook for completing the 900 courses' COORs. It is not as much work as any other COORs but this section did

need to be added if LMC is to comply with Title V.

GE (General Education Committee)

- The last GE SLO Professional Development Workshop was last week. It had presentations about the English sequence and greeting partnerships. The consensus was that it was very useful.

ART (Accreditation Response Team) – Richard Livingston

- Kiran Kamath is the lead for this task force. The goal of this team is to come up with the plan for what we need for the Accreditation Report in October 2009.
- The Accreditation Report – due October 2009
 - Plan created this (Spring 2009) semester.
 - Plan to be written over the Summer 2009 semester.
 - Plan to be turned in by October 2009.
 - Plan must contain how LMC is going to finish the 75% of the CSLOs and cycle them through assessment.

• **CSLO Creation**

- Suggested list prioritized by section size to be dispersed to the Department Chairs. The courses with the most section numbers that do not have a completed COORs will be ranked at the top of the list. The list has already been sent out to Department Chairs and the Department Course Outline Update Plan form and the memorandum regarding it will be handed out and discussed at the Department Chair meeting tomorrow, Tuesday April 7, 2009.
- The Department Course Outline Update Plan (see Handout) must be returned dated, completed and signed by April 30, 2009. The department must fill in the name(s) of faculty that is responsible for updating the COOR(s). It is important to include on this form the responsible individual for updating the COOR(s) and the submission date. If there is a course that the department feels will not be able to make it through the assessment cycle on time then it should be looked at being inactivated.
- Spring and Summer Camp Course Outlines. There is an e-mail being sent out with a survey monkey regarding Summer 2009 Camp Course Outlines. A concern was brought up regarding how departments vote on the COORs before submitting it to the Curriculum Committee, some faculty will be writing COORs over the summer how does it get voted on over the summer? The response to this concern is to write the COORs over the summer and have it ready for a vote when all faculty return in Fall 2009. Janice

		<p>Townsend also announced that coaches are available over Summer 2009 via e-mail or Camp COOR for assistance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coach recruiting. If you know of someone who would be interested in being a coach please submit their name to Janice Townsend. Coaches are compensated. ○ Reasonable number of COORs to be completed by Full-Time Faculty. The reasonable number maybe around 2-3 depending on the department and the number of COORs, the number of Full-Time Faculty and Part-Time Faculty and the academic complexity of those courses. Richard stated that the departments should be sure to consult with their Deans regarding this issue. Adjunct Faculty will be paid a stipend of \$250 for each COOR they complete and submit. ○ The deadline for all course outlines to be updated with SLOs is by January 29, 2010. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Cycle of Assessment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Starting Spring 2010 15% of all the courses each semester will go through the assessment cycle. With this plan in effect by the time the Mid-Term Report due date comes around in 2012 we will have about half the courses done. ○ Pilot in Spring 2010 to be done with classes containing the smallest number of sections. ○ Charting proficiency vs. meaningful improvement. The team is looking into software programs and various charting mechanisms that can track the proficiency of the students in a particular outcome for different courses as well as not letting this information become a huge database of student proficiency. This will not accomplish the goal of making meaningful changes in the pedagogy or curriculum as part of the cycle so as to ultimately go back and improve student outcomes. ● <u>Questions and Concerns</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is some discussion and concern brought up in regards to academic freedom and the vague concerns about CSLOs and the assessment of them. ○ There was some discussion about this team coming up with different ways of collecting data across departments. The concern is that different departments assess in different ways.
4,5	Approval of previous minutes Agenda reading and approval	Minutes approved with no corrections: (15-0-0) Agenda approved with one correction: (15-0-0) The date on the top of the Agenda needs to be changed from 03/23/2009 to 04/06/2009.

6	Appointments	<p><u>Graduation Speaker Appointments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The speakers for the graduation need to be appointed. Robin stated to Clint Ryan that two speakers worked really well for graduation last year and she would like to have two speakers again this year. John Maltester has asked to be appointed as one of the speakers. Jennifer Saito has stated that she would do it but she is unsure at this moment whether or not she will be out of town during graduation. John Maltester is retiring and Jennifer Saito is the G. Hayward Award recipient. <p>Motion is moved, seconded and approved to appoint John Maltester and Jennifer Saito (provided she can attend) as Graduation Speakers. (15-0-0)</p>
7	CalPass - Tue Rust	<p><u>History and Background</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tue Rust is the Los Medanos College representative for Contra Costa County on the CalPass project along with a Math teacher from Pittsburg High School. CalPass has a slogan of “Success at All Levels” or success at all segments. K-12, 12-14, 14-16 are each segments of education. There is not a lot of crosstalk between these sections, and because of this lack of communication between them borders have developed. CalPass is a PLC (Professional Learning Community) and is largely grass-roots. It was formed to help erase these borders between the segments. The facilitator is Kate Mohar. The main subjects represented in CalPass are Math, English and Science. CalPass exists all throughout the state of California and is attempting to become nation-wide. It has three main charges and they are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) A grass-roots approach to dissolving borders among segments in education and bringing people together across all segments. 2.) Data collection process. They have an extremely secure data collection system that stores a copy of all the information from 95% of all community colleges and 40% of all UCs and CSUs. Hopefully within this year it will have 30-40% of all high school data copied and stored there as well. A research team has also been devised and is really great about working with numbers and ideas. One of the remarkable things about this data collection software is that it is able to track a student’s academic progress throughout their grade levels. 3.) Meet and come up with ideas in order to do something to improve communication, curriculum, teaching styles and student outcomes throughout the segments (i.e. MOCA). The common trend is looking at 11th and 12th grade curriculum locally vs. the curriculum at

		<p>transfer levels in community colleges/college.</p> <p><u>The CalPass Mathematics PLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Math section of CalPass began by trying to understand what Math has gone through in terms of teaching styles and curriculum in the last 100 years. The group studied <u>Math Wars</u>, discussed and reviewed exams throughout LMC, middle schools, high schools and Cal State East Bay. After understanding Math at the different segments the Math PLC began to look at what can we improve on and became very interested at what LMC is doing with Mathematics. Teaching Math at high school there is not much time for revamping. At Cal State East Bay there was not much incentive to look into the teaching styles in Math. Most of the courses at the universities are just lecture which makes it harder to change the teaching styles. • Currently in the Math PLC we looked at locally what is occurring in 11th grade Math which is Algebra II and at what a LMC Algebra II student would take, and there was differences between the two. We also found students that were taking Algebra II and received a C or a D, if they just took one more course they would not have to remediate when they go to attend Cal State East Bay. Furthermore, we found that some high school students were disenfranchised with how Math was being taught. All of this was collected to help create a post Algebra II Math course, which is the LMC Algebra II Math Course. <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tue stated that should anyone have any questions or suggestions regarding CalPass they can let him know what they are and he will forward them on to the CalPass group and get back to them with a response. He also stated there is a website trust@losmedanos.edu that may be able to help answer any questions.
9	ASCCC Resolutions (See Handout)	<p><u>2.0 Accreditation Resolutions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>2.01 Providing Faculty Names for ACCJC Visiting Teams</u> • <u>2.02 Accreditation Team Visits</u> • <u>2.03 Developing Processes for Faculty Participation on Accrediting Teams</u> <p>LMC Academic Senate recommends resolutions 2.01, 2.02 and 2.03.</p> <p><u>4.0 Articulation and Transfer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>4.01 Adopt and Publicize California Community College General Education Advanced Placement (CCC GE AP) List and Template</u> • <u>4.01.01 Amend Resolution 4.01</u> • Michael Norris stated that this particular resolution has been on the agenda for the ASCCC a couple of times. Michael also clarified that this resolution refers to area AP tests not specific course AP. For example, if you

have a particular physics class that would count as an AP exam towards whatever science area. The individual campuses would still make their own decision about course equivalency regarding course-to-course equivalencies.

- California History area requirements have been an issue in regards to this resolution. None of our classes could count because both of our classes taught the California History and if we gave them that area here from the college and allowed them to graduate with it they didn't have the California History part we make sure they leave us with the California History part, and it is not good for students if they don't have that at the freshman or sophomore level.

9.02 Communication and Computation Prerequisite Validation through Content Review

- To validate prerequisites based on course review rather than a statistical analysis of success. The idea is to add another way to validate prerequisite(s) for a course. If this were adopted it would make it much easier to validate a prerequisite at the community college level.
- According to the amendment to the resolution you can implement new prerequisites but then the colleges have to conduct research on the effect(s) of the prerequisites. There was a request to add to the third amendment that based on the results of this research the colleges then may decide whether or not to continue with the prerequisite requirement(s).
- In some cases the advisory works as a self-select for students whereas the prerequisite may work better to help students who otherwise might not succeed in the course(s). Although in other courses the advisory works much better than the prerequisite(s).
- The individual departments may still be able to make decisions on an advisory or prerequisite for courses within their department.

10.0 Disciplines List

- **10.01 No Equivalent to the Associate Degree for Minimum Qualifications**
 - This resolution means that there would be no equivalent for an AA degree. There are some PTEC, EETEC and Cosmetology instructors who would not meet the requirements according to this resolution.
 - Some feel that it increases the professionalism. Furthermore, some feel that an instructor who is teaching a college level course and does not have an AA degree does not seem right.

LMC Academic Senate recommends resolution 10.01.

- **10.02 Eliminate Eminence for Meeting Minimum Qualifications**
- **10.03 Disciplines List - Political Science**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>10.05 Disciplines List - BioTechnology</u> • <u>10.07 Disciplines List - Humanities</u> • <u>10.08 Disciplines List - Instructional Design/Technology</u> • <u>10.09 Disciplines List - Mathematics</u> • <u>10.10 Disciplines List - Statistics</u> • <u>10.11 Defining the Master's Degree on the Disciplines List</u> <p><u>13.06 Reexamination of Lab Space Allocations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This resolution refers to the formula at the state level of how many students per square foot you have to have and what is allocated per FTEs for facilities. There is a difference between lecture square footage and lab square footage. This resolves to further differentiate the formulas to meet the distinctive needs of science and CTE programs. <p>LMC Academic Senate recommends resolution 13.06.</p> <p><u>13.07 Physical Education Courses Maintained as Credit Courses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This resolution requests that the Board of Governors dismiss the recommendation of the 2009 LAO Budget Analysis report to reclassify P.E. courses and maintain that all credit courses currently taught on campuses in the discipline of Physical Education be classified and funded as credit courses. <p>LMC Academic Senate recommends resolution 13.07.</p>
11	Adjournment	