

Los Medanos College

Minutes of the Academic Senate

Date: Monday, September 12, 2011

Time: 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Location: CC2-222

Members Present: Scott Cabral, Estelle Davi, Bill Fracisco, Phil Gottlieb, John Henry, Erich Holtmann, Mark Lewis, Cathy McCaughey, Joe Meyer, A’kilah Moore, Christine Park, Betty Pearman, Colleen Ralston, Ginny Richards, Clint Ryan, Alex Sample, Rebecca Talley, Sara Toruño-Conley, Janice Townsend (alt) and Lois Yamakoshi.

Members Absent: Cindy McGrath, Pam Perfumo, Dave Zimny and Lydia Macy

Guests: Theodora Adkins (alt), Robin Aliotti, Kyle Chuah, Mitch Schweickert, and Alex Sterling

Item	Topic
<u>1.</u>	<u>Call to Order (A. Moore):</u> The meeting was called to order at: 3:03 p.m.
<u>2.</u>	<u>Public Comment (A. Moore):</u> a. A’kilah Moore: Thanked the faculty for voting for her and looks forward to working with the Senate for the next two years. b. Sara Toruño-Conley on behalf of Alex Sterling: Requested that the Senate publishes the sub-topics of the AA Degree Requirement discussions in the agenda.
<u>3.</u>	<u>Senate Announcements and Reports (A. Moore):</u> a. Ginny Richards: Shared information about the Senate President loads from the other colleges in the district: DVC = 1.0 load (.6 for Senate President and .4 for Curriculum Chair) and CCC pays a small stipend. b. SGC (G. Richards): Budget: There were no reinstatements in eliminated or reduced positions at LMC since LMC did not reach the projected budget reduction in 10-11. The state budget tax revenue shortfall may increase tuition fees at Community Colleges up to \$46 per unit for upcoming semesters. Mid-year budget cuts are possible as well. FTE goal for LMC is 7,500. The

	<p>Accreditation Report was presented. Recommendations LMC is addressing are the following: SLO Assessment; Satellite Campus alignment; Professional Development; and Communication with students. The District Code of Ethics has been adopted.</p> <p>c. <u>Curriculum Committee (J. Townsend)</u>: Discussed Curriculum Committee Membership; Stand Alone Training and Roles and Responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee; and New Programs. (<i>Details are provided in the Curriculum Committee minutes handout</i>).</p> <p>d. <u>GE Committee (S. Cabral)</u>: GE has had one meeting so far for the semester and is currently trying to recruit replacements for three GE Committee members. There will be two GE seminars this semester and two next semester on GE SLO 4 (Ethical Implications). The committee has a standing agenda item: <i>GE SLO Assessment and What That Should Mean</i>. The GE Committee meets Fridays, 2:00pm in CC4-420 and everyone is welcomed and encouraged to attend.</p> <p>e. <u>DGC (A. Moore)</u>: SS3025 Freedom of Expression passed after the third read. Judy Breza and Mike Hill gave a presentation on the budget which is going to the Governing Board on Wednesday.</p>
<p><u>4.</u></p>	<p><u>Approval of Previous Minutes (A. Moore):</u></p> <p>a. Item #9, 2, e: Change wording to read, “At GE seminars it has been discussed that Science and other disciplines don’t fit all the GE SLOs...”</p> <p>b. Motion to approve: S. Cabral, Second: J. Meyer, Vote: 17-0-0. The minutes were approved with corrections.</p>
<p><u>5.</u></p>	<p><u>Agenda Reading and Approval (A. Moore):</u></p> <p>a. Motion to approve: S. Cabral, Second: B. Pearman, Vote: 17-0-0. The agenda was approved.</p>
<p>AGENDA ITEMS -----</p>	
<p><u>6.</u></p>	<p><u>Appointments: Multiple Committees (C. Ryan):</u></p> <p>a. <u>HSI Steering Committee</u>: Paula Gunder and Tue Rust volunteered.</p> <p>b. <u>Enrollment Management</u>: DE Rep – J. VonBergen; 2 Department Chairs from Liberal Arts & Science – Nancy Whitman and Paula Gunder; 2 CTE Reps – Len Price and Brad Nash; and Student Services Counseling – Bill Fracisco.</p>

- c. Learning Management System Taskforce: The Learning Management system Taskforce decides what learning system the District uses, e.g. Blackboard. Clayton Smith and Linda Johnson. *There is still one vacancy on this committee.*
- d. Research and Planning: Joe Meyer and Danielle Liubichich.
- e. District Research Council: 2 reps needed – 1 from faculty and preferably one from the Senate: Danielle Liubichich volunteered and there is still one vacancy.
- f. Grade Appeal Committee (a pool of representatives): Dave Zimny, Sharon Wellbrook and Mitch Schweickert volunteered.
 - i. The current number of reps is down to about 2 or 3. Clint will check with the appropriate personnel to confirm whether the faculty representatives need to be tenured faculty.
- g. SGC Liberal Arts & Science: No volunteers.

- 7. GE SLO Process (S. Cabral):**
- a. There exist GE SLO criteria that GE COORs must meet. The criteria are written in:
 - i. “Proposed Assessment Criteria” and “Explanations and Illustrations” in the LMC’s General Education Program document
 - ii. “Key Points” bullets in the GE Course Outline Evaluation document.
 - b. There is reportedly a wide-spread feeling among faculty that when the GE committee reviews GE COORs, the committee is too capricious, and nit-picky. It has reportedly also happened that a COOR passed GE, and then five years later the same COOR did not pass because the committee got new members who had different standards. Faculty Complaints about COOR Review for both GE and Curriculum Committee are the following:
 - i. Wordsmithing should stop.
 - ii. All GE faculty should have input about how leniently or strictly decisions are made about whether something in a COOR meets a GE Criterion.
 - iii. The leniency or strictness of the process should not change from semester to semester. It is possible that reviews become more strict when committee membership changes; e.g. a committee might get a new member who thinks that more writing is required to meet the writing criteria:
 - a) Writing is used to develop thinking, promote learning
 - b) Writing is used as evaluation instrument to measure student progress

- c) Students are asked to write with frequency or depth to explore ideas, relationships
- d) Students expected to demonstrate college level writing: clarity and command of grammar,
- iv. Some corrections are nit-picky and insignificant (picayune), too detailed.
- v. Some corrections are unclear. E.g., “Clarify the rigor of the writing,” or “Not enough critical thinking.”
- vi. “May” should not be rejected in favor of “will.”
- vii. Many faculty are frustrated by the way COOR review is done.

c. Senate Concerns and Suggestions:

The main Senate concern was over what seemed to be an absence of a specific standard or rubric, especially when the committee membership changes over time. There was also a sense that the system’s ability to function depended upon the respect levels committee reps have for the expertise of the COOR authors. The suggested default (mind-state) was that COORs should be viewed as good unless there was a glaring discrepancy. It was also suggested that there be a forum held specifically to address the frustrations over GE, Curriculum and Assessment.

d. GE SLO Process will be added to the next agenda.

e. The next GE meeting will be held Friday, September 16th at 2pm in CO-420.

8.

Associate Degree GE Discussion (C. Ryan):

a. **Motion (M. Lewis):** Expand GE Criteria to include Quantitative Reasoning and allow departments to pick at least three GE SLOs for a class, one of which must be critical thinking.

b. **Discussion:** The thinking behind the motion was to align with the State by including Math at the GE level. The Senate discussed using mock grids which would allow for departments to check off the GE SLOs they felt that classes could meet with room for commentary as to why they couldn’t meet certain key points within different GE SLOs.

c. **Comments/Concerns:** The English department was concerned about voting on a GE SLO model without hosting a proper forum; however it was clarified that the action being taken was a straw voting process and that no official vote would take place until proper forums are held. There was also concern over students missing GE SLOs if the Senate wasn’t careful and that the suggested process was reactive potentially resulting in breaking up the GE Program.

d. **Suggestions:**

- i. Map out the grids carefully and look at the CSUs like other colleges do.
- ii. Review depth and breadth – it should be balanced.

	<p>iii. Combine some GE SLOs and look at the difference between GE and SLOs – faculty could assess some SLOs but not all GEs.</p> <p>iv. The proposed sample grid should be by departments and not by class because students could select certain courses and miss a GE SLO in the process.</p> <p>e. Second (E. Davi)</p> <p>f. Vote: 12 – 2 (E. Holtmann and S. Toruño-Conley) – 3 (B. Fracisco, C. Parks and C. Ralston)</p> <p>g. Next Steps: The Senate Council will construct a sample grid and send it out electronically. The grids are to be reviewed by department chairs and filled out appropriately and returned to the Council. Upon receipt, the grids will be synthesized and brought back to the Senate for review.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><u>IT Email Migration Feedback (C. Ryan):</u></p> <p>a. The District will be switching to Live@Edu which will provide 10 gigs of space for email. The IT department will be working with the District to find a reasonable time for the upgrade. Training will start taking place next semester and into the summer. There is no timeline available as of yet.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p><u>ASCCC Curriculum Committee Best Practices (J. Townsend):</u></p> <p>a. A handout was provided on the ASCCC Curriculum Committee Best Practices. J. Townsend would like the Senate to read the document and would like to revisit the Academic Senate bylaws, or maybe develop a taskforce so that the Senate and the Curriculum Committee were in compliance with Title 5.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p><u>Adjournment:</u></p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.</p>