**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING SUMMARY**

**03/09/09 Room 222 3:00-5:00 p.m.**

Present:

Alex Sample, Michael Norris, Ginny Richards, Clint Ryan, Mark Lewis, Brendan Brown, Brad Nash, Cindy McGrath, Judy Bank, Mara Landers, Nancy Bachmann, Cathy McCaughey, Scott Cabral, Andy Ochoa, Casy Cann, John Henry, Lydia Macy, Estelle Davi, Phil Gottlieb

Guests: Jeff Michels, Rosita Harvey, Glenn Appell, Deborah Dahl-Shanks

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Topic/Activity** | **Summary/Actions Taken** |
| 1 | Call to Order |  |
| 2 | Public Comment |  |
| 3 | Senate Announcements & Reports | **Announcements & Reports**   * Cathy McCaughey was introduced as the new Nursing Representative.   **Consultation Committee**   * Meeting cancelled/postponed.   **FSCC (Faculty Senate Consultation Committee) Report**   * The main topic for discussion at the meeting was the equivalency guidelines and the process of making them more consistent amongst the three colleges. This process would still allow each department to keep their autonomy in deciding on their equivalencies, while achieving some uniformity amongst the department equivalency guidelines. Forwarded feedback from LMC Senate about local department guidelines for equivalency and consideration of local college department recommendations. Discussion will continue.   **SGC (Shared Governance Committee) Report**   * During this meeting SGC listened to the RAP proposals. Management representatives spoke to the faculty involved in their department RAPs before this meeting so they would have a better understanding of them before appearing at SGC to talk about them. At the next SGC meeting they will be ranking the RAPs.   **DGC (District Governance Committee) Report**   * There was an extra DGC meeting for further work on the District Strategic Plan. At this meeting 40-50 people throughout the District were broken up into groups of 10 (each group had an equal number of representatives from each college in the District) and each group was given a section of the District Strategic Plan to breakdown and work on. The group sections will be synthesized by the consultant and bring the District Strategic Plan as whole back to DGC to review.   **Curriculum Committee Report**   * Janice announced additional Camp Course Outline scheduled for March 20th in addition to March 27th and hopefully more coaches at each session. The Foundation is buying lunches for the Camp Course Outline attendees again so please rsvp to Janice by the Wednesday before each Camp date. Janice also announced that you may e-mail her or Nancy Ybarra if you are unable to make any of the Camp Course Outline dates and they can arrange individual coaching. * Concern: What about departments that have a high number of COORs and a small number of faculty members to complete them – what should the department do? Suggestions for any department in this predicament: stipends offered to pay part-time faculty who complete COORs and meeting with a coach. * The Curriculum Committee has started Content Review for COORs. * Prerequisite evaluation study for Phil 2 and Humst 3. Reviewed study evaluating student success in Phil 2 and Humst 3 for students who had completed English 100 prior to enrolling compared to those students who had only completed English 90 revealing that students completing English 100 are more likely to succeed in Phil 2 and Humst 3.   **DE (Distance Education Committee) Report**   * Reviewed the Distance Education Policy and are close to completing the final draft. * The Distance Education Committee will meet again next Monday.   **TAG (Technical Advisory Group)**   * The majority of the meeting was spent discussing ways to ask and/or raise more money for new hardware and software that is needed for computers throughout the campus. * A concern was raised regarding the mass e-mail that was recently sent out from IT pertaining to a “worm” that was infecting a lot of computers around the District. Someone had sent an e-mail to IT asking for more information about this worm and how it affects Blackboard and Online classes/students but received no response. Making these mass virus/worm alerts more informative and detailed about how it might affect different forms of technology across the District would be more helpful. Clint Ryan stated he would take this concern back to the TAG meeting. * Another concern was raised about the length of time it is taking for IT to respond to requests for service. Clint responded by stating that there are over 1,000 computers across the campus and only six IT technicians. Clint also went on to say that IT is currently trying to figure out a way to hire more personnel in IT. |
| 4,5 | Approval of previous minutes  Agenda reading and approval | **Minutes with no corrections:** (18-0-0)  **Agenda approved with no corrections:** (18-0-0) |
| 7 | Evaluations  Jeff Michels-UF  (see Handout) | **History and Review of Handout**   * A meeting about revising the Faculty Evaluation Forms was held last year. Our presenters today, Jeff Michels, Rosita Harvey, Glenn Appell, Deborah Dahl-Shanks, have all been working on the revised evaluation documents and are here to answer any questions. * This committee has taken a lot of effort in assuring that these evaluation forms can in no way be used as a document to police faculty with as well as attempting to make these forms clearer and more conducive for both the evaluator and the evaluatee. * Rosita Harvey from the committee has worked especially hard on word-smithing the Student Evaluation Worksheet so that every student, especially ESL students, can read and understand the document. * Most of the work was done to the Self-Evaluation Worksheet. The checklist on the worksheet will not be submitted nor used in the scoring process. The narrative is the only thing from the worksheet that will be left at the end of the evaluation process. * On the Summary Report Form the committee omitted the checklist that was previously on the document because of the redundancy of it. * On Part II of the Classroom Observation Form there is a number rating system that is being used excellent(5) –very good(4)-average(3)-below average(2)-poor(1). * On the Student Evaluation Form there is also a number rating that ranges from always(5)-often(4)-sometimes(3) –rarely(2)-never(1) and a n/a (not applicable) option. This rating and wording should be fairly easy for students to understand. * The Summary Evaluation Form the wording has been changed so as to avoid ambiguity and grammatical errors.   **Objective**   * The objective for today is to get feedback and answer questions from the LMC Academic Senate regarding the evaluation forms. The committee would also like a vote from the LMC Academic Senate to move forward with the revised forms or not.   **Questions, Concerns and Feedback**   * One idea was to exclude the number ranking from the Self Evaluation Worksheet. * One concern is that although the Self Evaluation Worksheet Checklist will not be seen by the Evaluation Committee there might be an expectation from the interviewer to ask the interviewee about the questions on the checklist. Jeff Michels again stated that the interviewer will not see the answers to the Self Evaluation Worksheet Checklist but they will see the questions. There was a major concern regarding this Self Evaluation Worksheet Checklist being tied to the evaluation process. There was one statement that either this worksheet should be completely tied to the evaluation process or not at all. * There was a request to change the word “within two weeks” on item #10 on the Student Evaluation Form to “by two weeks”. * There was a concern brought up regarding item #6 Classroom Observation Form for Teaching Faculty about the wording of “variety of methods”. The concern is that in the one hour the instructor is being observed and assessed will the evaluator be able to observe a “variety of methods” in teaching styles.   Glenn Appell addressed this concern by stating that the instructor being evaluated will be made aware ahead of time when they are being evaluated and what criteria they will be evaluated on. The meaning behind the wording of “variety of methods” is described as meaning does the teacher recognize that his/her students each have different learning styles (i.e. auditory-lecture, handout or writing on the board-visual, etc.).   * Another concern was brought up regarding item #8 on the Classroom Observation Form for Teaching Faculty pertaining to exactly how would the evaluator be able to tell which students are engaged and which are not (what exactly is “engaged” being defined as). The wording of the form and/or the way the wording is used may not be specific enough. * Possible addition of an asterisk next to some words such as engagement, to further define the exact definition of the term. There was also some discussion of adding N/A to the questions on the Classroom Observation Form for Teaching Faculty. * A comment was made regarding the deletion of the comparative form in the evaluation. It was brought up that it was very useful to have the comparative form specifically in the students’ evaluation of their instructor because the students are in the class for more than just one day. * A suggestion was brought up to change the questions in Part 1 of the Classroom Observation Form for Teaching Faculty to a “1-5” scale like the student evaluation form, instead of a “yes or no” particularly for item d. * Another suggestion was brought up to look at reconfiguring items #5, #8 and #11 on part 2 of the Classroom Observation Form because they intercept conceptually about motivation and engagement. * On item #9 on the same form change the bold heading to **Checking Comprehension** instead of **Comprehension**.   **Proposed Changes**   * Jeff Michels stated that there are some proposed changes that will be made to the procedures and/or policy of the Faculty Evaluation Process, and they are: * The Deans have stated that they would like to become more involved in the peer evaluation process of tenured faculty. Should they be more involved and if so, how? Jeff brought up the Foothill DeAnza model which allows management to give bonuses to faculty who complete their professional obligations. Many voiced concerns about management getting involved, no matter how little, in peer evaluations of faculty. * How to decide on what/which classes will be evaluated? * How to evaluate classes with no “classroom settings” such as coaching, forensics, etc. outside of the classroom? * Making the informal evaluation appeals process that is currently in place more formal. * For training it is suggested to create an online tutorial at some regular interval that faculty must complete if they want to get paid for completing evaluations. * Some discussion on evaluating department chairs and their duties. * Requiring faculty that teach online to be evaluated online in addition to the in-class observation process.   **Conclusion**   * Jeff Michels concluded the presentation by asking the Senate for a vote of confidence to let the United Faculty know that the Academic Senate feels that are moving in the right direction as far as improving the Faculty Evaluation forms and process. * Rosita Harvey made a statement to the Senate stating that as a part-time faculty member the Faculty Evaluation process has become a very important tool for self improvement as an instructor. * Jeff reiterated that these forms are indeed drafts and that the UF is still at the drawing board level with this. He encouraged more feedback, if necessary, from any and all faculty regarding this topic and the vote from the Senate today is just a vote to let him and the UF know that they are moving in the right direction with completing the improvement of the Faculty Evaluation Forms and Processes.   **Motion made, seconded and approved to give the United Faculty approval of their direction, themes and a vote of confidence from the LMC Academic Senate for the UF to move forward with the improvement of the Faculty Evaluation Forms.** (18-0-0) |
| 8 | CC Rep. Stipends  Janice Townsend-CC | **History**   * Last semester Janice noted that the Senators for the LMC Academic Senate receive stipends for their time and work in the senate. Janice was curious how Curriculum Committee members could also receive such a stipend? * Janice also noted that Curriculum Committee members put in a lot of time and effort into the committee as well as reading and reviewing COORs.   **Proposal**   * Janice came to the Senate to request that the Senate consider paying the Curriculum Committee members for one semester.   **Comments and Suggestions**   * Michael then stated that the LMC Academic Senate budget is still up in the air as it stands right now we might possibly be able to do it for a year, maybe two. However, we cannot continually do it every year due to the fact that it would amount to an extra $1100 out of the Academic Senate budget per year. * Michael’s next suggestion was to alternate semesters for paying the CC member stipends. Michael asked that all the senators think about this request and the suggestions offered. No decision needs to be made at this time but it will return to the Senate for action. |
| 9 | Information Competency  (see Handout)  Christina Goff | **History and Plan**   * Information Competency has been around since 1998 whereas the State Academic Senate stated that everyone should be doing information competency. * In Spring 2008 the new resolution from the ASCCC stated “…the State Senate wants to encourage local senates to ensure students demonstrate information competency.” * Christina is proposing that there be a Senate Information Competency Task Force to identify what is information competency, is LMC already delivering information competency embedded in current curriculum, and if so is there a way we can track this to ensure that when students graduate they graduate with a proficiency in information competency, is there a need for an additional information competency at LMC and if so is that need being fulfilled. This task force could also decide on how to include information competency requirements such as infusing it into current curriculum, offering a course in the subject, etc. * Christina clearly stated that she is not proposing any additional units/requirements for graduation. Some community colleges right now have information literacy/ information competency requirements for AA degree graduates. The UC and CSU are now currently looking at it as well for their graduates. * Information competency is loosely defined knowing when and where to go to find information and once the information is found, does the individual know how to evaluate that information to ensure that they are using the information correctly. * The task force’s main goals would be to look at what is LMC doing already, what are the standards, what does it mean to information literate, what is happening already in LMC AA graduate requirement classes. The next thing they would have to do is identify the standards that define information competency and poll the faculty as to whether they feel their students are meeting these goals.   **Suggestions and Comments**   * An idea was brought up to include a faculty member who is involved in the “Ethical Inquiry Paper” to be on this committee. It would be helpful to include those who instruct classes that already have information competency included in their curriculum. * One comment was made that much of the definition and requirements that are listed for information competency are already being required in classes at LMC. * This is not yet a mandate but it is something that the ASCCC was local senates to investigate and look at information competency in their colleges. * Information competency does not need to be included in every AA degree required class but it should be in some of them. |
| 10 | Adjournment |  |