Academic Senate
Minutes

Date: Friday February 27, 2015   **Time/Location:** 1-3 PM / Room 113

Senate Roles and Responsibilities (The 10+1)	
1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines.	7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
2. Degree and certificate requirements	8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
3. Grading policies	9. Processes for program review
4. Educational program development	10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success	11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate
6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles	

Senators: Matt Clark (President), **Donna McGill-Cameron** (CTE), **Donna Bahneman** (Adjunct), **Talwinder Chetra** (Math & Science), **Kevin Ferns** (Secretary, FaLaHum), **Greg Gassman** (Social Science), **Pam Geer** (Adjunct At-large), **Christopher Howerton** (At-large), **Cheryl Latimer** (Student Services)

Absent: None

Guests: J. Brown, B. James (ASWCC), J. Shah

Call to order at 1:03 p.m.

Item	Description-Type	Lead	Background and Objective
I	**Approval of Agenda -Action**		Approve agenda of 2/27/15 (MSC Bahneman/Howerton)
II	**Public Comment**		Guests are welcome to comment on any item on the agenda or not on the agenda. For items on the agenda, they may comment now or during the discussion of that item.
	Discussion		
III	**Approval of Minutes-Action**		Review and approve the minutes of 2/13/15
	Discussion/Decision: 1. Approve the minutes of 2/13/15 as amended (MSC Bahneman/Howerton).		
IV	**President's Report -Information/Discussion**	Clark	
	Discussion/Decision: 1. See the attached report. 2. Clark reports that M. Senecal would like to speak with the senate regarding surveys that need to be administered in some classes this semester. Senators should speak with their divisions to gauge faculty support for the surveys. Also, once we get data from surveys such as this, we need to determine how to use the data. 3. Clark states that President White is interested in adding a 4th dean in charge of CTE and enrollment management and planning.		
V	**Committee Appointments -Action**	Senate	**Objective**: Appoint faculty members to committees.
	Discussion/Decision: 1. The ASCCC Academic Academy is meeting in March, and WCC has a reserved seat for an interested faculty member. J. Shah volunteers to take that seat.		

VI	**Senate/Committee Reports - Information**	Senate	
	Discussion/Decision: 1. Bahneman notes that some WCC students have set up a used book exchange on Facebook called Textbook Exchange. They currently have more than 200 members signed up. 2. Gassman states that the ASWCC student forum was not well attended. Please help get the word out whenever ASWCC has an event like this. 3. Gassman announces that M. Moreno is organizing informative and interesting events for faculty and students with the Ethnic Studies Cross Cultural Series. The next event is on March 10 with a presentation from the Director of the Skirball Cultural Center Museum, Dr. Roberto Kirschner, from 12-1 pm in the Multicultural Enrichment Center. 4. Howerton would like for WCC to invite a CLC faculty member to attend the curriculum institute in Anaheim. 5. Howerton is currently writing the SLO annual report, which is due soon. 6. Geer reports that the Colusa County community provided lots of good discussion in the meeting today in Williams regarding the CCOF. 7. Chetra reports that if the district submits a compressed calendar application to the state in June 2015, it would need to provide a sample schedule of classes. The calendar committee is currently conducting outreach and information sessions on the compressed calendar with faculty, students, and the community. 8. B. James reports that students don't always know how to turn assignments in to adjunct faculty. The adjunct faculty office does not include names on the desks. 9. Latimer reports that 21 students attended the UCD Discover Day, 3 of whom were from CCOF. 10. Latimer is tracking down students earning ADT degrees. Students are sometimes missing a class that is required for the ADT. CSUs allow students to take a summer class to complete the ADT for fall enrollment. Send students to see a counselor if they are unsure about their degree. 11. McGill-Cameron reports that many flex workshops are coming up. Check the portal for more information. 12. McGill-Cameron reports that the summer law enforcement academy and the summer academy in marketing will be taking place during the summer session.		
VII	**Vice President Election - Action**	Ferns	**Background**: Per our bylaws, at the last meeting in February the senate will elect a Vice President from its membership. **Objective**: Elect a Vice President for the 2015/16 academic year.
	Discussion/Decision: 1. Howerton nominates Latimer for the position of senate Vice President for 2015-2016 and a vote is taken (Secret Ballot Vote Y-8, N-0). Congratulations Latimer! 2. In the process of nominating Latimer, the senate identifies some confusing language in the bylaws that will need to be modified.		
VIII	**Faculty/Administrative Roles in Disciplines without Full-time Faculty – Information/Discussion**	Ferns, Clark	**Background**: A large number of disciplines at WCC have no full-time faculty members. Tasks that would normally fall under full-time faculty members (e.g., program review, SLO assessment, adjunct interviews…) are currently dealt with through a mix of division full-time faculty, discipline adjunct faculty, and administrators (or in some cases not completed). **Objective**: Discuss possible strategies (e.g., division chairs) for ensuring necessary work is done without inappropriate burdens on faculty members (full-time or adjunct).

	Discussion/Decision:		
	1. Clark distributes a list of ideas of potential needs (attached) that a department or division chair could potentially address in a way that improves upon the status quo. Many of the listed tasks fall on the shoulders of a dean, but in divisions with no full time faculty these tasks may be deprioritized or not completed at all. The senate will brainstorm this list and discuss in a future meeting. The senate will also need to consult with faculty and administration before making any decisions as to what this new structure might look like or how compensation would work.		
	2. Some additional items brought up by senators include the following: web site management and updates; individual department needs on a case-by-case basis (for example, finals scheduling, exam writing, and group grading in the English department); adjunct faculty interviews and hiring committees; and adjunct orientation, support, and coordination. Planning, scheduling, and curriculum issues with CCOF and CLC may also need attention once the CLC transition is finalized.		
IX	**ASCCC Accreditation Institute Debriefing – Information Discussion**	Brown, Howerton	**Background**: Christopher Howerton and Julie Brown attended the ASCCC Accreditation Institute last weekend. **Objective**: Receive a debriefing of their experiences at the institute.
	Discussion/Decision:		
	1. Howerton and J. Brown report that they had a lot of fun at the ASCCC Accreditation Institute (see attached notes from each below) and found it to be informative and enlightening. They report that many colleges are in a similar situation to WCC in that they may be dealing with accreditation warnings. One of the new standards, disaggregation of data, represents a new way to look at student populations and to assist in raising the achievement levels for those populations. We have the freedom as a college to determine which populations we would analyze. Because we are doing the midterm report now, we need to consider how we might begin to address the new standards in an upcoming review. J. Brown reports that she attended an interesting breakout session on online classes and the topic of regular effective instructor-initiated contact. WCC and the DE committee will need to work on addressing the specifications of Title V in this area. Clark would like the senate to take the lead, with ART, in making sure that our faculty are educated in the accreditation process.		
X	**Accreditation Midterm Report and Restructuring of the Accreditation Steering Committee and ART – Information/Discussion/Action**	Clark, Howerton	**Background**: At the most recent ART meeting leads were assigned to the various standards for work on the Midterm Report. In addition, leads were tasked with working with appropriate governing bodies in drafting the midterm report. For Standard IV, the senate and the President's Cabinet (PC) were designated the appropriate bodies to work with Clark. Additionally ART has made a recommendation regarding the restructuring of our accreditation work groups. **Objective**: Review work plan and recommendations, and task ad hoc group to work with PC on draft of Standard IV.
	Discussion/Decision:		
	1. Clark would like one or two volunteers to help write Standard IV and work with the president's cabinet. Chetra volunteers; Clark will check with the college council for one more volunteer. Howerton notes that support for the accreditation lead in the form of a stipend or release time would be helpful to ensure a quality report. ART is still working on the most effective strategy for membership going forward.		
XI	**Constitution & Bylaws Update – Information/Discussion**	Clark, Gassman, Ferns, McGill-Camerons	**Background**: The senate is in the process of updating its constitution and bylaws. **Objective**: Receive (and augment) a list of questions to be shared with constituents, in preparation for the revision.

	Discussion/Decision: 1. Clark distributes his initial thoughts and questions on key areas of the senate constitution and bylaws that should be addressed (attached). Senators should distribute these questions to the divisions for input (Clark will send out an updated list soon). He suggests that we focus on the constitution revision first and then modify the bylaws later, especially if we change the approval process such that it simply requires a 2/3 majority of the senate to modify the bylaws (rather than a vote of all faculty). 2. Some additional questions that were raised and should be added to the list: How should ties be broken in elections? Should adjunct faculty be voting members of the tenure committee hearings? Should non-tenured faculty be voting members of the tenure committee hearings? Should the senate be involved in tenure hearings? Why are the vice president and secretary elected from the senate membership, but the president is elected from the faculty? Why not elect all three from among all faculty since they all receive release time? Why does the vice president nomination process allow for only one nominee at a time? Why not have an election process for VP and secretary just as we do for the president?		
XII	**Library Advisory Committee Update– Information/Action**	Clark	**Background**: After a period of dormancy, LAC has started meeting again. **Objective**: Receive an update on status, issues, and work plan.
	Discussion/Decision: Not addressed		
XIII	**ASCCC Spring/Summer Events –** **Information/Discussion/Action**	Senate	**Background:** The state academic senate (ASCCC) holds various events throughout the year. At the last senate meeting we agreed to work with the administration to secure regular attendance at these meetings. Upcoming events are the Academic Academy, Spring Plenary, Vocational Leadership Institute, Leadership Institute, and Curriculum Institute. **Objective**: Select attendees that the senate will fund for these and determine the number of attendees we will ask the administration to fund.
	Discussion/Decision: Not addressed		
XIV	**Future Agenda Items-Discussion**		Department/Division Chairs, College Catalog, SSS Priorities, Ed Master Plan, Committees, CCOF, WCC Committee Structure, CLC Transition, Constitution & Bylaws
	Discussion/Decision:		

Meeting adjourned 3:01 p.m.

Senate Goals, 2014-2015 (14 goals)			
#	Goal	Who	Status
1	**Curriculum:** Create catalog/class schedule subcommittee (via curriculum and scheduling committees), increase faculty awareness, establish program development structure and incorporate with EMP, and create a DE handbook.	McGill, Howerton	
2	**Communication:** Advocate for increase in effective communication tools and access.	Howerton, Ferns	Continuing
3	**Grading Policies:** Review, update, and distribute Faculty Handbook.	Clark	TBD
4	**Academic Standards:** Initiate campus-wide discussion to promote rigor in coursework, DE, and collegiality among faculty, classified staff, administration, and students.	Clark, Bahneman, McGill-Cameron	TBD
5	**Student Success:** Identify and address barriers to student success (counseling availability, course offerings).	Latimer, Clark, Bahneman	Student Equity Plan for 2013-14 has been completed and will help drive the work
6	**Faculty Development:** Find more opportunities/activities focused on student success.	Chetra, McGill-Cameron	In progress
7	Improve **faculty evaluation** process.	Clark, Howerton	In progress
8	Work to create comprehensive **process for Colusa County Outreach Facility** (CCOF).	Clark, Chetra, Geer	Early in process
9	Revise **Senate Constitution and Bylaws**.	Clark, McGill, Gassman, Ferns	In progress

Senate Goals, 2014-2015 (14 goals)			
#	Goal	Who	Status
10	**Professional standards** research	Clark	TBD
11	**Sustainability and grant funding**	Clark, McGill-Cameron	TBD
12	**Clearlake College transition**	Clark, Howerton	In progress
13	Update the **Student Code of Conduct**	Bahneman	TBD
14	**Accreditation**	Clark, Howerton	Response to Recommendations is nearly complete; work to begin on Midterm Report

President's Report
February 27, 2015

Meeting with WCC Administration – There was no meeting on 2/10 (Academic Holiday) and the meeting scheduled for 2/24 was postponed (or at this point, more likely canceled). Cheryl and I will meet with PC on 3/2 to work on the agreement with 4-year schools recommendation. The meeting scheduled for 3/3 will be rescheduled. On a related note, there is an idea being floated that the Chancellor might replace his meetings with the senate leadership with meetings with senate and college leadership.

DCAS (2/19) – Highlights:
1. Chancellor Houston proposed we consider changing the rhythm (and possibly the structure) of DCAS, having meetings alternate between strategic and operational meetings. CHEX is undertaking a restructuring. One advantage is that attendance could vary with (or be defined by) the type of meeting. E.g., the strategic meeting could be the Chancellor, the college presidents, and the senate presidents focusing on planning, while the alternate meetings could be the VC and VPs working on BP/Aps. Whether we undertake this change or not, there is also a desire to align the rhythms of DCAS, CHEX, DC3, and the
2. Board meetings. Houston will forward the Board calendar, after CHEX has reviewed it, to look at how DCAS (and implicitly, the senates) might structure their calendars.
3. APs – AP 4050 Articulation and AP 4231 Grade Change are being worked on by the VC and the college VPs and will be brought to DCAS soon. The senate presidents will forward the current draft of AP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates to their respective senates for review and feedback. AP 4260 Prerequisites and Co-requisites is currently in the hands of the District Curriculum Committee (DCC) and will be forwarded to DCAS.
4. In lieu of HR Director Whitfield's attendance, Denise Daniel reported on the progress (?) of the three task forces DCAS charged HR with leading (Sabbatical, MQs/Equivalency, and Evaluation). The latter accomplished work last year (academic), but stalled and has not resumed work this year. The other two have yet to meet. A meeting had been set to begin the sabbatical work, but we suggested rescheduling so that the Chancellor could attend. (It was clear at the last Board meeting that board members might have a different view of where this work should go than the faculty.)

College Council (2/20) – Highlights:
1. Committee reports were presented for the SLO Committee and for the Schedule Criteria Committee. Related to that was an agreement that the College handbook needs a thorough updating.
2. CAT has been charged with drafting a policy for the use of the electronic marquee that WCC will soon have.
3. A new membership for College Council was approved. The Dean of Student Success is the only dean currently on the council under the new membership. "Currently", because the new membership includes five new slots (College Center FT faculty, adjunct faculty, classified staff, ASCLS, and Executive Dean) one the CLC transition takes place. The senate will be looking out our other governance committees with transition in mind soon.
4. College Council has charged Student Services with creating a Student Services Leadership Council.
5. A list of possible "brands" for WCC generated at the planning activity in January was distributed. Council will narrow the list and send a new list out for review by the college community.

PRVT (2/19) – PRVT ranked the non-faculty staffing requests that from program reviews. It was decided that for this iteration of the process PRVT would ask FSAPC to rank the faculty staffing requests. Where requests to increase FTEF (without additional full-time faculty) should be made was identified as a gap in the planning processes at WCC.

Budget and Planning (2/19) – There was no change in breakage spending, although it was acknowledged that breakage continues to grow as hiring is delayed. It was agreed that Konuwa would draft the portion of the Accreditation Midterm Report tasked to B&P. We intended to look at WCC spending-to-date, but had not received the report at the time of the meeting. The report will be reviewed at the next meeting. Konuwa informed B&P that some form of the PSV process will take place this year; details are forthcoming.

Konuwa asked that we begin considering a process for funding campus events. Should established events (e.g., the Research Symposium or the Ethnic Studies Cross Cultural Series) have a formal budget? Should there be a pool of money set aside for other events (or all events) and if so, what process would be used to secure funds from that pool?

DC3 (1/21) – The next meeting is 3/3. There was no meeting between the last senate meeting and this week's.

ART (2/13) – The first half of the meeting was a joint meeting with CEAC (YC's equivalent to ART) and DSET (District Services Executive Team) to discuss general strategies for writing the Midterm Report and to what extent WCC an YC should match (e.g., format) in writing the report. We also reviewed timelines. At the front end, the timeline is aggressive. Ideally that will allow for more careful vetting among all college employees before the Midterm Report is submitted (mid-October, 2015). In the second half of the meeting, we divided the standards among leads and also assigned governance groups to work with the leads to write that portion of the Midterm Report. E.g., (and most relevant to the senate) I am the lead for Standard IV and will work with the senate and PC to draft that portion of the Midterm Report.

Miscellany
1. I received calls from various people regarding the delayed evaluation of M. Dragos. The faculty members on the evaluation committee may have made progress in moving the evaluation forward. YCFA may have suggested that this is partially a senate issue, since it has bearing on the tenure process. (I say may have, because I have not heard anything directly from YCFA, but I have heard from two sources that it was discussed.)
2. Hiring committees in general are moving extremely slowly, especially those in Student Services. For any committees that have senate appointed co-chairs, the co-chair may need to push the process more than has been the case in the past.
3. Dr. White held a debriefing regarding last week's HSI Summit among those who attended. (I didn't attend the summit this year; we had a district-wide math department meeting at CCOF on the 17th. For those of you keeping track, that makes two consecutive academic holidays where I've had meetings.) His intent is to hold further events building on that aimed at sharing information and, perhaps more importantly, at defining what being an HSI means at WCC (i.e., what should we be doing as an HSI to improve the student experience at WCC.
4. Dean Senecal asked for senators to help with the job description for Student Services Resource Faculty position (probably renamed again by this point). I asked Talwinder and Christopher to work with her based on the input they provided when the denate looked at the original draft of the duties.

Notes from Julie Brown, Accreditation Institute

Breakout 1 – Student Services, Libraries and Equity in the Online Arena

- IIC (student services) and IIB (library)
- IIB – equitable distribution of resources (sites)
- Evaluate and identify student needs
- Collaborates with other sources (outsourcing library and tutoring)
- Test proctoring
- Who monitors third party sources such as smart-thinking? How do we evaluate and assess them?
- IIC – need definition of REC for whole college
- Same quality books (rigor)
- 24/7 reference online vs reference desk (EBSCO)
- How are we doing the following for distance students:
1. Counseling/Advising
2. Financial Aid
3. Orientation
4. Tutoring
5. Assessment Testing
6. DSPS
7. EOPS
8. Remediation
9. Health Services

-How do we offer accomodations for assessment testing when students are new and haven't been through DSPS?

-How do we deal with the key themes of iiB and iiC?
1. Define equitable access
2. Document resources (DE Plan)
3. Widespread knowledge
4. Easily accessable on campus
5. Students who need accomodations can access them
6. Disaggregate DE data to look at equitable access. (Check out Pearson Project)

-Are outcomes for DE students widely shared?
- Separate out DE when accessing services.
-systematic and longitudinal assessment
-"no change needed" SLO assessment doesn't work
-IIB and IIB questions in program review
-assure reliability of outsourced learning support services
-DE person on visiting team will be looking for these specific things

Breakout 2- Regular and Effective Contact
-Under DE there is online (instructor initiated) and correspondence (student initiated)
-Title 5 is more stringent than DOE
-Define techniques for REC in DE addendum
-in syllabus document how REC happens

-ACCJC says REC
1. In online elements of hybrid
2. Demonstrated and documented
3. Need for financial aid
4. Key to SLOs

-got examples from a couple of colleges
1. Syllabu
2. Variety of methods
3. Ongoing and consistent

4. Definition (use title 5 language)
5. Instructor initiated focus
6. Policy that points to a DE plan vetted by senate
7. Could use board policy but make it very general and then point to DE plan for each college

-REC examples
1. Email
2. Discussion
3. Chat rooms
4. Cccconfer
5. F2F
6. Mail
7. Phone calls
8. Video conference
9. Social network
10. Fax
11. Twitter
12. Blogs
13. Texts
14. Facebook (on this topic they recommended that we have a social networking sites policy)

A good REC will have acitivities, frequency and quality

Breakout 3-Multi-College District Challenges
-BP that defines role of faculty in accreditation needs to be evaluated and improved
-Functional map examples were given and these also need to be systematically reviewed
-Board agendas should list Standards involved when they hear their reports
-Board policy defining its review of key indicators

Breakout 4 – Institutional Learning Outcomes – New Standards
-GELOs need direct assessment, not indirect from program level and course level
-asking students would provide direct assessment
-GELOs should be more specific than ILOs
-need GELOs for IGETC, ADT, CSU patterns, CTE … (Eligibility Requirement 11)
-one way to get CSU pattern GELOs is to pick from outcomes listed in their catalog
-a graduation survey with specific questions on ILOs is suggested
-are SLOs approved by curriculum committee? In what detail?
-are Admin outcomes linked to ILOs?
-Put ILOs in college mission statement
-Rand ILOs in each program (1-5) and then assess the ones you give 4 or 5 to
-Use a survey in the capstone course of how program worked for you. Use this only for students who did all their courses at our college.

General Session 3
-Christopher got this in more detail than I did so please read his notes.

Notes from Christopher Howerton from the Accreditation Institute

Howerton Notes 1 ASCCC – Accreditation Institute San Mateo Marriott Feb. 20-21, 2015 Breakout Session 1: Preparing Your Campus for a Site Visit Danny Martino – Santiago Canyon College John Stanskas -ASCCC Secretary James Todd, ASCCC Area A Representative • This session is a brainstorming focused on best practices. • Some colleges have used a similar technique with pamphlets with photos, bios, etc. • Good rapport with the team members and develop communication with members prior to visit. • Game and events to get the campus actively involved. Acronym quiz., "typical questions" • Primer for campus on governance and decision-making • In senate, opportunity to develop ongoing communication and visual representation of the processes • "Accreditation April" "WASCapaloza" – food, games, and an opportunity to focus by standard as a fun forum to get input and to conduct a self-evaluation • Campus created visuals to illustrate understanding of processes. (contests?) example of the use of the ECE lab with kids toys to see who could make a model of how things work. • Honest assessment, not the "high gloss" version of yourself. • No longer planning agendas, but a small paragraph focused essay to action plan. • Evidence on a flash drive was super easy for them to find the needed material – Keep it simple. • Standardize the name of the document…use it consistently in all documents • Be adaptable to the computer request for the visiting team…make them comfortable. (mac. Vs. PC) • Good practice to have a standing committee not just gearing up for a visit. Accreditation needs to be woven into all practices • Role of the faculty Accreditation Chair. Standing report out on all Senate agenda meetings. (bi-monthly report from the steering committee) • Funding for the work. • Involve classified. • Utilize committee structure as review team. • Chairs of the standards need to go to other standing committees to ensure that they understand what the standard is asking, and then participate in the data and drafting of the response. • Need to give reassigned time on an on-going basis…to coordinate with the ALO. • There needs to be a report-out with meaningful information. • Evaluate committee structure and how members are assigned to committees. • Bring to the division level- senate faculty level- etc.Howerton Notes 2 • Use the tool of recognition of everyone's effort…Need to say "thank you" and the ability to energize all that work. Even right after the official submission and results are not known. • Creation of an Award and recognition committee as a sub-committee of the Senate, maybe work with the professional development to ensure that there are opportunities to be concern with • Make a campus accreditation time-line especially a year or so out. Status update and what needs to be collected in the process. Breakout Session 2: Student Learning Outcomes and Continuous Quality Improvement Randy Beach, Southwestern College James Todd, ASCCC Area A Representative Rebecca Wolniewicz, Southwestern College • SLOs is one of the reasons why most institutions are put on sanctions with Accreditation. • Dialogue needs to be campus wide. • Are you using SLO data to inform what services and courses being offered where…what's best for student learning and not just what's good for an employee. • Documentation to show visibility that these things are "important" • Achievements vs outcomes discussion. What's happening in competency mastery but not getting "ahead". Equity! • Pass rate vs. ability to mastery competency (any impact to any particular group)? • Student equity means all voices are heard and all students have an opportunity to succeed. • Per-student data. We should be collecting disaggregation of student data. • Concerns of privacy and workload impact on faculty. • SLO assessment is a useful opportunity for collecting data to support student equity initiatives. • Student equity plan…funding to look at tracking of students in terms of their achievement on campus broken out by ethnicity and other special populations such as foster youth, veterans, etc. • I.B.6 – "The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students."…"When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies." o How to link to MIS data? Course reporting data (not individual section data reports) o Home grown system? o Legally able to track? o Process of how to link back into the data. o Research office to aggregate and disaggregate for the program o "sub population" is not directly defined in the standard. What is best for your population of students (HSI?) o Check the manual regarding specific data points, and nation-wide demographics and what is organic for our organization that we need to help us improve.Howerton Notes 3 • Assessment as scholarship, • Concern for some students do not truthfully identify themselves as their demographics (i.e. not reporting as a foster youth, or veteran to keep money options for other education) • Action research vs. Empirical research. This is an attempt to get useful data based on what we have and that we can look at to make decisions. • But what about the process of looking at the allocation of resources and program planning. How are goals set as it

relates to learning and have the sub-populations can be helpful for this discussion. • Strategic planning- links to outcome assessment and other long-term planning • Evaluation of SLO processes for faculty and staff. (maybe part of a climate survey) • In the program review process leading questions such as: "What are you assessing?" "How are you assessing it?" What are the results?" What are you going to do to improve results? And WHAT RESOURCES DO YOU NEED TO INCREASE ACHIEVEMENT?" Built into the program review process. • What about follow up from how funds have been used and if improvement was successful? • Evidence for students to be able to demonstrate their learning from us as they transfer, meaningful assessment and "accountability". What are the take-a-ways? Portfolios? Etc. Breakout Session 3: Human Resources, Professional Development and Employee Evaluation Phil Crawford, ASCCC North Representative Dolores Davison, ASCCC Area B Representative Timothy Pawlak, San Diego School of Continuing Education Kay Weiss, Dean, Arts and Humanities, San Bernardino Valley College • Refer to ASCCC Resolution 2.01 (FA 08) – Senate position on the role of outcome assessment and faculty evaluation and academic freedom • New ACCJC Standard IIIA (Human Resources) – "The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning." • CA has a unique position because of the labor union • Faculty self-evaluation aspect. • River CCD, Mt. Sac, and Santa Rosa has been accepted by ACCJC • "Participation of SLO assessment" can be mixed in with the other professional responsibility. • FT faculty are given 10 hours a year extra pay to cover the expectation to conduct SLO work. And adjunct faculty can request extra pay (EXAMPLE from San Bernardino) • Accurate SLOs on syllabi as on official COR and in TracDat…all location • Important for the Dean review of submitted syllabi to ensure that they are in place. • Use of sharepoint as an electronic version for all syllabi submission., • What is in the Ed Code for the peer makeup for a tenured contract member? • The powerpoint for this breakout session has a few examples of what language has been accepted earlier by ACCJC.Howerton Notes 4 • Inclusive all faculty (both full and part-time). Also the evaluation of administration and other management areas. • ACCJC Standard IIIA8 – "An institution with part time and adjunct faculty has employment policies and practices which provide for their orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development. The institution provides opportunities for integration of part time and adjunct faculty into the life of the institution." • Maybe different modalities in addition to just the offering of the professional development. • Offer professional development at multiple locations to ensure they are opportunities for professional development even with faculty at multiple campuses • FLEX calendar discussion. • Colleges are allowed to follow up to 15 days of FLEX • Average is 4.5 FLEX days across the state. • A lot of discussion regarding getting adjunct involved • FOOD brings people to events. • "office hours" for adjunct can be supported for equity issues and student success. • ACCJC Standard IIIA14: "The institution plans for and provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement." • You need to conduct a review of professional development activities to ensure qualities and use the results to improve future professional development. • How are we training faculty to use assessment data? In an effort for how does the faculty use data. • Online vs. face-to-face data, etc. • "Where is it written?" "Where is the data?" (Tim Pawlak) • Anecdotal data is not the same as proof. Myths become fact! • People within the discipline who can understand the trends and data. • What are the numbers that support the percentages? • What kind of professional development activities do you have that support this standard? o Professional development clearinghouse – a repository that will be accessible to all community colleges o OEI Resources-Online education Initiative • Ranking faculty hiring recommendations and voting…data driven. Breakout Session 4: Team Training – Views from Visiting Teams Dr. Bill Scroggins – Mt. San Antonio College Kay Weiss – San Bernardino Valley College Julie Bruno – ASCCC Vice President, Sierra College Timothy Pawlak – San Diego School of Continuing Education Stephanie Curry – ASCCC Accreditation Committee Member, Reedley CollegeHowerton Notes 5 • College President will receive a list of who can serve from your college.- Check with Dr. White. • How are visiting team members trained? o Online training session (2hr secession) o With an online option for suggestions and discussion o There is a face-to-face training prior to a visit (with scenarios – all day) o Talk with team members of actual team and assigned role (typically as a lead on a standard and a backup on other standards) o A lot of variations with team training o Usually only a short turnaround from when the team is selected and when they have training before the actual site visit. o Experience is dependent on who the lead. o Information on form including campus experience to help the team

leader to place your responsibility. • What was the most important thing that you learned from accreditation team training and what do you wish you had learned? o The advance workload – there is a lot of prep work. o Chairs have a separate training prior to a team training. o Need to get up-to-date. Past reports, etc. Need to write to the history and arch of the work the college has done. Need to refer to it in the writing. o Electronic versions that match the hard copies of the evidence o Overall self-study review with primary and secondary standards, Two templates are used for overall self-study and then one to the specific standard you have been assigned. (i.e. Strength of the quality of evidence, inconsistencies with what is written and what evidence is in place, etc. – High level of analysis (prior to visit). o There will be a second round of evidence that will need to be reviewed (typically 2-4 weeks prior to visit this will all happen) o Also, deciding who will need to be interviewed during the visit. o Department of Ed will inform the different commissions as to what are priorities that need to be considered in the review of institutions. (example: Distance education with the verification of clock hours for DE students are aprox equal to the face-to-face hours for units earned) o Need to write compliance for areas that may be needed to add to the review of standards. o Concern with the federal oversight as a compliance audit, but how a college is supposed to meet when they are not informed? o Team may be asked to find strategies to find information to meet compliance that comes out prior to the visit, but after the submission of the college's self-study. o Uniquely online and expectation of student learning to ensure that amount of time student and log in time for students of DE courses are matching expected learning time that is equivalent to face-to-face; substantive interaction with the instructor and with each other. How much instructional TIME in the course. And there is an expectation for the college being able to document and use as submission of evidence. o START EARLY…IT'S A LOT OF WORKHowerton Notes 6 • What is the workload like for a visiting team member and how would you suggest that team members prepare in advance for the visit? o Both individual and group writing, however, the full draft of the report is written before the team leaves the college they are reviewing. o Rewriting and editing throughout. Reviewing drafts from colleagues and having multiple eyes on each part of the draft. o Primary audience of the recommendation is for the college. Although the recommendation is for the commission with justification. The recommendation is written tightly for the commission, but the narrative leading to the recommendation is useful for the colleges to know where they need to focus. o There is a writing standard from the commission. There is a unique way of writing. o Team recommendations are confidential and signed by the team. There is a back and forth with the team chair and the commission and with the college presidents. However, the commission is the authoritative body • What one piece of advice would you give a college that is about to have a team visit? o The use of an Addendum is an opportunity that is not utilized enough. A last minute update for the team and the faculty needs to be involved and make it comprehensive of the changes since the last report was submitted. Start the addendum and collecting data at the end. o Make evidence accessible (no more than 3 clicks if on website) Keep it super easy and simple. o Do not just cite minutes that are long, give the page and paragraph to verify the report evidence. o ANSWER the prompts- make it obvious and keep it easier to o Limit the planning agenda to what really are planning to do. o Preference for the evidence…the team will be using the wi-fi in the hotel and you may want to give a flash drive to ensure that connection is easy. o People at the college needs to know about the evidence. o After the evaluation report is submitted make sure people know what is in the document and how things happen. o Perception is reality… o Name and label the evidence so it's clear what is being opened and reviewed. • What are some things that team members expect to see/read ion the self-study that have frequently been missing from the documentation? o Policies that say you are going to do it is NOT the same as showing that you have done it. Minutes can be typical for internal information, but for an outside reviewer does it show that it actually happened what you claimed. o Team members can "pop in" o Team members are given the freedom to "wander". Yes there are specific appointments, but also expected to walk around and ask questions talk to students, faculty, it is an informal validation of the evaluation study. Looking for credibility to the document. o Evidence, verification, documentation.Howerton Notes 7 General Session: Institution Set Standards Matthew Wetstein – RP President • Institution set standards- Eligibility Requirement 11 • Download the presentation • MiraCosta example of a good published online view of indicators and success rates (5 year span trend) • San Joaquin Delta College used a 4 year average to show trend and then set a proposed goal that moves to President's Council to set the goals and indicators for student achievement. • IB6 – "disaggregates and analyzes" - Student equity plans in reference to IB6 – required course success rates, and SEP plan is a critical; evidence for ACCJC reports as fundamental evidence that you have done this work. Indicators of achievements. On one level of achievement and in program reviews disaggregated achievement data. • What does it mean to say a college disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes for subpopulations of students? Which subpopulations? How is this done on your campuses? Who does it? • Should it be done? •

What subpopulations might be looked at? o Online vs. face to face in large enrollment courses o Consider controlling for classes where faculty are the same (faculty specific effects) o Ethnicity – but beware of ethnic breakdowns in lo enrolled sections o Fiorst generation to attend college vs. not o Majors vs. non-majors o College prepared vs. unprepared • (scorecard data?) • Biggest payoff with disaggregation o Large enrollment courses (50%) of your enrollment takes place in roughly 20 courses. o Key gatekeeper courses o Be skeptical of going too far with this notion of disaggregating in small settings (personal skeptical) FERPA concerns and looking at data at that granular level. • Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (SB 860) o Need to take out our scorecard data and have some conversations regarding the matrix o Benchmark with other similar institutions. o Dialogue- at the program level and at the peer institute level • ER11, 1B3, 1B6 are linked elements in a web of institutional effectiveness • Increasingly, faculty are being asked to …. Achievement vs. learning and most colleges do not have these level of disaggregated data and longitudinal to make validation of placement data and currently do not have the data. Institutional Integrity – Randy Beach • I.C. Institutional IntegrityHowerton Notes 8 • Based on Eligibility Requirement 20-21 • "Consistent and ethical actions, values, methods, measures, principles, expectations, and outcomes, as defined by institution; and of clear, accurate, and current information available to the college community and public." • Not a new idea • Consult with you Senate Leadership to Call Attention to Integrity Issues • Subjective Analysis of Actions alongside objective data analysis. • Themes of Integrity: teaching with integrity, communication and self-representing and reporting with integrity. • Teaching o Policies on academic freedom and responsibility (7) and does it cover DE o Support for an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom exist for all constituencies o Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views (9) o ARE there ways a campus climate survey get this for evidence? • Communicating o Info is precise, accurate, current (1,3,4) ♣ Mission and student support ♣ SLO assessment Results ♣ Student Tuition, fees and other financial obligations ♣ Degrees, certificates, etc. o Catalog requirements (2) o Policies procedures are clear and available • Self-reporting o Dealing with external agencies are above board(13) o This part of the standard is more connected with for-profit organizations o Clear beliefs or world views are clearly understood o Commitment to adhering to ♣ Eligibility requirements ♣ Accreditation standards ♣ Commission policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure ♣ Institutional reporting, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes ♣ List of other accreditations held by the institution • Honesty and Leadership (1.C.8) o Promoting honesty o Modeling responsibility, etc. • Reviewing policy/procedure, review catalog, discussing the perceptions, documenting efforts aimed at integrity (multi-college districts functional maps) – any efforts in good integrity. (all meeting rooms have a list of civility rules?) • ACCJC has put a lot of this into a standard. IN ABOUT A WEEK THE POWERPOINT PRESENTATION WILL BE AVAILABLE ON THE ASCCC.ORG WEBSITE UNDER "PAST EVENTS"

Constitution & Bylaw Revision Questions

Questions relating to membership –
- Do special meetings count in determining attendance?
- Is past president subject to attendance rules?
- Is past president as voting member?
- How should we define term of incoming president after a resignation?

Questions relating to roles –
- Should role of secretary be expanded?
- What sub-committees need better definition?

Questions relating to division structure –
- Move nutrition to M&S?
- Move philosophy to FaLaHum?
- Library/SSRF placement?
- Is the current division structure appropriate?
- Location of divisions in the document?
- Will CLC be a division?

Questions relating to processes –
- Should constitution and bylaws have the same requirements for revisions?
- What portions of either should be moved to "supplemental procedures"?
- Should the election of the secretary take place at the same meeting as the election of the VP?
- Does two consecutive terms for president mean elected or any?
- Should the summer designation of powers be part of the document? If so which portion?
- Do we wish to reconsider the voting weights?
- Should a senate calendar be established and placed in "supplemental procedures"?
- Robert's Rules of Order?

Others?

Administrative/Faculty Roles Which Lack a Consistent/Defined Lead in Disciplines without Full-time Faculty

1. **Program Review** – Dean Senecal has asked for guidance regarding program reviews. Currently, some disciples are handled by division faculty, others by adjunct faculty, and occasionally, some slip through the cracks.
2. **SLOs** – Assessment of SLOs is typically done by adjunct, but tracking of SLOs and more importantly, making adjustments based on tracking is sporadic at best.
3. **Curriculum Updates** – Sometimes done by FT faculty members in the division, sometimes, by adjunct faculty members, and sometimes not done.
4. **Scheduling** – As with curriculum, but also sometimes done by scheduling deans and sometimes through the scheduling process.
5. **Adjunct orientation, support, and coordination** – handled in a mix of ways that vary by both division and discipline. [Editorial comment – this seems to be a significant gap throughout the district.]
6. **Adjunct interviews** – frequent scrambles to find FT faculty members to sit in on adjunct interviews.

Faculty Roles that Might Benefit from a Quasi-Administrative Role (Such as a Division Chair)

1. **Governance Structures** – a division chair might fill the divisions slot on one or more college committees (e.g., Curriculum). This would need to be navigated carefully, since that might remove the senate from the process of filling such positions.
2. **Coordination with YC** – Although core-curriculum is gone, there are still places where interaction with our colleagues at YC could help one or both colleges. Finding time to foster such conversations is hampered by an overburdened faculty.
3. **Division Meetings** – Division meetings could occur more frequently (if needed) and be better organized at times if there was a faculty member from the division tasked with running meetings that a dean cannot and with working with the dean to establish agendas for those meetings that the dean will run.
4. **Professional Development** – If faculty members are relieved of some of the tasks above, there would likely be more availability to attend conferences and workshops truly focused on PD to fulfill FLEX obligations, rather than using the tasks as meeting the FLEX requirements.