I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Public Comment – Each speaker will be given a maximum of 4 minutes to address the senate about a non-agendized item or items, with a maximum of 15 minutes allowed for public comment. The senate may vote to extend public comment at any meeting. Please contact the senate secretary before the meeting when wishing to speak at public comment. The senate welcomes all speakers to participate in the discussion on agendized items.

B. Approval of Agenda

C. Approval of Minutes from November 1, 2010

II. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

A. Announcements

B. Part-time Officer-at-Large vacancy

C. Accreditation Faculty Co-chair Selection - Laura Sim

D. ESL Task Force follow-up

E. Professional Development contract review/approval process

F. Plenary Session report

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Upcoming committee work highlights

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. SLO Coordinator Model (Attachment #1)

V. INFORMATION ITEMS*

NONE

*The Academic Senate may move information items to action upon a 2/3 vote.
GUESTS:
- Barbara Blanchard - Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Beth Smith, Math Department Faculty, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Treasurer

RECORER: Rochelle Weiser

I. CALL TO ORDER (11:05)

A. Public Comment

None
B. Approval of Agenda
A motion was made to approve the day’s agenda with one change; remove item A in the Committee Reports, upcoming committee work highlights, until the next meeting.
M/S/U Wirig/Atchison

C. Approval of Minutes from October 18, 2010
A motion was made to approve the minutes from October 18, 2010.
M/S/U Sim/Robinson

II. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

A. Announcements

Chris began by announcing the Senate election results; Academic Senate President, Sue Gonda; Divisional Senator for Student Services, Narges Heidari; Divisional Senator for English, Social and Behavioral Science, Kirin Farquar.

Chris then reported that there was still a vacancy for the Part-Time Senate Officer-at-Large. She reported it was a 2-year position that had been held by George Gastill, but was now vacant. Chris noted that this position, like the other Senate Officer Positions, is a 2-year term and when a vacancy occurs mid-term the Senate by-laws allow for nomination of candidates from the Part-Time faculty serving in the Senate for a replacement. Chris noted she would be sending out an e-mail requesting nominations and volunteers. Chris explained that the duties of the Part-Time Senate Officer-at-Large include attendance at Senate meetings, chairing the Academic Senate Part-Time Faculty Committee meetings, and attending the weekly Senate Officers meetings. Chris then asked if any of the newly elected Divisional Senators would like to serve as the Part-Time Senate Officer-at-Large; she noted that anyone interested could contact her to put their name on the ballot. Chris announced the nominations would be open until the next Senate meeting and that voting would take place at that next meeting. Chris noted the position would only be for a semester and a half; in order to finish the current term, then a new officer would be elected.

Chris reviewed a memo from the California Community College Chancellor's office that expressed the need for a continued emphasis on three primary missions for the community colleges: transfer, basic skills and workforce development.

To follow up on an item from a previous meeting, Chris asked Senators to discuss the pros and cons of an earlier withdrawal deadline with their constituent groups so that the senate can conduct a more informed discussion on the topic at a future meeting.

Chris reported that Barb Blanchard would be speaking on issues regarding class schedules, but wanted to stress this item was in the early discussion phase and was being brought to the Senate to make faculty aware of the situation. Barb began by reporting what Title 5 outlines as the minimum number of hours per course unit. She noted that Grossmont currently schedules at the minimum number of hours required, but when a holiday falls on a scheduled class day that could make the course out of compliance. Barb reported that nothing would be done with the Spring 2011 schedule, but noted that for the Fall 2011 schedule some courses might fall below the minimum requirement and may need to be addressed. Barb reiterated she still has more research to do before anything is finalized. Discussion then occurred regarding various schedules and how the holidays affect the courses that are scheduled for those days. Chris reiterated that this discussion was purely informational.
B. Accreditation Faculty Co-Chair- Close nominations – Laura Sim

Laura began by giving a brief review of the election timeline. She noted the nominations had been open since the last meeting; she had received no additional nominations via e-mail. Laura then asked for any additional nominations from the floor, none were made, she officially closed nominations. Laura announced Chris Hill as a candidate. Laura noted she would send the application to Chris to be filled out, it would then be available for review by Senators, then at the next Senate meeting voting would take place.

C. Area D meeting and Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) plenary session resolutions

Chris began by reporting she had attended the Area D meetings the previous weekend. She reported at the meetings she received the proposed resolutions for the Fall plenary session. Chris then highlighted some of the upcoming institutions including a Basic Skills Institute will take place February in San Jose and a fully-funded institute on workforce development that would be taking place. She encouraged interested faculty to contact her for more information.

Chris reported that there are several resolutions coming forward in relation to SB1440; she then reiterated that SB1440 outlines the creation of transfer degrees that will guarantee students admission to the CSU system if they meet the degree requirements. Chris then reviewed the process by which the ASCCC will create the degrees utilizing the ongoing C-ID process to create Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC). Chris noted that the legislation does not preclude colleges from creating their own degrees, but consistency among colleges will benefit students. Chris then reiterated the importance of visiting the www.c-id.net website and signing up for the listserv for individual disciplines. This will allow faculty to participate in the process and be notified when their discipline is meeting. Beth Smith reported that the oversight committee would be meeting the following day to start working on the details of implementing the new degrees. It was asked how a faculty member could become involved in the actual formation of the degrees; Beth noted there are two groups; the Faculty Discipline Review Groups, which are smaller groups made up of representatives from the disciplines from CSU and the community colleges and these groups would be working on the actual degrees. The Discipline Input Groups, which are made up of any interested faculty from a given discipline (using the C-ID listservs), are focused on developing common course descriptors and proposing draft transfer degrees. Chris mentioned that if faculty are interested in participating in a FDRG or DIG to contact her and she would re-send the e-mail link to the C-ID website. Beth reported that the first three degrees that are coming out are Sociology, Communications Studies, and Math. She noted that once they become available for review, the ASCCC would like input and feedback from faculty in those disciplines.

Chris then reported that at the Area D meeting clarification was given on SB1143, the legislation to create a task force for producing recommendations for performance-based funding. It was clarified that any recommendations coming forth from the task force will not be considered as research results, but will actually be implemented. She shared that Jane Patton, ASCCC President, reported that the recommendations would likely go to the Consultation Council and the State Chancellor’s Office first. Beth Smith reported that the process would likely be that the task force would spend the first half of the year researching and creating matrices related to performance-based funding, then bringing them to town hall style meetings for input. Beth noted that colleges will need to come up with markers other than the traditional graduation/transfer measures to gauge student success at the college level, including possible momentum points for tracking progress from basic skills to college-level work. Sue Jensen noted that in the area of Basic Skills the funding has begun to be tied to student success and they are looking at various ways in which student success can be measured. It was also noted that a practical evaluation is always a good thing (i.e. to know what one is doing well and what one can do better) but to tie funding to that creates many unforeseen and unwanted results. Beth noted that
it is in the best interest of all involved to have these “markers” or matrices for student success be faculty driven rather than mandated by legislators who do not work with students every day and may not know the different ways in which students succeed. Chris noted that both she and Beth would continue to keep the Senate updated.

Chris then reviewed the process involved in bringing resolutions forward to the Plenary Session. She noted that the first review occurs at the area meetings, then amendments or changes are proposed, and the final documents are presented at the Plenary session. Chris noted that she wanted to bring the proposed resolutions to the Senate in order to have input from the Senators, especially on items that pertain to their discipline or department. Chris then reviewed several of the proposed resolutions, including a resolution to track the long term impact of SB1440, another to ask the ASCCC to research the implementation of a college-wide template for the use of CLEP (College Level Examination Program) in Associate Degrees, a resolution recommending flexibility in the approval process of degrees related to SB1440, another asking to incorporate double counting in the development of the degrees for SB1440 in the “Golden Four”-Critical Thinking, Written and Oral Communication, Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning, one in regard to SB1143 asking the ASCCC to define student success and ensure faculty-directed matrices are used, and one asking the ASCCC to urge local senates to give priority to local students over non-local or international students. Chris also noted there were several papers being presented; SLO Assessment, Student Success, Library and Learning Resources. Chris noted that a complete list of the resolutions and papers being presented can be accessed on the ASCCC website and asked for faculty feedback.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Upcoming committee work highlights

This item was moved to the next meeting, November 15, 2010.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

None

V. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. SLO Coordinator Model

Chris briefly discussed the origin of the proposed change in the SLO coordinator structure from a single coordinator model to a dual coordinator model. She emphasized that with the move to the SLO assessment phase, this model allows for more support to the various departments within the college. She asked for Senators to review the proposal with their constituencies and that the item would come back for action at the next meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:25 pm
Next meeting is scheduled for November 1, 2010.
CH: rw
SLO Coordinator On-Going Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Steering Committee meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Accreditation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Spreadsheets/6YPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one meetings, SLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPDC Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Response Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOs on Course Outlines of Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSOs and ASOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSLO to PSLO Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisiting “What’s a Program”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitizing Annual Reporting process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why is a Dual SLO Coordinator Model useful and good for Grossmont and why we should adopt it beyond Fall 2010?

1. With double the manpower, Micah and I have been able to meet with each department individually, providing them with clarification, guidance, resources, and a commitment to continued assistance.

2. The workload of this job is enormous—with two people we avoid burnout of the Coordinator and a fairer valuation of what the job requires.

3. As we approach another Accreditation visit, it will be imperative that we continue to grow our SLO efforts and provide as much support as possible for departments.

4. The new Program Review process has been launched and having a Dual Coordinator model gives us both manpower and knowledge that we can use to assist departments going through Program Review with regard to the Program SLO portion of the Review document.

5. We are making real headway in terms of “turning the ship around” and getting departments to be comfortable with conducting simple, doable and meaningful assessments—but this requires a good deal of energy, time, organization and effort, and is best facilitated by two people.

6. This model provides an opportunity to train new SLO leaders on campus.

7. This model also allows us to provide new, dynamic and ongoing professional development opportunities re: SLOs for our faculty.

SLO Dual-Coordinator Proposal

For the past three years, Grossmont has functioned with one SLO Coordinator, receiving 40% release time. With this move into the assessment phase, however, we need an additional 40% reassigned time for a second SLO Coordinator to help facilitate the process. Together, the two SLO Coordinators would comprise 80% release time to coordinate the campus’ SLO assessment efforts. Other campuses of similar size typically have between 60% and 100% release time dedicated to SLO efforts, so this second SLO coordinator position would help bring Grossmont’s SLO manpower to a comparable level.