

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

May 8, 2014

Unless noted otherwise, all page numbers refer to the packet used during the meeting, not the current packet you are reading now.

Academic Senate President Gold called the sixth and final Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2014 semester to order on May 8, 2014 at 12:36pm. The meeting was relocated to the Board Room.

Approval of last Minutes:

[See pgs. 6-10 of packet] for minutes of the April 15, 2014 meeting. There was one correction on page 9 under New Business. K. Whitney clarified that when looking at realignment in the fall and that any SLOs based on content knowledge “could be included in critical thinking” instead of “will be included in critical thinking.”

NEW BUSINESS

President Gold made a change in the agenda to begin with the Resolutions of Congratulation for Cynthia Mosqueda and Michael Odanaka which can be found on pages 53 and 54 respectively. Both recipients addressed the Senate and thanked us for this recognition.

J. Nishime then addressed the Senate by thanking the entire faculty for making a positive difference in people’s lives here at El Camino College.

JN then went on to thank C. Gold for her two plus terms of service as Academic Senate President. She acknowledged that she had been put through the wringer and suffered some clashes, but also had many successes. She presented her with the traditional gavel handed down to outgoing Senate Presidents even though it was noted that the gavel was something CG could have used at the beginning of her tenure! Incoming co-presidents, Claudia Striepe and Chris Jeffries, then presented CG with a Resolution of Appreciation and a fossil given to her by S. Di Fiori. CG thanked everyone for all our support throughout the years.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Institutional Learning Outcomes (pgs. 11-31)

The revised Institutional Learning Outcomes are being brought to the Senate after careful and extensive discussion in and approval by the Assessment of Learning Committee. This is a second reading and the Senate may vote.

The current and proposed Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) can be found on page 11. K. Whitney began her presentation by explaining why they were recommending changes with the ILOs. Basically it is to make ILOs more assessable by providing good data that then can actually be used to look at ILOs. KW gave a history of ILOs. We began reviewing ILOs in Fall 2013. An ad hoc committee was formed to review previous assessments and research what other schools were doing. This committee created on-line discussion boards. They looked at other schools such as Pasadena CC and San Diego Mesa. ILOs such as communication, critical thinking and social responsibility were being worded in ways that could be assessed. Some schools still did have content knowledge as one of their ILOs, but the trend was moving away from including content knowledge as an ILO. The reason is that content knowledge was already being assessed at the Program and SLO-levels, so it was a duplication of effort. Most of the ILOs just did not align with content knowledge. The team proposed using PLO assessment results and External Exam pass rates to measure the content knowledge ILO. They looked at approximately 1200 courses and only 8.7% of those aligned with content knowledge and that was using just one SLO and now with multiple SLOs that is down to 5%. The Industry and Technology Division is concerned about removing content knowledge from ILOs since so many of their programs are skill based.

The proposed realignment for the fall then is to align SLOs to PLOs and PLOs to ILOs. There will be an alignment of PLOs with content knowledge, but would also be aligned to another area, so the PLO can

align with the ILOs. There will be no SLO to ILO alignment, but courses in general will align to an ILO to help with general education courses. There was a motion to accept this new alignment by M. Lipe and seconded by C. Wells. Discussion followed. C. Wells wondered why ILOs could be assessed on grades, but SLOs could not. C. Mello answered that specifically with ILOs that the only concrete data available was grades and exit exams, so we are not getting much by doing this. I. Graff suggested that because ILOs are so much broader that if we see that people are passing then they must know the content being taught. C. Mello suggested we look at the ILO assessments on the web page and see how there are many mechanisms to assess the other areas while content knowledge assessment is so limited that is why there was a decision to eliminate content knowledge from ILOS. C. Mello said that everyone is welcome to the ALC meetings if they wish to understand this process better. C. Wells asked why other schools are moving away from content knowledge and C. Mello said that previously 60% had content knowledge and 40% did not, but now this year that ratio has been reversed. He also noted that one couldn't always find assessments on their websites. He stated that we are just finishing our last ILO assessment and we really need to move forward. He also suggested we ask the statewide Academic Senate to see what they are doing in regards to content knowledge and ILOs. M. Ichinaga asked if Industry and Tech were on board with the change and K. Whitney said yes, it was unanimous from the members on the ALC. A. Ahmadpour asked if we can do a survey a year from now to see what the faculty thinks. C. Mello said the assessment process is done yearly. There was a call for the question and it passed with two abstentions.

SPECIAL REPORTS

Assessment of Learning Committee: SLO Coordinators

The SLO Coordinators were invited by the senate to report on accreditation requirements and our local assessment processes.

K. Whitney started with an explanation of the history of the assessment cycle. The goal is to achieve sustainability on the ACCJC rubric, which is where we are, but need to demonstrate continuous and on-going sustainability. In December of 2012 we received communication from the ACCJC that we should not just have one SLO per course. In February of 2013 we were put on warning by the ACCJC and were told we must increase and strengthen our assessment of SLOs. We also had to show they were using information that was coming from these assessments and it was not enough to do these every four years. Now that we have multiple SLOs, the ACCJC said in their letter to us that we are making progress and all assessments must be done at a minimum of a four-year average. We also need to show that these changes have been sustained. An example of how other institutions are looking at SLO assessment is Cerritos, which is assessing every course in the year it is offered. Glendale is another example in that they are doing continuous assessment. CG said it is smart that we are looking at what the ACCJC has said to other schools. KW said what has been decided is to do an annual assessment within a 4-year cycle. With the three SLOs that are required, each year one of them will be assessed. In the fourth year, we will look at action plans in TracDat and see if they have been followed up on. At the end of all these assessments, it will lead to program review. KW showed us some screens from TracDat, so faculty could see that the ALC is looking for quick and concise action plans. These really are not that daunting after all. C. Striepe asked what if there were 10 SLOs since she felt three seems static and KW responded that yes, all 10 would have to be assessed in that four-year cycle. She recommended that each course not have more than three SLOs and it really isn't static since each year we will be reexamining how we are assessing. K. Degnan, co-SLO coordinator from Humanities, suggested that we assess all SLOs for each course offered. M. Wynne recommended we assess all three SLO's for half the classes in the fall and the other half in the spring. C. Wells pointed out that all SLO assessments should be included in department meeting minutes.

Degrees and Certificates Report (pgs. 32-53)

Preston Reed of Institutional Research (IR) presented a report that highlights the trends in degrees and certificates awarded for the years 2008-09 to 2012-13 for both El Camino and the Compton Center. There has been a steady increase during those five years and reached a peak in 2012-13. Much of the increase is in STEM and CTE majors. As an institution, we have set institutional standards and now are

working on setting institutional goals. E. Geraghty asked where the numbers for the standard came from and the reply was from IR, deans, and the Senate, but now also through the Student Success Advisory Committee. CG cautioned that we should be conservative with the standard, but the goal can be higher. C. Wells wondered if we can assess the importance of the AA-T/AA-S degrees and the reply was we can look at the drop in non-transfer degrees with the increase in transfer degrees. C. Pineda, from IR, then handed out the “Student Success Scorecard Trends for El Camino College and the Compton Center.” The cohort starts in 2006 and this can be found on the Chancellor’s website. CG pointed out that the Compton Center’s numbers have seemed to decline, but noted that it is a small population. C. Wells noted that some colleges are not offering enough courses for underprepared students, so this would skew the rates for prepared students to be higher. He also asked about the Federal Score Card and C. Pineda said that is more geared towards four-year colleges and universities.

NEW BUSINESS

Senate Handbook

CG went over the Senate Handbook which she has completed and has posted on the website. It was originally started by David Vakil some years back. She feels it is helpful for new senators to have and a place where the constitution and by-laws can also be found. The first section is organized by Senate state laws and regulations. The second section addresses the subcommittees of the Senate with a special section dedicated to the Ed Policy Committee since it is a more complicated committee. CG added the Faculty Development Committee and said the memorandum of agreement with the Union needs updating. A brief overview of Roberts Rules of Order is included along with a copy of the “Making Decisions at El Camino College, 2012-13” document. CG said reassigned time for Senate officers needs to be included in the handbook.

OFFICER REPORTS

President – Christina Gold (CG) (pgs. 56-58)

Included were copies of the College Council Meeting of April 21, 2014 and the Student Success Advisory Committee Meeting of April 10, 2014. CG put a strong plea out to the vice-presidents to increase the reassigned time for Senate leadership. She pointed out that Title 5 requires the Board of Trustees to provide appropriate resources. She added that more time is needed to address accreditation and SLO demands. C. Wells asked if instead of reassigned time if a stipend could be offered and CG felt that wouldn’t work because of the amount of time needed to complete Senate work. M. Lipe noted that the president-elect of the Curriculum Committee is not common and normally the extra 10% could go the president. He has pointed out that his position is up after one more year and that there is no one in place to replace him. A. Martinez was wondering if we shouldn’t start recording our hours spent on Senate work and bring that back to the VP’s. A. Ahmadpour wondered if there is a conflict with the Union since it involves collective bargaining and CG replied that she would love for it to be in our Union contract, but unfortunately it is not. J. Troesh motioned to approve more reassigned time for the Senate leadership and A. Martinez seconded it. CG amended the motion to include an extra 10% for Curriculum chair-elect. A. Ahmadpour pointed out that we no longer had a quorum, so no vote could be taken on this important issue.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 2:04pm.

CJ/ECCSpring14