

Academic Senate  
October 30, 2008  
Minutes

**I. Opening Business**

**A. Called to Order at 2:50 pm by Vice President Heather Faust**

**Roll Call:**

Alfred Hochstaedter, President- FH  
Heather Faust, Vice President - HF  
Laura Loop, Secretary--LL  
Anita Johnson, ASCCC Representative – AJ  
Alexis Copeland—ABSENT  
Jamie Dagdigian--ABSENT  
Alan Haffa -AH  
Debbie Anthony – DA  
Lauren Michel--LM  
Jon Mikkelsen – JM  
Chris Calima--CC  
Susan Joplin - ABSENT  
Mark Clements - MC  
Jonathan Osburg - JO  
Marguerite Stark – ABSENT  
Stephanie Tetter—ST

**B. Acknowledgment of visitors**

David Clemens, Susan Steele, Diane Boynton, Douglas Garrison  
(Rosaleen Ryan joined at 3:15 pm)

**C. Approval of Draft Minutes from meeting of 10/16/08**

Motion (DA) to accept minutes.

Second: MC

Carries with two abstentions (AH, FH).

**II. Reports**

**A. ASCCC**

1. AJ reports highlights from the Area B ASCCC meeting at Las Positas College 10/24/08:
  - a. Colleges that received Warning/Probation status reported common problems with SLO compliance, shared governance issues and clear links between Program Review, Planning and Resource Allocation. Many recommended to focus on the rubrics provided by AACJC (awareness phase, proficiency, sustained quality improvement, etc).
  - b. Extensive debate about letter issued by B. Beno of ACCJC re: authentication of student ID, especially with distance education classes.

Academic Senate  
October 30, 2008  
Minutes

- 1) Focus is on student cheating and accountability; how do we insure that online/DE students are who they say they are and are doing the work themselves?
  - 2) Some schools require onsite orientation and exams or set up proctored exams; UC Berkeley will not accept credit from distance course unless exams were proctored.
  - 3) Problem extends to classroom impersonation.
  - 4) Federal legislation may require authentication of student ID in both online and classroom settings as early as 2010.
  - 5) Should classroom instructors check IDs? Vary assessment tools? Enhance security over course and exam materials?
  - 6) Douglas Garrison: Will investigate the federal rule(s) and report findings to senate president FH.
- c. Review of Resolutions pending at Fall Plenary 11/6/08-11/8/08:
- 1) In support: changes in ballot logistics, diversity statement in Mission statement for ASCCC, Umoja community, College Counseling research document, establishing state resource libraries for SLO materials and academic integrity policies and information, faculty leadership in setting “metrics” for Basic Skills, adequate basic skills offerings and value of information competency. Newly added: Opposition to the use of SLOs in faculty evaluation.
  - 2) Calls for more research: specificity in the minimum qualification guidelines for lab coordinators and instructors; use of and policies re: Add/Drop deadlines, role of local Senate in BSI decision making and accountability, practices and policies for “TBA” classes, costs of accreditation and SLO development.  
Discussion:
    - (a) Variations in Add/Drop deadlines among colleges within the same district seem to erode student accountability and also success by making it very easy to drop at one and add at another to evade negative consequences. Anecdotal observation that English students who add late are more likely to drop.
    - (b) Resolution about “TBA” practices is to delay January 2009 deadline for compliance with a

Academic Senate  
October 30, 2008  
Minutes

new policy; issue has to do with amount of supervision provided.

- 3) Recommendations: define AA and AS degrees; make Articulation/Transfer a Standing Committee of the ASCCC; develop language regarding student authentication for DE and onsite instruction; track accreditation and SLO development costs.
- 4) Full text of resolutions is available at [www.asccc.org](http://www.asccc.org). Senators are asked to give feedback to AJ or to DA (also attending) before Wednesday 11/5. AJ will probably attend breakout sessions on Accreditation, Equivalency, Grading Policies, Basic Skills and the role of the local senate.

**B. COC**

1. MC reported that the COC is working on recruiting faculty for the Technology Committee to work closely with the Distance Education committee. The goal is to get the technology committee up and running for Spring semester.
2. Updates will be coming in the future about committee recommendations for Academic Freedom.

**III. New Business**

- A. DA requests funding for the Fall Plenary session Nov. 6-8 from the Academic senate travel and conference budget. Cost is \$325.
  - a. FH distributed an estimate of the travel and conference items anticipated for the present academic year totaling approximately \$3300. The budget allows \$3200.
  - b. Consensus for Executive Committee to discuss and find a reasonable solution immediately following this senate meeting.
- B. GE SLO (GEO) Plan **FH reporting as SLO Coordinator**
  1. FH distributed the following:
    - a. Powerpoint handout entitled *GEOs: General Education Outcomes*
    - b. *General Education Outcomes (GEOs) aligned across disciplines*
    - c. *General Education Outcomes (GEOs) aligned with GE areas*
    - d. *Suggested General Education SLO for each MPC Area A2 (Communication & Analytical Thinking) course*
  2. The proposed "GEO Plan" was developed by the SLO committee (FH, Diane Boynton, Marilyn Wilcox and John Gonzalez).

Academic Senate  
October 30, 2008  
Minutes

- a. The SLO committee looked at Cabrillo's model which was accepted by the accrediting body. The model defines General Education learning outcomes for a major/area of emphasis as the same as those at the course level, since (unlike a career or technical program SLO) there is no identified outcome beyond what is defined in the individual courses.
  - b. Most colleges have identified common themes in their GE outcomes (e.g. Communication, Critical Thinking, Global Awareness, Personal Responsibility, etc).
  - c. All colleges reviewed by the committee have designed the GEOs to be aligned across GE areas or disciplines; committee worries that this model is cumbersome and complex without providing clarity for the real outcomes.
  - d. Some colleges (e.g. Grossmont) have created very busy and elaborate diagrams or matrices to describe learning outcomes; still don't know what the student is supposed to be able to do when they finish. At some colleges, GEOs and institutional SLOs are becoming one and the same.
  - e. MPC's SLO committee is committed to keeping the model simple and manageable; committee proposed embedding a standard GEO into all course SLOs within a given area (e.g. For Area B, Natural Science: "Use the scientific method to investigate phenomena in the natural world and use concepts, theories and technology to explain them."
3. Discussion:
- a. FH: CSU, UC, IGETC course areas don't line up perfectly.
  - b. Susan Steele: Do the proposed GEO statements apply only to the MPC GE pattern then?
  - c. We're not quite there yet, but will create outcome statements for each pattern.
  - d. AH: Proposed that a flex event be dedicated to writing outcomes for the areas in other patterns.
  - e. DA: Transfer students are guided through the IGETC pattern which is combination of the CSU and UC patterns. Area E (Lifelong Learning and Self-Development) and Area F (Intercultural Studies) do not have outcomes listed.
  - f. Diane Boynton: The focus for accreditation is in the assessment of the SLOs, which is more complex. The assessment happens in the classroom methodology, not through vague overarching principles.
  - g. JM: Is a particular GEO supposed to be de-emphasized if it can be conveyed in a non-GE course or in a GE course of another area (e.g. Is "critical thinking" only an outcome for the Area A2 classes?

Academic Senate  
October 30, 2008  
Minutes

- h. FH: This is the question that promoted great complexity in the GEO models of other colleges.
- i. Diane Boynton: It's overwhelming to try to cross-reference every potential outcome in each course or area; we know that is addressed in the course and in the assessment methods.
- j. MC: We need to ask whether the course objectives are leading to SLOs, or vice versa? All courses have objectives and the SLOs should reflect them. How is academic freedom impacted in trying to figure out which standard GEO the course should fall into?
- k. FH: SLOs force us to examine what is taught and to see if the student can actually do what is expected. Is this a good or bad thing?
- l. MC: The dialog is a good thing, but hasty writing of SLOs is not; they should flow naturally from the course objectives.
- m. Diane Boynton: There are already SLOs in place for most of the AA GE courses; 4-6 each for the most part and not particularly well written. One simple broad GEO statement is unlikely to not fit. The question is whether we should continue down this road (the model of inserting the standard GEO into course level SLOs) or not? Or should we adopt a more complex model, or does anyone have yet another idea?
- n. HF: Are the Area E and F outcomes yet to be written, and so all students will be exposed?
- o. FH: Those areas are part of the detailed dialog still to be continued.
- p. Diane Boynton: Area E and F outcomes are actually created, but have yet to go to AAAG.
- q. JM: Recommended that the proposed model move forward; faculty have an obligation to identify SLOs and if students are not meeting them to ask why. Some faculty may have issues with "force feeding." If a course already has one of the GEOs incorporated, would it need to be listed again?
- r. AJ: If every instructor incorporates the appropriate GEO, the assessment becomes part of the body of evidence that GE SLOs are indeed happening at the course level. Was there a sense of surprise at the conference that perhaps the simplicity of MPC's proposed model would not meet the expectation for accreditation?
- s. Diane Boynton: The ACCJC rep seemed to receive it very well. We need to assess every statement we make—the colleges who used the "overarching" approaches were

Academic Senate  
October 30, 2008  
Minutes

- overwhelmed and inundated with committee bureaucracy. The ACCJC rubric is a moving target, so simple is better.
- t. FH: The WASC conference was filled with people who are deeply dedicated to assessment, not necessarily to dialog.
  - u. CC: A simple plan is good; is there time to take the idea back to our constituencies for feedback?
  - v. Dave Clemens, MC, AJ: Agreed that divisions should review.
  - w. Consensus that FH will come to individual divisions if desired/invited, and will also make the power point presentation available on the senate website for those who wish to present to own department/division.
  - x. Motion: *Senators will discuss the proposed GEO Plan with their respective department/divisions and report back at the regular senate meeting 11/20/08.* (MC) Second: HF. Carries unanimously.

- C. Academic Senate President Board Presentation on SLOs.  
Deferred to future meeting due to time.

**Adjourned at 4:26 pm**

Academic Senate  
October 30, 2008  
Minutes