

I. Opening Business

A. Called to Order 2:45 PM

Roll Call:

Alfred Hochstaedter, President- FH
Heather Faust, Vice President - HF
Laura Loop, Secretary--LL
Anita Johnson, ASCCC Representative – ABSENT
Alexis Copeland—AC
Jamie Dagdigian--ABSENT
Alan Haffa -AH
Debbie Anthony – DA
Lauren Michel—ABSENT
Jean-Claude Prado--ABSENT
Chris Calima--CC
Susan Joplin - SJ
Mark Clements - ABSENT
Jonathan Osburg – JO (arrived after roll)
Marguerite Stark – MS
Deborah Ruiz--DR

B. Acknowledgment of visitors

Douglas Garrison, John Gonzales, Susan Steele.

C. Approval of Draft Minutes from meeting of 05/21/09

Motion to accept minutes as recorded: AH

Second: DA

Carries with the following abstentions: SJ, CC, AC.

II. Reports

A. President/SLO/CAC Report (FH)

1. College Council had first reading of BP 5100 (Equal Employment Opportunity and Commitment to Diversity). Senate's suggested changes regarding quorum and size of committee were not adopted, nor was a separation made between equal employment opportunity and a commitment to diversity. *See Appendix A* for the minor revisions made. How strongly should we advocate for the changes suggested at senate meetings?

Discussion:

AH: We discussed in great depth; we should ask for a written response from College Council explaining the reasons for not adopting our changes.

DA: EEOAC supported the policy with only minor revisions. Do we know of other ways to promote diversity besides equal employment opportunity?

Academic Senate
May 21, 2009
DRAFT Minutes

FH: "Equal Employment Opportunity" and a "commitment to diversity" are related but separate. Other ways to promote diversity might include statements about student equity; efforts to educate faculty and staff about values related to diversity.

AH: The difference to me is that the EEOAC prevents a negative thing from happening (illegal discrimination). But a commitment to diversity encompasses a breadth of viewpoints and ideologies, not limited only to protected groups.

Doug Garrison: Both views are right; But the EEOAC may see that their role is limited to the charge defined by Code, i.e. to prohibit illegal discrimination in hiring. The committee may see the promotion of diversity in other ways to be beyond their scope.

Consensus to refer to Executive Committee for further discussion with Barbara Lee (Associate Dean of Human Resources).

B. COC

No report. (MC absent).

C. Flex Day Committee Report (LL)

1. Updated schedule was distributed. Session descriptions are almost complete and schedule will be forwarded to staff development committee by end of semester.

2. FH will send ALLUSER email to alert faculty/staff about planned events; RSVPs for CPR can be Emailed to LL.

Motion to accept the final Fall 2009 Flex Day schedule as developed by the flex day scheduling committee: FH. Second (AH). Carries unanimously.

III. Old Business

A. Resolutions from the SLO Committee (Vice President Heather Faust presiding) Second reading:

FH distributed revised versions of the resolutions from the SLO committee. *See Appendix B.*

Major revisions include the deletion of 3rd and 4th whereas statements from Resolution #4, and a recommendation to faculty to use broadly defined SLOs and/or specifically defined objectives when engaging in the SLO-Assessment process.

1. E-mail communications to the senate:

--Caroline Carney: Resolutions not clear that SLOs are required to appear in the course syllabus.

--Lynn Iwamoto: CAC was not involved in the creation of these resolutions; would like that statement to be included.

Motion to endorse the revised versions of the SLO committee resolutions as they appear in Appendix B (AH). Second: DA.

Carries with one abstention (JO).

B. Proposed Academic Affairs Program Review Process

1. No change in the “Academic Affairs Program Review Self Study”, nor in the “Academic Affairs Program Review—Annual Report Form.”
2. Changes to the SLO forms “Instructor Reflections on Student Learning” and Program Reflections on Student Learning” include the addition of “supporting objectives” wherever “SLO’s appear. Also changes item #6 in the former to direct faculty to keep the instructor reflections for own records only. *See Appendix C.*

Discussion:

CC: For clarification, aren’t GEOs also SLOs?

FH: GEO(s) need only be included if the course satisfies a GE requirement.

AH: Time for dialog about the program reflections should be embedded in flex time somehow. Need to acknowledge that the completion of this process takes a great deal of time.

John Gonzales: Flex days include a total of 14 ½ days for individual, departmental and institutional purposes.

AH: Item #6 on the “Academic Affairs Program Review Self Study” (“Summary) focuses so much on the outcomes that their value is overstated as part of student learning. Graduation rates, placements and other achievement data could also be included. Even the AACJC rubric uses the term “student learning” in its description of sustainable CQI. Suggest the following change:

Summarize and prioritize the PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLANS for improving or maintaining the quality of your program area. Include improvement of student learning attainment of SLOs as rationale for any plan, if appropriate. Distinguish between budget-dependent and budget-independent items.

Motion to endorse the “Academic Affairs Program Review Self Study”, “Academic Affairs Program Review—Annual Report Form” and SLO forms “Instructor Reflections on Student Learning” and Program Reflections on Student Learning” (AH). Second: CC. Carries unanimously.

C. Educational Master Plan (Susan Steele)

1. An updated version of the *Educational Master Plan* was distributed with changes highlighted in yellow. Most notable is the addition of “Facilities Improvement” as a college-wide initiative, and the addition of Administrative goals (p.23).

Discussion:

FH: Are processes addressed in the master plan as well as financial resources? Specifically, the integration of the SLO process into

Academic Senate
May 21, 2009
DRAFT Minutes

program review at all levels?

CC: The student success initiative will require intense collaboration.

Susan Steele: Basic Skills Initiative is included in that section.

CC: BSI is too specific to encompass all of student success. We need to address the need for collaboration between Academic Affairs, Student Services and Administration.

Motion to endorse the Educational Master Plan contingent on the addition of a statement about SLOs as they relate to student success, and collaboration between Academic Affairs, Student Services and Administration required to ensure student success (AH). Second: FH. Carries unanimously.

IV. New Business

A. 2009 Annual Report

FH distributed his Academic Senate Annual Report 2008-09, which is included in the Board meeting agenda for May 26, 2009, and available on the academic senate's website.

Motion to endorse the Annual Report as prepared by Academic Senate President Fred Hochstaedter (LL). Second: HF. Carries unanimously.

B. Rehearsal for Accreditation Flex Day Presentation *(presented out of order on agenda due to time constraints)*

President/Superintendent Douglas Garrison and VP of Academic Affairs John Gonzales engaged senators in a mock town hall meeting to demonstrate how the visiting team may conduct faculty interviews. Themes are Planning, Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes. Consensus by senators to participate in a similar demonstration at the general session at Fall Flex event.

Summary of questions discussed:

1. *What level of proficiency has been attained by MPC on the "Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness" for Planning?*

AH: We're past "awareness" and "development" on the rubric, as there are clear processes for resource allocation.

FH: College Council is the shared governance group that hears program reviews from all areas and plans the allocation of resources. Compliment goals are formed by each area (Academic Affairs, Student Services and Administration). Department/Division action plans are reviewed through the 3 advisory groups (Academic Affairs Advisory Group, Student Services Advisory Group, Administrative Services Advisory Group).

2. *How do faculty/staff who are not on College Council interface with the planning process?*

DR: As public service librarian, my colleague is a member of College Council and serves as the voice for library staff and

Academic Senate
May 21, 2009
DRAFT Minutes

- faculty by exchanging information at regular meetings.
3. *How does MPC assure that the quality of education at the Education Center in Marina is comparable to the main campus, and that the planning and allocation process is consistent there?*
DR: The library will need to decrease hours, but remains committed to providing regular hours and resources to the Ed Center in Marina.
CC/AH: A campus committee is active in ensuring that student services (like counseling, library support, etc) is available to the Marina students. The academic senate formed a subcommittee while the Ed center was being planned, but the campus committee's efforts were so thorough that the senate committee was no longer needed.
4. *Does the planning process work?*
AH: It works better than in the past; imperfect but moving toward proficiency.
CC: Program Review is becoming a useful process rather than a paper exercise.
FH: The academic senate accomplishments (see 2009 Annual Report) show that the faculty have great input into the planning process.
SJ: I have had a voice in many ways with the mission statement in mind: Program Review for the Reading Program, Ed Center subcommittee, AAAG representation.
5. *To what extent do SLOs and assessment guide decision-making?*
AH: We are in the development phase of SLOs and assessment. We began the process with dialog and have engaged in conversations about methods. But have not yet fully integrated into program review. We're discussing how measures we already do (like completion rates, academic achievement) factor into SLOs.
LL: While we have not assessed SLOs in all of the courses offered in the nursing program, we have as part of program review reviewed the outcomes of core courses and this process has generated discussion about teaching methodologies that will not only result in student achievement (like licensure pass rates), but also in enhanced critical thinking skills.
6. *Can you estimate your timeline to achieve sustainable continuous quality improvement, which is required by 2012 for accreditation?*
AH: First we would need to establish a financial commitment to the institutional research needed to support CQI.
FH: The SLO committee has proposed a new process with forms designed achieve the goal of CQI. We will have in-depth dialog about it in Fall 2009.
DA: Student Services needs help with SLO discussions. There is

Academic Senate
May 21, 2009
DRAFT Minutes

no division structure in Student Services, and no representative/reports from College Council.

AC: Student services has representation on AAAG and sometimes on College Council, but few student services faculty do SLOs. There is a disconnect between Academic Affairs and Student Services.

John Gonzales: A recent joint meeting between AAAG and SSAG re: Education Center at Marina provided a vehicle for better connectivity.

7. *Are there any topics or issues that the visiting team should be especially aware of?*

AH: Know that the dialog among faculty has been primary to us in the implementation of SLOs. We struggle with finding a system that works well for all faculty, especially in content areas that lend themselves poorly to numerical analysis.

FH: Be sure to note our controversial encounter with SLOs. We have a strong and exemplary academic freedom policy which honors faculty expertise; ask the faculty to articulate the *essence* of SLOs in their classrooms. They do evaluate them.

Douglas Garrison: The visit will conclude with an exit forum to summarize the observations of the visiting team. The final report will be generated by the ACCJC. Prompts for faculty forums during the visit could include the "Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness," or something from the self study that needs further explanation.

The visiting team does not presume that all faculty members have read the self-study.

Adjourned at 4:31 pm

APPENDIX A

Board Policy 5100: Equal Employment Opportunity and Commitment to Diversity

“The Monterey Peninsula Community College District is committed to the concept and the principles of equal employment opportunity. To this end, the District will implement a comprehensive program to put that concept and those principles into practice, ~~one that applies to every aspect of education and personnel policies, and to practices in employment, development, advancement and treatment of employees, students and the general public.~~

It is the District’s policy to ensure that all qualified applicants for employment and all employees have full and equal access to employment opportunity. To achieve this end, the District will ensure that applicants for employment and all employees are not subjected to discrimination in any program or activity of the district on the basis of ethnic group identification, race, color, national origin, religion, age, sex, physical disability, mental disability, ancestry, sexual orientation, or on the basis of these perceived characteristics, or based on association with a person or group with one or more of these actual or perceived characteristics.

The District will strive to achieve a workforce that is welcoming to men, women, persons with disabilities and individuals from all ethnic and other groups. Such a workforce will ~~ensure~~ promote the District provides an inclusive educational and employment environment which fosters cooperation, acceptance, democracy and free expression of ideas.

An Equal Employment Opportunity Plan will be maintained to ensure the implementation of equal employment opportunity principles that conform to federal and state laws.”

APPENDIX B

Resolution 1: The MPC Academic Senate Is Committed to Implementing an SLO-Assessment Process as One Way to Improve Student Learning

Whereas, the MPC Academic Senate is committed to academic excellence and the improvement of student learning as reflected in the 2007-2010 MPC Institutional Goals,

Whereas, the MPC Academic Senate recognizes that there are many ways to improve student learning,

Whereas, implementation of an SLO-assessment process is required by the accrediting agency in order to reaffirm accreditation,

Resolved, that the MPC Academic Senate recognizes that the implementation of the SLO-assessment process is a useful and beneficial way for MPC to improve student learning, but not the only way to improve student learning,

Resolved, that the MPC Academic Senate recognizes the utility of developing SLOs as a way for instructors to focus attention on the core abilities expected of each student as they exit each course,

Resolved, the MPC Academic Senate commits to devising and implementing SLO-assessment processes in ways that honor the primacy of MPC faculty in academic and professional matters, prevent unwanted outside groups or agencies from influencing the ways that assessment of student learning is conducted, and benefit student learning to the greatest degree.

Resolution 2: Clarifying the Distinction between Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes

Whereas, each course offered by MPC has objectives that are defined and described by the MPC document "*Curriculum Basics: the CAC Handbook*" as explaining "in measurable terms what students will be able to do" upon completion of the course (p. V-4 and VIII-15, <http://mympc.mpc.edu/Committees/CAC/Pages/CACHandbook.aspx>)

Whereas, the MPC document "*Curriculum Basics: the CAC Handbook*" emphasizes the requirement for critical thinking to be evident in the objectives of college level courses,

Academic Senate
May 21, 2009
DRAFT Minutes

Whereas, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in their document “*The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum Reference Guide, 2008*” recommends that (direct quote):

- “Objectives should be stated in terms of what students will be able to do.
- Objectives should be concise but complete: ten objectives might be too many; one is not enough.
- Objectives should use verbs showing active learning.
- Theory, principles, and concepts must be adequately covered. Skills and applications are used to reinforce and develop concepts.
- Each objective should be broad in scope, not too detailed, narrow, or specific.”

(p. 24, <http://www.asccc.org/Publications/Papers/Downloads/PDFs/Curriculum-paper.pdf>),

Whereas, both the MPC Curriculum Advisory Committee and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges have, as the result of much dialog, adopted standards of quality aligned with California law (the California Education Code) and a set of guidelines that help implement California law (Title 5, Division 6) that stipulate requirements for a community college course,

Whereas, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) defines SLOs as the “Knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes that a student has attained at the end (or as a result) of his or her engagement in a particular set of collegiate experiences.”

(p.29, Accreditation Standards—ACCJC Standards Glossary, http://www.accjc.org/pdf/ACCJC_NEW_STANDARDS.pdf),

Whereas, ACCJC accreditation standard IIA2h states that, “the institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education,”

Resolved, that the MPC Academic Senate recognizes that the primary difference between SLOs as envisioned by the ACCJC and objectives as described by the MPC Curriculum Advisory Committee for use on the MPC Course Outline of Record, is one of number, with a lower number advised for SLOs (<~4) and a greater number allowable for objectives (<~15),

Resolved, that the MPC Academic Senate recognizes that for courses with a large number of objectives on their MPC Course Outline of Record (>~5), that the course SLOs should be based on these objectives,

Academic Senate
May 21, 2009
DRAFT Minutes

Resolved that the MPC Academic Senate recognizes that for courses with a small number of objectives on their MPC Course Outline of Record (<~4), that these objectives are equivalent to SLOs as long as they are written according to standards articulated by the MPC Curriculum Advisory Committee.

Resolution 3: Recommendation that MPC Faculty Use Broadly Defined SLOs and/or specifically Defined Objectives, as Appropriate, When Engaging in the SLO-Assessment Process to Improve Student Learning

Whereas, MPC recognizes that the primary difference between course-level SLOs as envisioned by the ACCJC and course objectives as defined and described by the MPC Curriculum Advisory Committee for use on the MPC Course Outline of Record, is that objectives articulate a greater number (>~5) of specific student skills or abilities, and that SLOs articulate a fewer number (<~4) of broad student skills or abilities,

Whereas, the ultimate goal of the SLO-assessment process is to prompt dialog that leads to improvement of student learning,

Whereas, assessing student attainment of and engaging in associated dialog about either broadly defined student learning outcomes or more specifically defined objectives could both lead to improvement of student learning,

Whereas, the MPC Academic Senate wants to encourage wide-spread participation in the SLO-assessment process by broadening the kind and range of student skills and abilities that faculty members may choose to investigate when engaging in the SLO-assessment process,

Resolved, that the MPC Academic Senate recommends that faculty members use broadly defined SLOs and/or specifically defined objectives, as they deem appropriate, when engaging in the SLO-Assessment process to improve student learning.

Resolution 4: Recommendation That Broadly Defined SLOs and/or Specifically Defined Objectives Be Included On Each MPC Syllabus.

Whereas, MPC recognizes that the primary difference between course-level SLOs as envisioned by the ACCJC and course objectives as defined and described by the MPC Curriculum Advisory Committee for use on the MPC Course Outline of Record, is that objectives may articulate a greater number (>~5) of specific student skills or abilities, and that SLOs articulate a fewer number (<~4) of broad student abilities.

Academic Senate
May 21, 2009
DRAFT Minutes

Whereas, ACCJC accreditation standard IIA6 states that, “In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies *learning objectives* [emphasis added] consistent with those in the institution’s officially approved course outline,”

Resolved, the MPC Academic Senate recommends that course objectives, as defined and described by the MPC Curriculum Advisory Committee and recorded in the MPC Course Outline of Record, be included on each syllabus for each section of every MPC course,

Resolved, the MPC Academic Senate recommends that SLOs may be included on a class syllabus if the class instructor thinks that such inclusion might improve student learning.

APPENDIX C

Instructor Reflections on Student Learning

To be completed each semester by each instructional faculty member

Directions

At the beginning of the Semester

1. Meet with your department or group to choose at least one SLO or supporting objective for at least one of your courses to focus on for the semester.
2. Each department or group must choose to focus on GEOs (General Education Outcomes) at least twice during a program review cycle, if the department or group teaches GE courses.

During the Semester

3. Evaluate the student attainment of your chosen SLO(s) or supporting objective(s).

Near the end of or shortly after the semester

4. Reflect on the results and think about ways to improve the student learning related to the outcome(s) or objective(s).
5. Record your thoughts on this form in preparation for meeting with your department or group.
6. ~~Include this form in your program review package.~~ Keep this form for your records after your meeting with your department or group.
7. Proceed to the "Program Reflections on Student Learning".

Instructor Name	Department or Group name	
Course Name and Number	Semester	Date
Course SLOs or supporting objectives (one or more) to be evaluated this semester		
Evaluation Methods for the SLO(s) or Supporting Objective(s)		
Brief summary of evaluation results		
How do you plan to use the evaluation results to improve student learning.		

Academic Senate
 May 21, 2009
 DRAFT Minutes

Program Reflections on Student Learning

To be completed each semester by each department or group within each division or area.

Directions

Near the end of or shortly after the semester

1. Meet with your department or group and discuss the student attainment of SLOs or supporting objectives as well as plans for the improvement of student learning.
2. Record the results on the “Program Reflections on Student Learning” Form.
3. Include all forms in the Program Review package.

Department or Group Name	Semester	Date
Department or Group Members Present	Principle SLOs or Supporting Objectives Discussed	
Summary of Department or Group Discussion about Student Learning		
Description of action plans resulting from the analysis of student attainment of SLOs or supporting objectives (budget dependent or non-budget dependent)		