

Academic Senate

Open Meeting

Monday, November 22, 2004
3:00-5:00

Room 1108

Minutes

Members Present

Cathy Anderson

Vickie Kimbrough

Frank Nigro

Warren Lytle

Dave Bush

Chuck Spotts

Kevin Fox

Sharon Yox

Ron Marley

Ted Lord

Kendall Crenshaw

Jeff Cummings

Laura Valvatne

Carolyn Borg

Gary Lewis

Terry Turner

Guests

Joan Bosworth

1. Call to Order: Meeting was called to order at 3:00.

2. Approval of Minutes 10/25/04 and 11/08/04 (2 Attachments) Frank Nigro moved approval of the 10/25 minutes; Terry Turner seconded. Frank moved approval of the 11/08 minutes; Terry seconded. Both motions carried unanimously.

3. Reports

a. (None)

4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Program Assessment Procedure (1 Attachment): *Vickie Kimbrough, Ted Lord and Ron Johnson will present and recommend their committee's final report for discussion/action.*

Vickie clarified the latest changes to Program Assessment Procedure. She explained that the committee had gone back and addressed all the comments made at the last Senate meeting, including the definitions section and suggested modifications to the flow chart. She covered all changes made. Ron explained that the area of “cost” was explained in a way that they wanted it to be explained since they were unable identify any kind of formula that we could use.

There were some questions about the weighting of the various early alert criteria, and also some about whether quantitative or qualitative data would count most when evaluating a program.

It was suggested that on future Program Assessment Committees, one of the two Student Services reps be a counselor.

Warren Lytle moved approval; Vickie seconded. The Senate voted to have Gary Lewis send this forward to Cabinet with the one suggestion about the counselor representative. Gary will also emphasize that we see this as a pilot policy that will possibly have kinks that may have to be worked out as they become evident.

b. Student Learning Outcomes (No Attachment): *This is the beginning of our next huge project. Discussion will be led by Jeff Cummings, Kevin Fox and Cathy Anderson.*

We'll be working on the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) project for the next four years, but it will be spread out; we're not in a rush to complete it, though we *are* in a rush to show the accreditation team that we've made an effort to start and that we have a plan and a timeline. We need to be able to document that we are making progress in identifying and measuring SLOs. SLOs, and our demonstrated ability to measure them, will probably play a role in future funding.

Last week, Gary Lewis, Jeff Cummings, Joan Bosworth, Sharon Lowry, James Crandall, Kevin Fox and Cathy all went to a workshop on SLOs. They were not given a definition of SLOs at the workshop, so the group decided to be proactive and define it for our school. They initially arrived at this definition: "*A Measurable Student Learning Outcome (MSLO) is something a student should be able to demonstrate that they know or know how to do upon completion of _____.*" (fill in the blank).

We have to decide what to fill the blank with, and we can't simply put in a course. SLOs are not the same as course objectives, either. The group came up with these possibilities:

- AS degree (the major courses, not the g.e. requirements).
- AA degree (the major courses, not the g.e. requirements)
- General Ed portion of the AS degrees.
- AA-Transfer G.E., and AA-University Studies; AA degrees (The group was leaning against this, because we shouldn't do SLOs for things we can't control; this is one of those things)
- A certificate
- A Student Service Activity (SS will have to get together and figure this out for themselves)
- A course

Cathy took the Senate through a cycle model that one might go through when developing SLOs. Each individual program will eventually decide its own SLOs and figure out how to measure them.

Cathy asked the Senate to agree upon a definition of SLOs. Looking at what the workshop group came up with, the Senate modified the definition to read: “*A Measurable Student Learning Outcome is something a student should know or know how to do upon completion of _____*” (fill in the blank).

At the next meeting (probably a special meeting on 11/29), we’ll decide upon a game plan as far as how to progress on measure. Several people thought it would be better to start with some vocational programs because outcomes for such programs are fairly concrete.

Accreditation is driving the SLO push more than the state. Concerns were voiced that once we determine our SLOs, our accreditation organization might change the rules as they’ve done in the past. Cathy conceded this was a risk. She noted there’s a sense that accreditation really doesn’t know where to go with this, so they’re waiting to see what the schools come up with. From there, they may pick the best SLO measuring ideas and standardize them for all of us. The workshop group, however, it was best to be proactive in this process.

c. Technology Plan (1 Attachment): *Frank Nigro will lead a discussion.*

Frank presented a document he had prepared stating what the Senate’s recommendations are on “adequate support” for instructional technology. This document was loosely based partly on the Tech II plan that was put together by the state Senate and the Chancellor’s Office. The idea, Frank noted, was for our Senate to send a clear message about what sorts of things we need in the classroom to keep using all the technology we’ve become so accustomed to when teaching. He asked for suggestions and changes.

One suggestion was that we ask for regular maintenance for classroom equipment; we need a maintenance schedule. Another was that we make the H-drive available to faculty off campus so they could work better at home. Another suggestion was that we allow faculty-purchased equipment to be more easily integrated into the campus system, so that if you had a laptop of your own, for example, you could more easily get onto the network. Finally, there was a suggestion made that we modify point 4 to emphasize that classroom computers be given the most recent software possible so that when students bring in presentations, for example, classroom computers will recognize the software.

The Senate approved the document with these changes. Terry Turner moved approval; Kevin seconded it. The motion carried unanimously. This document will be sent to Mary Retterer.

5. Other (none)

6. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

7. Next Meeting: 3:00 pm, November 29, 2004 in Room 1108 (if necessary)
3:00 pm, December 13, 2004 in Room 1108.