

Academic Senate

## **Open Meeting**

Monday, February 28, 2005  
3:00-5:00

**Room 1108**

### **Minutes**

#### **Members Present**

Susan Meacham

#### **Frank Nigro**

Warren Lytle  
Toby Bodeen  
Scott Gordon  
Andrea Williams  
Carolyn Borg  
Kevin Fox  
Vickie Kimbrough  
Kendall Crenshaw  
Laura Valvatne  
Marsha Ray  
Ron Marley  
Gary Lewis  
Dave Bush  
Cathy Anderson  
Jeff Cummings

#### **Guests**

Jane Harmon  
Mary Retterer

1. Call to Order: Meeting called to order at 3:00.
2. Approval of minutes –01/24/05 (Attachment coming from Frank): Voting on the minutes was postponed till the next meeting.

### 3. Reports

- a. (None.)

### 4. Discussion/Action Items

- a. BP 4500, BP 5140, AP 4500, AP 5140, AP 5141 (Previously emailed to you):  
*Proposed changes to board policy and administrative procedure.*

Cathy Anderson began discussion of the proposed changes to DSPS policies. The Board Policies (BP) and Administrative Policies (AP) are being distributed for our input and comments. Cathy pointed out that contrary to suggestions that someone is “sneaking the changes behind our backs”; the policy for developing policies is being followed. It’s an excellent procedure, and no one is trying to bypass it.

Beyond that, she thinks we might ask that AP4500 might be delayed being voted on for a month so there’s adequate time to discuss it.

Dave Bush suggested changing item 1 of AP 4500. The way it opens makes it sound like the instructor will be responsible for determining the student’s disabilities. Item 5 should come earlier. Mary Retterer noted she would ask Jane Harmon to rework this part, and particularly the first sentence of item 1. She agreed to bring it back with our revisions to College Council as a new first reading.

Jane clarified that we needed to have an AP to go along with the BP. Several senators pointed out it was unclear what, exactly, was old and new on the AP draft. Jane will try to clear this up.

The main point of the changes to the BPs and APs is that while an instructor can refuse to evaluate a student’s documentation and refer them to DSPS, the college cannot mandate in the AP or BP that a student *must* go to DSPS.

Someone raised this question: If a student does not go to DSPS and apply for services, what services do they have access to? Kendall Crenshaw pointed out that if the student shows some sort of documentation, the college is obligated to

provide services. So, if a student was identified with a specific learning disability in high school, and they tell an instructor they want more time for the test, at that point, they should be referred to DSPS, and we would be obligated to provide services.

Several other questions relating to DSPS situations were discussed.

b. Faculty Learning Academy Proposal (1 Attachment): *A discussion led by Mary Retterer.*

Mary Retterer led discussion of the Faculty Learning Academy, a proposal to provide a sort of intensive orientation for new faculty and administrators. It's a fairly new model for orienting new hires, and it's important we do something given the huge changeover (10% of our faculty being replaced, for example) that we're experiencing. We don't have the money to do this for two weeks as many schools do, but we can do it for a couple of days, probably on a Wednesday and Thursday. The Learning Academy will include sessions on SLOs, the college's mission and goals, instructional technology (hands on), active learning, etc. Something that's worked well elsewhere is having a panel of students who talk about what makes a good teacher, and who field questions from new faculty members. Also, a panel of experienced faculty to do the same would be good. The intention is not to give people piles of paper, but maybe give them a CD or jump drive, plus create a web site, that contains things like a sample syllabus. The McConnell Foundation will host a reception and a dinner. The Cabinet, some community members, and all the people participating in the workshop will be invited. The budget for this is not huge (\$6,000 or so), and we have a source for it. The mentoring system through the tenure review process would continue, and the mentors would also be invited to the McConnell event. Adjunct faculty will not be included in this; they will eventually have a separate orientation.

c. SLO Cycle (handouts at meeting): *A sample SLO for a certificate and a sample SLO for a course.*

Jeff Cummings, Kevin Fox, and Cathy presented some new ideas on how to proceed on the SLOs. They tossed the old flowchart and put it in another format. Our goal as a Senate is eventually, to be able to give the rest of the faculty clear instructions on how to write an SLO.

Here's how the trio proceeded: They wrote an SLO for Jeff's certificate. Then, they wrote a general template for writing an SLO based on the process they followed. They applied the SLO definition we defined at our last meeting. Then, they applied it to Jeff's task ("to be able to gather the appropriate field

data and calculate a percent slope”). This task is a capstone SLO that actually comes from several classes. So, it’s not just one skill learned in one class. A student can theoretically pass all the classes and not get the certificate unless they pass the SLO at the end. This is simply how Jeff set his up. Finally, since there’s a need to gather data on SLOs and to measure the data over time, they indicated how data was to be gathered. Jeff will have to develop a specific form for everyone to use to gather the data for his class.

Having developed an SLO for Jeff’s course, and then another for a math course from Cathy, the trio then developed the form for SLOs sent to us as an attachment. It has us 1) Stating the SLO, 2) Stating the criteria for student success, 3) Describing the assessment process, and finally, 4) Describing how the data will be organized.

There was a question about whether the SLOs would have to be listed in the catalog. They probably would be.

What if a student couldn’t do the task in Jeff’s class, but they otherwise had a B in the class, meaning they couldn’t repeat it if they failed the course? This would mean they would not be able to get the certificate. It was suggested it might be better to have the task test prior to the withdraw date so the students would have a chance to withdraw if they failed the test.

It was clarified here will be only one set of outcomes for each course: One for English 1A, one for Math 4A, etc.

In the ensuing discussion, there was a debate as to whether the “criteria for student success” should be about student outcomes or about the outcomes as a whole. How do we provide for measuring both on the SLO form?

5. Other: none.

6. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

7. Next Meeting: 3:00 pm, March 14, 2005 in Room 1108.