

Academic Senate

Open Meeting

Monday, February 13, 2006 * 3:00-5:00 * Room 1108

MINUTES

Executive Committee members present					
x	Cathy Anderson	x	Toby Bodeen	x	Carolyn Borg
x	Dave Bush	x	Candace Byrne	x	Stephen Concklin
x	Kendall Crenshaw		Jeff Cummings (N/V)		Kevin Fox
x	Karen Henderson		Pamela Hanford	x	April Howell
x	Gary Lewis (N/V)		Sue Loring (N/V)		Warren Lytle
x	Ron Marley	x	Erin Martin	x	Susan Meacham
x	Frank Nigro	x	Alan Spivey	x	Chuck Spotts
x	Maureen Stephens	x	Terry Turner	x	Laura Valvatne
	Andrea Williams		Dave Wright (N/V)		

Other faculty present					
x	Roger Gerard				
Guests present					
x	Joan Bosworth	x	Scott Gordon	x	Catherine Jackson

1. Call to Order: Meeting called to order at 3:05. Cathy introduced the newcomers, Catherine Jackson, who is our new research person, and Erin Martin, who is stepping in for Divan Fard (Divan has a scheduling conflict).

2. Approval of Minutes –01/23/06 (1 Attachment): Warren Lytle moved approval and Terry Turner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Reports

a. Reorganization of Divisions – Gary Lewis

Joan Bosworth addressed this topic. There will be a temporary reorganization of Math, Business, and Technology and the Nursing/Dental Hygiene programs of Human Development. Under the reorganization, Business will now go with Nursing and Dental Hygiene to form a Division of Health Occupations and Related Areas. It's necessary for accreditation purposes that Nursing be led by a dean with a master's at least in Nursing. Math will now be with Science. Last Wednesday, Joan noted, there was a meeting between the two divisions that are affected by the reorganization.

Concerns were raised about a lack of a dean for business, the difficulty students will have finding "business" classes under a Division of "Health Occupations and Related Areas," the lack of a nurse in nursing, how long the reorganization will last (Gary estimated two years, she said), logistical concerns (where the secretaries will be), questions about the Science Learning Center, etc. Gary's position was that at this point, they weren't going to make a lot of changes.

4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Hiring Priorities List- Gary Lewis (1 Attachment): *Presentation of a new hiring priorities list from Instructional Council.*

Gary presented the new hiring priority list developed by Instructional Council. Math is now at the bottom of the list. In effect, this is the original priority list. Culinary Arts is in the #3 spot now; we're having a hard time finding instructors for this, and it appears if we don't find an instructor for it, we'll have to suspend the program. Hence the move from #4 to #3. Economics was plugged in at #4 because of the sudden retirement of Jim Gilbertie in December and the difficulty in finding adjunct faculty to teach all the sections we need. Advertising has occurred for English, Sociology, and Math, although we'll pull the Math advertising. We'll be advertising for Economics and Culinary Arts.

There were discussions about the Veterinary Technology position. Joan noted we have about 250 students in this each year. To do worksite learning, which the local vets are demanding, we need a full-time faculty member. Long term, then, we really need to hire a full-timer for this position.

Cathy noted that our role is to approve the process. Candace Byrne moved that we felt the spirit of the process was followed. Carolyn Borg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. In the ensuing discussion, Gary noted we really need to delineate how to handle distinctions between new hires and replacement hires. A subcommittee consisting of Dave Bush and April Howell and several others is continuing to work on revising the process. They will present what they come up with at a future date.

b. Review of Accreditation Standards-Cathy Anderson and Lenore Frigo (One Attachment): *Thinking about a to-do list for SLOs.*

Last week Lenore and Cathy went through the accreditation standards and highlighted anything having to do with student learning outcomes. They're trying to figure out what things the Senate should work on and which to turn over to administration. They found that many of these don't make sense and perhaps even contradict one another. They wanted us to read together through these to make sense of them. In two years' time, when the accreditation team comes back, we must have a process in place.

The Senate considered the following items from the accreditation standards:

II.A.1.c.: Cathy and Lenore felt we are already addressing this.

II.A.2.a. and b.: They believe we cover this with our SLO cycle and program reviews. Cathy made a note to herself that program review has to address SLOs. We need to have a subcommittee go through our program review procedure and note where we should put in some SLO language.

II.A.2.e.: It was felt that this item referred to program reviews and partly to curriculum review, but that again, these reviews need to address SLOs somehow.

II.A.2.f.: Program reviews again seem to address this.

II.A.2.h.: There was some discussion about what “credits” means here. Does this mean if a student doesn’t succeed 100% in the SLOs, they won’t get “credit” for the course? This goes against what we’ve been saying all along.

Items II.C.: This item has been addressed.

There were questions about the accreditation report which is now out. Sue Vanderwerf is getting it and will put it on the website when she does.

c. SLOs and Faculty Evaluations- Cathy & Lenore (Three Attachments): *Senate should make a recommendation to Faculty Association that will satisfy the standard that references SLOs and Faculty Evaluations.*

The Senate discussed item III.A.1.c. on the accreditation standards. There was some discussion about this was suggesting that we “Teach to the test.” The Senate decided to interpret this as saying “the faculty participated in the SLO assessment process.”

There followed discussion of the language Cathy and Lenore proposed we add to the faculty observation forms. Their proposed language would seem to address the interpretation above. Dave felt that items V.D. and VI.C in the observation forms address this already; if we get too specific about SLOs, then it leaves more loopholes for faculty, which is not good. April noted that there could be something in the list of expectations the TR committee gives to faculty members each year as part of their regular evaluation. Susan Meacham suggested that we instead/also put something in the TRC committee member training. It was also suggested that we put something in the list of guidelines given out to faculty evaluators.

Cathy asked for suggestions to work on this list. Cathy, Kendall Crenshaw, Maureen Stephens, and Terry volunteered to serve on this committee. Cathy will try to recruit Joan Bosworth from the deans to work on this as well.

Program review is on the Academic Affairs site. There are two documents related to program review. We’ll read both of these for the next meeting and talk about how to revise them to incorporate SLOs.

d. Other: None.

5. Other

6. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

7. Next Meeting: 3:00 p.m., February 27, 2006 in Room 1108