Faculty Chair
March 5, 2012
MB 212
2:00 – 4:00

Minutes

1. **Agenda and Minute**
   Approved as submitted

2. **UPDATE:**
   a. **Bookstore –** what is happening**?**
      Action Item – Corey will contact Michael at the bookstore – continued
      communication
   b. **Catalog –** targeting April bot for approval has to be to Vice Chancellor of Educational
      Services by March 19th. Pulling program information from CurricUNET and
      somewhat of a mess. Meeting w/Shelley today and will try to get all program
      information to her. AA and AS and Certs will be combined into one alphabetically.
      Each degree and certificate will be separate on its own page. Will ask the chairs to
      look at program email on Wed feedback by Monday, March 13th.

   c. **Assessment input into CurricUNET –** assessment module is open for business and
      still a bit of difficulty. Just a reminder we all agreed that March 31st is deadline for
      Fall assessments, and May 15 is deadline for all previous assessments. October 1st is
      deadline for Spring assessments. Cheryl questioned how far back? Corey indicated
      that every class you have assessed should be entered. Currently no place to include
      statement of methodology. Every class you have assessed should be included in the
      assessment module. With each cycle we will get better. It was requested that the
      kinks in the system be worked out as soon as possible.

3. **Review of Accreditation Standards**
   What is an actionable improvement and why don't we have any. Actionable items used to
   be called planning agendas. These are operational deficiencies that we need to address. The
   accreditation steering committee is working on this. We are to identify barriers that prevent
   us from moving to sustainable quality improvement. What is an example of actionable
   improvement? Corey believes that a sign of no actionable items is a testament to this group
   that they are paying attention to the details. Professional development is a good example of
   where we need to improve. The professional development committee is working on that
   now.
   a. **II.A.1 –** The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of
      location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and
      uphold its integrity. The self-evaluation will show we meet this standard. The
      mission statement is up for revision through College Council. College Council does

not have an official process for reviewing our mission statement. It will not likely be done before May 1st. The Strategic Goals need to be revised as well. We are not completely sure what the process will be, but one thing for sure all constituent groups will be involved in the process. Our programs do line up with the mission and vision of the college. We will do a better job of describing it. One of the big problems the past 10 years has been the online program and its role. It is something that needs to be talked about. This is a chance to pull the distance education piece into the mission statement. Often our conversations revert back to our state mandated guidelines. We must include what we are being accredited with in our mission. There are a number of components that need to be captured and put into one piece. The mission should be measurable.

CIC is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. CurricUNET does not approve anything CIC does. The service area covered needs to be consistent.

Include additional information regarding the honors program. We have a wonderful honors program.

Institutional research – business data term is incorrect.

SESSE needs to be woven into the document in a consistent way.

II.A.1.b - CIC is a standing committee of the Academic Senate.

II.A.1.c – We need to add concrete examples of assessments. How have we looped back and improved – need more specific detail. We are currently at proficiency level. Any type of meeting minutes is a good source of backup.

Action Item – faculty chairs will provide evidence for SLO & PLO deficiencies and will show how to improve.

b. **II.A.4** – All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. Each program has 18 units required. Written very well and we meet this standard.

c. **II.A.6** – The institution . . . we do not misrepresent our programs to the students. CIC is very careful about the statements included in catalog. We are honest in the way we represent ourselves to our students. PLO and SLO achievement levels will be a part of the gainful employment piece. PLO and course requirements will be in the catalog. SLO's do make an appearance but faculty members are not evaluation on SLO's. We are in the process of revising some of the information in II.A.6 which will include additional information about Pathways.

II.A.6.a – no comments

II.A.6.b – we are rather vulnerable in this area. Any program that is discontinued please take to senate to draft a policy and how we address it. The academic exceptions committee has submitted language that has been approved by senate. We have a program discontinuance policy but it does not address how to deal with the students in the middle of the program.

II.A.6.c – what process do we have that reviews how accurate our information is? Particularly the electronic version of our information. Actionable improvement item might be needed here. The catalog is published every two years and reviewed by faculty, management, and staff. The catalog is posted on the web, but there is disagreement within our own website. There may be an assumption that the chairs collect the syllabi from each faculty member in their area. This is not in the contract,

but a task assigned to the chairs. Many times the syllabi go directly to Magi. This is a cultural issue. It could be a part of department procedures. Syllabi must include the disability statement according to contract, but the contract does not include any language regarding the SLO inclusion. But there are departments that have collegially agreed to include the SLO's on all syllabi according to the COR's. Do we still have the Campus Communicator? Yes, but it is no longer copied and placed in mail boxes.

d. **III.A.1.c** – We meet this standard because in our evaluation instrument there must be a statement about SLO's. The faculty portfolio and adjunct professional development are included.

Action Item –Disaggregated data will be provided at the first chair meeting in the fall.

4. **GE courses mapped to GELO's**
Last task of 2011-12 academic year. If you are CTE and no course on GE pattern no need to worry about this. We need to assess how we are doing. Task force met and drafted philosophy and learning outcomes that were approved by Academic Senate. We need to assess the effectiveness of the GELO's. How do we know students are coming out with the LO's? The GE task force determined they would not make every single course have an outcome. We will work with the outcomes already there, but there needs to be a mapping. Example – English 221 World Literature I – handout on how to map GELO's for this specific course.
Problems or concerns see Corey.
Deadline –April 30, 2012
Action Item – Corey will send an email with the request of what he is expecting from the chairs.

5. **Degree Works**
Dawn Fidel – degree works no longer a dream and planning to go live in June. Students will be able to go online to use and view. We need to enter a couple of catalogs entered in order to use. Currently working on 2010-12 catalog. Why aren't we going back and entering other catalogs? BC is because they have been on the CAP system and have articulated them. Dawn reviewed the PowerPoint information with the chairs. Degree Works Student Educational Planner is a great feature for the students. This will not automatically populate from career pathways. But students will be able to project down the road for their degree. Greater scrutiny has gone into the scheduling process so we can commit to offering the courses students need to complete their degree. This tracks the degree progress providing a visual queue for degree progress. Reports can also be run from this for pre-planning of course offerings.

6. **ODS Reports –** Corey provided the drop rates between first day and census. Question was asked about caps for online. Handout provided by campus beginning with 200970 semester through the 201230. The pattern of drops is heavy and volatile in the Fall. But Spring is very consistent. The Fall semester seems to be heavily impacted. Priority registration may be a

part of the issue. Corey will pull the zip code data to provide additional detail as it relates to this issue.

7. **Faculty Chair Re-Org Feedback**
It seems that we should move forward with departments that want to re-org as it relates to what is in the best interest of the students. The re-org was to be completed this year, but it must be approved by Academic Senate. Academic Senate is quick, but the negotiations can take a great deal of time. This is a union issue, and the union has worked really hard on the current plan. If the department feels very strongly about the re-org then they should be able to go to the Academic Senate and request approval. There are some components of the re-org that make perfect sense, but not all. Splits in departments are problematic, but merges have not presented problems. It is important to bring the Senate a comprehensive plan that administration buys into as well. This will make the negotiating piece much easier. The administration and faculty must be on the same page prior to going to Senate for approval. It was recommended that the faculty should take over the process to create a proposal and submit to the administration. The meeting in 604 did not provide an alternative faculty plan. It simply swatted down the different scenarios. There has never been a clear statement as to why the changes are being recommended. It is not just efficiency and cost, it is efficiency and cost that will benefit the students. The elephant is that the district took the faculty contract to impasse due to the faculty chair compensation. The last scenario provided the breakouts requested but the compensation was reduced.

The suggestions and impulses come from the faculty side and there is a dialogue that takes place.

Denim and Diamonds is scheduled for April 20, 2012 – the departments will be asked to provide baskets again.

8. **Remaining Faculty Chair Meeting Dates:**

   Spring Semester
   April 2, 2012 (2 - 4) – Monday
   April 23, 2012 (2 – 4) – Monday

9. **Adjournment – 4:18 p.m.**