

<b>Academic Senate SBVC</b>	<b>AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30</b>
---------------------------------	----------------------------------

## Minutes of September 4, 2013

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>Call to Order</b>		
	<b>Approval of Minutes from August 21, 2013</b>		<b>Motion</b> by K Kammer for approval of the Minutes of August 21, 2013. <b>2nd</b> by J Notarangelo <b>Voice vote</b> – voice, unanimous
	<b>President's Report</b>	<p>J Gilbert presented the following (attached):</p> <p><b>Adjunct Senators:</b> a welcome to adjuncts J Hoyt (Aeronautics) and J Buchanan (Psychology).</p> <p><b>Election of Academic Senate President:</b> the election must be held no later than Dec. 15, with two candidates nominated by faculty at large or from the Senate floor. Nominations will be called for in a few weeks.</p> <p><b>Compressed Calendar:</b> J Gilbert gave a brief history of calendar proposals, then proposed having a standing committee ascertain what 13 area colleges are considering, weighing ramifications like cost, financial aid, orientation, assessment, intersessions, etc. J Lamore asked how many times this impractical proposal needed to be defeated, considering the consistently negative feedback it fosters. S Bangasser reported that in 2004, CHC opposed the pilot concept; also, the entire District must either adopt it or not. A downturn in enrollment was a chief reason for considering the compressed schedule. Room usage is a critical factor. J Stankas said that some districts do run split calendars, which is more difficult. Some programs, e.g. nursing and aeronautics, do have to meet the time requirements of regulatory agencies. Block-scheduled MW classes would possibly have to add Friday. O McGinnis raised the problem of meeting the 177-day requirement within a compressed framework. J Gilbert reported that CHC is currently considering a 16-week calendar. A Au said CHC is a pilot school for the newly approved AB 955; District may expect SBVC to go along with their revised calendar. Student Services Committee was requested to bring back an information-only report.</p>	

**Academic Senate  
SBVC**

AD/SS 207  
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>New Business</b>	<p><b>Committee Review Structure:</b> an information-item report (attached) was distributed describing current committees, duties, and meeting times. More discussion will be scheduled at later meetings.</p> <p><b>K-16 Bridge Program:</b> The Lewis Center functions as an intermediary between high schools and colleges (2- and 4-year), selling its mentoring program. An MOU has been distributed. G Fisher gave background on the agreement; she met with the Senate President; the MOU would have gone forward for Board approval on 9/12. Background: conversations with Dr. Dale Marsden, Superintendent of SBCUSD, led to an SBVC meeting with several VP's, including Fisher. The MOU (different from current draft) had been signed and Board-approved the previous year. Concerns were raised regarding issues we already fulfill or which hadn't been through appropriate SBVC processes. The original MOU guaranteed that SBVC would provide priority registration to all SBCUSD students meeting certain criteria; there were conflicts with our own Early Assessment Placement (EAP), causing difficulty for our counselors and processes. There is reluctance to allow outside agencies, using their own instruments, to determine readiness of individuals without our College subscribing to their guidelines. Other concerns include providing IT personnel (which we can't always spare), training for bridge counselors, certifying counselors, sharing Accuplacer testing units with SBCUSD.</p> <p>The current three bullet points impacting SBVC are:            1) Work with the Lewis Center Technology Department to facilitate the transfer of mutually-agreed-to student data fields;            2) Participate in the development of stronger K-16 ties between educational institutions through committees, workshops, and conferences; 3) Arrange for administration of the college placement exam for the SBCUSD secondary math and English departments for collaboration and alignment purposes.</p> <p>G Fisher invited Senate to send her proposed changes; many have already been demanded and achieved. She observed that \$50K is reasonable considering the data gains and the cost of remedial education. A Aguilar-Kitibutr asked what accountability and training will Lewis Center do in terms of ed planning for our incoming HS students. SBVC counselors will help train local high school counselors. Details will ensure a program advantageous to our college and students. The current MOU has an opt-out clause; SBVC is not bound to a three-year commitment.</p>	

**Academic Senate  
SBVC**

AD/SS 207  
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>New Business (cont)</b>	<p>O McGinnis posed the question: why is this third party needed? SBCUSD feels <i>they</i> need the Lewis Center to successfully do their job. J Stankas queried why the college should be involved with the Center. G Fisher pledged to carry the Senate's sentiments to the Chancellor; the MOU can be examined by SBVC's own attorneys. "I'm not promising that this won't go forward; but I will put my best effort into having your voices heard."</p> <p><b>Matriculation Exemption Form:</b> G Curasi described how the college often uses transcripts in place of assessment scores for incoming students; even though 80-90% of exemptions are granted on this basis, the form makes no mention of this allowance. The form needs to be modified to read that a submission of transcripts from a regionally accredited institution can waive assessment. Senate agreed with the change.</p> <p><b>Short-Term SLO Remediation Plan</b> (attached): C Huston's committee put data from course summary books (F 07 – S 12) – percentage of students meeting SLOs – on spreadsheets, then plugged into core competency mappings created by departments. This will be presented at the 9/25 Flex Day.</p> <p>The role of the Accreditation/SLO Committee, as a collegial consultation group, is to develop the process and timeline. Its job is to stay current on best practices for assessment and monitor compliance with the state ACCJC. The committee gathers feedback on processes from the Campus Governance Committee and concerned constituencies.</p> <p>A short-term plan for outcome assessment processes is needed in order to comply with accreditation; core competencies have never been evaluated. Most SLOs and SAOs remain unevaluated. The SLO database is underperforming. Goals are to use archival data for first-time evaluation of core competencies and instructional program SLO's. The group recommends collecting data each semester through Spring '15 to do our second evaluation of programs and core competencies and establish an ongoing cycle. The essential cycle is: 1) Establish SLOs; 2) Assess SLOs; 3) Analysis of SLO Data; 4) Evaluate SLOs; 5) Close the Loop and Start Cycle Again. Note: SLOs are currently 97% complete.</p> <p>In 2012 Executive Summaries to ACCJC reported that 71% of courses had ongoing assessment; a manual inventory put the figure at 28%. 31% were not assessed at all. (The goal, of course, is 100% of all courses every semester.)</p>	

Academic Senate SBVC		AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30	
Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<p><b>New Business (cont)</b></p> <p><b>Old Business</b></p> <p><b>Committees</b></p>	<p>C Huston reminded that the two-year plan doesn't last forever; it ends Spring '15. The currently recommended rigor of data collection is so the college can catch up. Data is used to measure course SLOs, program SLOs, and core competencies. During the period, F 07 – S 12, less than 6% of data (574 course summary reports out of 10K) was available to map to core competencies. Note: this figure may be misleading if data is from courses, not sections. All data is provided to Program Review. "Continuous Quality Improvement" is what Accreditation is looking for. The Committee's "rock and a hard place" dilemma is the shortness of time and limited available archival data. Considering the issue of student privacy, it was noted that the process will collect samples but not rosters.</p> <p>"SLOs should be clearly mapped and aligned through a course sequence and among various levels (course, program, institution) to achieve the most efficient and effective assessment." Principle 4, ASCCC</p> <p><b>Wait List Revisit:</b> CHC is moving to a Wait List for Spring '14. Their concern is the 24-hour turnover; preferred would be a 72-hour time frame. J Lamore suggested that two days would be a reasonable compromise. J Gilbert will continue dialogue with CHC.</p> <p><b>Ed Policy – no report</b>  <b>Student Services - no report.</b>  <b>Personnel Policy - no report.</b>  <b>Career &amp; Tech Ed - no report.</b>  <b>Financial Policy - no report.</b>  <b>Equity and Diversity - no report.</b>  <b>Legislative Policy - no report.</b>  <b>Elections - no report.</b>  <b>Curriculum – no report.</b>  <b>Program Review – no report.</b>  <b>Professional Development – no report.</b></p>	<p><b>Motion</b> by J Lamore to approve the SLO Remediation Plan as presented. 2<sup>nd</sup> by A Au. K Kammer spoke on the record regarding the deadline, strongly recommending moving forward. <b>Hand Vote – unanimous.</b></p>
	<b>Additional Reports</b>	<p><b>College President's Report - SBCCD-CTA –</b></p> <p><b>District Assembly –</b> J Gilbert will meet in the next few weeks with the new head of Human Resources to discuss policies (which are being followed; which aren't) and other concerns.</p>	
	<b>Public Comments</b>		

