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| Academic Senate CommitteeMinutes |
| november 26, 2013 | 11:00-11:50 a.m. | L 246 |
| note taker | respectfully submitted by Caree Lesh & angie Arietti |
| Attendees | ~~Andrade-Robledo, Margarita~~ E | Horlor, Barry  | ~~Preciado, David/Tom Rogo~~  |
| Beach, Randy | ~~Jones, Linda~~ | Quan, Nghiep |
| Bloch, Maya  | Lesh, Caree | ~~Rempt, Andrew~~ E |
| Brenner, Susan  | Lewis, John | ~~Salahuddin, Sheri~~ |
| Carberry, Ed | Lucas, Yvonne | Speyrer, Michael  |
| Caschetta, Todd | ~~Maag, Eric~~ E | Stuart, Angelina  |
| Davis, J.D. | Martinez-Sanabria, Maria E. | Tyahla, Sandy  |
| ~~Detsch, Steven~~ E | McAneney, Danielle | Villegas, Val |
| Edwards-LiPera, Diane  | Moore, Ryan | ~~Whitsett, Jessica~~  |
| Flores-Charter, Patti | Mossadeghi, Yasmin  | Wolniewicz, Rebecca |
| Hayashi, Chris | ~~Orozco, Alejandro~~  | ~~Yonker, Susan~~ |
| ~~Hopkins, Kesa~~ | Pollock, Lynn | ~~Zinola, Lauren~~ |
| GUEST/s |  | Josue Arredondo  |  |
| Names in red indicate AS Executive committee members. |  |
| **Call to order; Approval of Agenda (Action Item)** | randy beach |
| Discussion | The meeting was called to order at 11:05 a.m. by the Academic Senate President, Randy Beach.  |
| Action items |
| A motion was made to approve the agenda and to strike item #3, was seconded and approved.  |
| **Public Comment (Information Item)** | randy beach |
| Discussion | Last night the APRC Chair sent out announcements for the first round of results on comprehensive program reviews. If you were a part of the comprehensive program reviews, your lead faculty member and your dean have the results.  |
| **Approval of Minutes from 11/19/13 (Action Item)** | randy beach |
| Action items |
| This has been postponed until our next meeting  |
|  Discussion | No discussion.  |
| **President’s Report (Report)** | randy beach |
|  Discussion | The President’s report is available on SharePoint.Highlights include:If you are in OLA, there is one last workshop for this semester, but there are many more to come in spring. The final workshop this semester will be on 12/6/13, from 1:00-2:00 p.m. and will focus on Title 5. The SCC is hosting a campus-wide forum on 12/4/13, in L238. There will be a brief update on what SCC has done this semester and opportunities to comment on what you would like to see happen in SCC. There was a Senate Executive meeting with Cabinet and discussion included how to move to compressed calendar, campus morale, and staff development. We really hit hard on how overworked people are, especially after this semester. ATC has been meeting all semester and has begun its prioritization process for academic technology needs requested by program reviews. ITC has a meeting this afternoon and are working on their computer replacement plan, how to handle institutional software needs and accreditation standards. Randy thanked the ATC/ITC members. The School of Language and Literature is electing someone to replace part-time faculty senator Marsha Rutter. CSEA breakfast is 12/13/13 and there is an ugly sweater contest. Please come and help sponsors scholarships.  |
| **SCEA Report (Report)** | eric maag |
| Discussion | Eric was unable to make this meeting but an announcement was made to please vote online to endorse a San Diego Mayoral Candidate.  |
| **Policy/Procedure Update (Information)**  | randy beach |
| Discussion | Randy shared a spreadsheet on what policies and procedures are being updated. Our Mission Statement must be reviewed each year. 3430 is an Institutional Policy/Procedure; Prohibition of Harassment and Discrimination. 4021 is our Program Discontinuance Policy and it will come to Senate in spring. Matriculation, Student Unit Caps, and Probation and Disqualification are being worked on in Student Services to reflect changes in law. 4260: Requisites and Advisories Policy/Procedure came to this body in 2012 and was approved by one vote. We wanted to look at this again and see if we can get more consensus. The original group who worked on it is taking a second look at it and we will spend some more time discussing. There have been legal changes that require it be updated. This would allow faculty to put pre-requisites on courses without looking at data on if the pre-requisite improves student completion.  |
| **Faculty Recognition Awards Procedure 4710 (1st Read)** |   randy beach  |
| Discussion  | The policy is very succinct and to the point. Nothing on the policy is being changed. The committee has been working to improve the process for nominees. The size of the committee was too big. The amount of people on this committee is going from 24 people to 9-10 people who still represent the campus community. The procedure called for two committees, a nominating committee and a selection committee. This will now be one committee doing both functions. The paperwork that will be required has been minimized, so the burden of the work is on the nominator. The nomination form will include a letter of support and eliminates a letter from a Dean. The letter from the student will be gathered by the nominee. The past procedure gave the winners a trip to the NISOD conference. This was changed to say that they will get an honorarium of $1000.00 to go to a conference of their choice. The team award would get up to $2000.00 towards the team going to a conference. The nomination forms were aligned to the rubrics being used for each award to evaluate the nominees. The rubric was also simplified and it includes samples of things to look for. We intend to approve this at our 12/10/13 meeting.  |
| **SLO Report (Report)** | rebecca wolniewicz |
| Discussion | We received a response from the ACCJA that SLO implementation at SWC “Solidly Meets Expectations of Effective Practice” in SLO Proficiency. The ACCJC now requires that SWC reach and maintain “Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement.” . In 2002 the ACCJC first announced requirements for SLO assessment. In 2009 the ACCJC announced that all colleges within the western region must reach the “Proficiency” level of SLO assessment by 2012. In October 2012, SWC submitted its report on the “Status of Student Learning Outcomes Implementation” to the ACCJC. The results of our report were received in October 2013. At SWC in 2003, a small group started working on our campus ISLOs. In 2007 there Staff Development offered SLO workshops during Opening Day Breakout Sessions. Also in 2007, SWC purchased eLumen In fall 2009-spring 2011 course SLO’s were entered into eLumen. In spring 2011, the manual migration of course SLOs from CurricUNET to eLumen occurred. In fall 2011 18% of our college’s CSLOs were measured. By fall 2012 99% of our CSLO’s were measured. This is attributed to the College’s hiring of an SLO Coordinator at 100% reassigned time from fall 2011-spring 2014. Scoring for the SLO report submitted to the ACCJC were as follows: 5=exceeds expectations of effective practice, 4=solidly meets expectations of effective practice, 3=barely meets expectations of effective practice, 2=doesn’t fully meet expectations of effective practice, 1=doesn’t meet expectations of effective practice. For courses, programs, and student services SWC received a score of 5. For ISLO’s SWC also received a score of 5, but that is when we only had 11 ISLOs. A year ago, we added 5 additional ISLO’s and no CSLOS are currently linked to the new 5 ISLOs. When updating your Course Outlines of Record, please check to see if one of the new ISLOs link more accurately to the course’s CSLOs. For the SLO report submitted to the ACCJC SWC received an overall score of 4 (solidly meets expectations of effective practice). There are several reasons as to why SWC received a score of 4 rather than 5. 1. We are discussing and using SLO results in our disciplines, but not necessarily at the institutional level. 2. We are not discussing results across campus as well as we should be. 3. We do use CSLO and PSLO results in Comprehensive Program Review and Snapshots and use the information for decision-making, but we don’t necessarily use ISLO results. 4. In Comprehensive Reports SWC received a score of 3—most likely because we supply the campus community with raw data and do not include analysis of the data and conclusions drawn from discussion of results. A motion was made to extend by 5 minutes, was seconded and passed. It appears that we were mainly dinged because we did not discuss and process raw data at an institutional level. We now need to meet “sustainable continuous quality improvement.” Only 36 of 134 colleges submitting a report, including us, received a score of 4, “solidly meets expectations of effective practice.” Plans are already laid to work on the items for which we did not receive a score of 5. Rebecca was thanked for all of her work on SLO’s and ISLO’s. A question arose as to if we got marked down on some of these areas because of administration. Most of our scores of 3 were due to not discussing institutional data campus-wide and using it for decision-making and to plan.A motion was made to extend for 4 minutes, was seconded and approved. The 5 new ISLO’s were created specifically for the arts and social sciences and are available on the pull down menu on Curricunet and the SLO website. Rebecca will send them again. The are currently available on the SLO website: <http://www.swccd.edu/index.aspx?page=2295>A suggestion was made by a senator that this needs to be a topic on Opening Day. We can look at how to have a broader dialog and connect it to program review in a more productive way. We do not know how the dings against us on the institutional problems will count against us on our next site visit. It was suggested we put together a timeline on how to make our improvements, but the college has to work with the ISLO Coordinator to make this happen.  |
| **Budget/Strategic Planning Update (Report)** | randy beach |
| Discussion |  The Budget committee is meeting with key campus groups to make sure we are using SLO’s to tie to budget.  |
| **Adjournment** | Randy beach |
| Discussion | The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m. |
| The next Academic Senate meeting: Tuesday, December 10, 2013  |