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Attendees: Dr. Jeanne Marie Velickovic, Kindra Beale, Dr. Kathy Hart, Dr. Hazel Hill, Dr. Ginger Holden, Sonia Flanders, Grant Narita, Linda Peabody, Bob Rennicks, Jack Saunders, Janice Takahashi
Absent: Dr. Charles Jennings
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College Mission Statement (BP 1200)
The mission of San Joaquin Delta College is to provide excellent post-secondary education that serves the needs of students, the College District and the community through continuing, transfer, career and technical education, and economic development. To achieve this objective, the faculty and staff are committed to providing comprehensive instructional programs, student services and public services that are high quality.

In fulfilling its mission, San Joaquin Delta College acts upon the following principles:

- Commitment to excellence requires effective collaboration, respect for cultural diversity, appreciation of historical perspective, open communication, high academic standards, a vital connection to the arts and cultures of the community, and competitive athletics.
- Student success and equity are founded on a well-coordinated and institutionally-integrated developmental education program.
- Educational resources are available to all students regardless of age, disability, gender, or ethnicity.
- Institutional renewal must include continuous improvement through new and revised curricula; the use of student learning outcomes to enhance student performance; new and effective technologies; and ongoing faculty and staff professional development.
- All aspects of the College encourage good citizenship, responsible leadership, ethical behavior, and the appreciation of lifelong learning.

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 by Chairperson Velickovic.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
The Committee was reminded that there will be an extra Curriculum Meeting next week to try to accommodate the review of courses for the summer 2011 catalog deadline.

CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Approval of the Consent Agenda with the exception of the Sign Language courses pulled from the agenda by the submitter. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)
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Agriculture, Science & Mathematics Division
Course Revision (Minor)
BIOL 002 General Zoology Dr. Amir Assadi-Rad
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite BIOL 001 with minimum grade of “C”. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)


Applied Science, Business & Technology Division
Course Revisions (Minor)
AUTO 080C Auto Body Repair Larry Mariani
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 080B with a minimum grade of “C”. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

AUTO 080D Auto Body Repair
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)
MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 080C with a minimum grade of “C”. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

AUTO 080E Auto Body Repair
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 080D with a minimum grade of “C”. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

AUTO 080G Auto Body Repair
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 080F with a minimum grade of “C”. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

AUTO 081A Introductory Auto Collision Repair Laboratory
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

MOTION: Approval of co-requisite AUTO 084A. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

AUTO 081B Beginning Auto Collision Repair Laboratory
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 081A with a minimum grade of “C”; Co-requisite AUTO 084B. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

AUTO 081C Intermediate Auto Collision Repair Laboratory
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 081B with a minimum grade of “C”; Co-requisite AUTO 084C. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

AUTO 081D Advanced Auto Collision Repair Laboratory
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 081C with a minimum grade of “C”; Co-requisite AUTO 084D. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

AUTO 084A Introductory Auto Collision Repair
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)

AUTO 084B Beginning Auto Collision Repair
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (J. Saunders/S. Flanders)
MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 084A with a minimum grade of “C”. Second. Approved unanimously.

AUTO 084C Intermediate Auto Collision Repair
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously.

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 084B with a minimum grade of “C”. Second. Approved unanimously.

AUTO 084D Advanced Auto Collision Repair
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously.

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 084C with a minimum grade of “C”. Second. Approved unanimously.

AUTO 087C Auto Body Specialization
MOTION: Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously.

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite AUTO 084D with a minimum grade of “B”. Second. Approved unanimously.

Library Services, Learning Resources, and Language Arts Division
Course Revisions (Minor)
SL 001 Elementary American Sign Language Charlene Nunes
Pulled from agenda by submitter prior to the meeting.

SL 002 Elementary American Sign Language
Pulled from agenda by submitter prior to the meeting.

SL 003 Intermediate American Sign Language
Pulled from agenda by submitter prior to the meeting.

SL 004 Intermediate American Sign Language
Pulled from agenda by submitter prior to the meeting.

SL 071 Elementary American Sign Language Laboratory
Pulled from agenda by submitter prior to the meeting.

SL 072 Elementary American Sign Language Laboratory
Pulled from agenda by submitter prior to the meeting.

SL 073 Intermediate American Sign Language Laboratory
Pulled from agenda by submitter prior to the meeting.

SL 074 Intermediate American Sign Language Laboratory
Pulled from agenda by submitter prior to the meeting.
ACTION ITEMS

**Health Sciences Division**

*New Course*

H S 072  Introduction to Pharmacology for Health Science  Sonia Flanders

**MOTION:** Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (H Hill/G. Holden)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisites H S 036 C and BIOL 031 or BIOL 032 or BIOL 033 each with a minimum grade of “C”. Second. Approved unanimously. (H Hill/J. Saunders)

**MOTION:** To approve distance education as a method of instruction for BIOL 002. Second. Approved unanimously. (G. Holden/H. Hill)

*Regular Courses to replace Approved Topics Courses*

H S 078A  Paramedic Anatomy and Physiology  Sonia Flanders

**MOTION:** Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (H. Hill/K. Beale)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite HS 077B with a minimum grade of “B”. Second. Approved unanimously. (K. Beale/H.Hill)

**MOTION:** To approve distance education as a method of instruction for BIOL 002. Second. Approved unanimously. (B. Rennicks/G. Holden)

H S 078B  Paramedic Introduction to Emergency Medical Services

**MOTION:** Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (H. Hill/K. Beale)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite HS 078A with a minimum grade of “B”. Second. Approved unanimously. (K. Beale/H.Hill)

**MOTION:** To approve distance education as a method of instruction for BIOL 002. Second. Approved unanimously. (B. Rennicks/G. Holden)

H S 078C  Paramedic Cardiology

**MOTION:** Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (H Hill/K Beale)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite HS 078B with a minimum grade of “B”. Second. Approved unanimously. (K. Beale/H.Hill)

**MOTION:** To approve distance education as a method of instruction for BIOL 002. Second. Approved unanimously. (B. Rennicks/G. Holden)

H S 078D  Paramedic Pharmacology

**MOTION:** Approved to go forward to the Academic Senate as submitted and upon approval to the Vice President’s Office. Second. Approved unanimously. (H Hill/K.Beale)

MOTION: Approval of Catalog Prerequisite HS 078C with a minimum grade of “B”. Second. Approved unanimously. (K. Beale/H.Hill)

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION, ANNOUNCEMENT, OR ACTION

1. Approval of General Education Student Learning Outcomes (GELOs) - Jack Saunders, Chair GE Sub-Committee
   The Chair of the GE Sub-committee reviewed the final draft of the General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) forwarded by the GE Sub-committee to the Curriculum Committee for their approval. Minor changes to the language in Area 1 a and c and Area 6 were outlined.

   MOTION: To approve the General Education Learning Outcomes as presented and to forward them to the Academic Senate for their consideration. Second. Approved unanimously.

   The Articulation Officer shared that the next step of the process is the matching the GE courses to their respective GELOs. He also clarified that if the GE course does not currently have an outcome that will map to its respective GELO, one will need to be written that will.

   The Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Instructional Services stated she hopes that once these make their way through the process they will appear in the catalog as well as the ILOs.

2. Student Learning Outcomes – Dr. Jeanne Marie Velickovic, Academic Senate 1st Vice President
   • Benefits of Student Learning Outcomes
     The Curriculum Chairperson outlined the framework that would be followed for the discussion. The Academic Senate and CTA Presidents were welcomed and thanked for attending the meeting. The Chairperson stated that they should both feel free to share any information they would like to regarding the issues.

     The following background information was provided by the Chairperson. On October 28 CTA issued a cease and desist order with the Administration regarding Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Several issues were mentioned in the order. Some of issues relate to the role of CTA and some of them relate to the role of the Curriculum Committee. One of the main issues is to clarify the roles of CTA and the Curriculum Committee so we can specifically focus on what we as a committee need to do.

     The Chairperson stated that some of the items such as workload and use of student learning outcomes in faculty evaluation relate to the role of CTA. CTA is currently in negotiations with administration and the Chairperson stated she is confident they will be able to come to a mutual agreement on these issues. Other items such as specific guidelines regarding SLOAs (including the use of data and benchmarks) and the role of the SLO Coordinator are under the purview of the Curriculum Committee as a committee of the Academic Senate.

     Representatives of Academic Senate and union met on November 8 to discuss some of the concerns. Issues raised included the confusion on the part of faculty members over what is required for SLOs, the fear that benchmarks or baselines will be used for faculty evaluation, and the role of the SLO Coordinator. The Chair’s response to the union was that it is up to the Curriculum Committee to decide on guidelines for SLOAs and if benchmarks are to be used and that this is not an area of responsibility of the union.

     Documents were distributed that clarified the roles of the Academic Senate and the Curriculum Committee. Curriculum, including SLOs, lies within the primacy of the Academic Senate. The Curriculum Committee is a sub-committee of the Academic Senate and makes recommendations regarding curriculum to the Senate for their approval. Senate Bylaws state that the SLO Coordinator and the Distance Education Sub-Committee Chairperson are part of the Curriculum Committee and specify that they will do technical review on their respective areas. Both positions are appointed by the Academic Senate President. College policy also states that the Chairperson of the Curriculum Committee appoints the Technical Review Committee and that one of those
positions is the SLO Coordinator who is to do the technical review of SLOAs. The Chairperson stated that is her position that is that the Curriculum Committee has to decide about SLOAs and guidelines. She also stated that she recognizes that clearer communication needs to take place regarding guidelines for SLOAs. The 10 + 1 areas of primacy of the Academic Senate were also distributed that clearly states that curriculum is under the prevue of the Academic Senate. She asked if either the Academic Senate President or the CTA President had anything they wanted to add at this time.

The Academic Senate President referenced Education Code and Title 5 sections from the Local Senate’s Handbook on the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Website as a resource for faculty to keep close at hand. The first item of primacy of the Senate guaranteed by law and put into Title 5 is curriculum which includes outcomes and assessments. She reiterated that curriculum, including grading, certificate and degree requirements, educational program development, standards and policies regarding student preparation and student success, is a responsibility as well as the right of faculty.

The CTA President stated that he had nothing to add at this time, but he did wonder where the “ancient” clarification of roles report had been found.

The Chairperson stated that each item should be reviewed one at a time. She shared that, while this was probably not the way we would have hoped for these to come up, we should cease the moment to find out what issues are that need to be addressed and at least begin the discussions to resolve them. She shared that when working with faculty some do not understand the need for outcomes and assessments and, that perhaps we should better explain this and share with faculty why SLOAs are important. A Committee Member stated that since SLOAs are required for accreditation it is important for faculty to understand that we are not undertaking this just because our college wants us to have them. Another Committee Member added that SLOAs are part of the accreditation process for a reason and that is that we all want to accomplish what we set out to accomplish when we became instructors and when we became an educational institution, and that is to educate students. We need to be able to take a snapshot of how we are doing with that process and we can only do that if we look at outcomes and start measuring outcomes. We can then use that process for feedback, not for the purpose in terms of evaluation for employment, but evaluation in terms of what we are doing with our courses and how students are being successful. If students are not being successful in certain areas we can utilize the feedback to identify those areas and what we can do to help them become more successful. The process provides continuous quality improvement and that is something that we can all be excited about. We need to come up with a way to communicate this effectively, because if faculty members do not understand this process it is not their fault; we have not communicated effectively in terms of what the benefits are of this whole process. It was shared by another Committee Member that programs with outside accrediting agencies/boards have been required to have outcomes for quite some time. There are also benchmarks set by the boards that must be achieved or they will have to answer directly to the boards. The way her area has used the feedback is reflected in their new curriculum. They looked at what was going on and looked at the evaluations and developed curriculum they hope will result in greater success for their students. Faculty has not been evaluated by the outcomes; only the courses and programs have been evaluated based on the outcomes. Another Committee Member suggested that since accreditation is behind the push for SLOAs it might be helpful to investigate the explanations they are using so we could use the same language. She also shared the concern of her discipline faculty of when we say benchmarks or SLOAs how are we intending them to be presented to students.

The Chairperson distributed the SLOA Philosophy from Cañada College that could be used as a model for the Curriculum Committee to use in developing our Philosophy of SLOAs. The Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Instructional Services distributed a packet of six documents and provided a brief overview of each of them. The documents were shared with the Committee to help create a better picture of the national view of SLOs and Assessments and their value as a national movement since it began in 1993, and not just something hoisted upon us by our regional accrediting body that is only happening to us in California. The first document
contained a collective statement of all of the regional accrediting agencies and described in their language what they as a group prescribe to and believe in regarding learning. The second document was a paper written by the president of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) arguing why it is a good thing we don’t have a national accreditation that would be a one size fits all for the nation and why it is preferable to have regional accrediting bodies that can be more reflective of their regions. The third document, also written by CHEA, contained a detailed summary of expectations for accreditation and SLOs and the relationship of SLOs to accreditation. The fourth document was an overview of SLO assessment in higher education and reviews all of the different ways in which SLOs and assessment are being used and their importance across the country. She stressed that there is an unbelievable amount of literature on SLOs and assessments and that one of the mistakes we may have made was not connecting ourselves well enough to this national movement and being focused too much on what ACCJC is requiring. She added that while what they are asking us to do is important, and while it is also true that our accreditation is directly related to our ability to award financial aid, that should not really be the reason we want to do this; it should be because it is good for students, helps students succeed more effectively, helps us teach more effectively, and helps us work more effectively together more effectively. We have focused so much on the accreditation and the demand that we do this that we have lost sight of what the point of it was in the first place. The fifth document was a transcription of a speech given by Linda Suskie, a past president of the Middle States Accreditation Association who has become a national expert on SLOs and assessments. This particular piece states that in some ways we have lost our way by obsessing on details and having lost sight of what we are really trying to do. Because of this we are finding ourselves in a very difficult position over some details of a system that should not be getting in our way. The last piece of the set was a description of a collaborative between the State Wide Academic Senate and the Research and Planning (RP) group on SLOs and assessments. The Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Instructional Services Committee encouraged committee members to take the time to read the documents. It was her hope that in future weeks there could be conversations about their reactions to the information that she felt would be very valuable. The Chairperson added that since she has been exposed to conferences on SLOAs and the excitement of faculty from other colleges about the process, she has become inspired because she sees the positive benefits SLOAs can have, not only at the course level, but linking courses to programs, program review, and the collaboration between faculty members.

Committee members raised the concern that SLOAs have become an artificial construct seen only as a necessary task that needs to be done to get curriculum through the process and do not have an effect on what takes place in the classroom. They also questioned how we can know that teachers are applying all of this work to the classroom experience. The Chairperson stated that when we start the assessment phase faculty will begin to think in practice, not just in theory. Discipline faculty group discussion will begin to focus on what is working, what is not working and what they want to focus on to improve student success. Committee members also shared that it is important to remember that SLOAs are not written in stone and can be changed by faculty if they decide they are not appropriate and that it is important that we focus on program outcomes.

The Academic Senate President shared that as she looks at what we are going through with this process we are looking at ourselves as students and the outcome we have is the acceptance of the process. By looking at our rates we may be able to figure out what some of the problems are and be able to move forward. The Chairperson added that at the SLOA conferences she has learned that faculty are resistant until they become involved in the process and can see the benefit. It is at that point that it becomes contagious. She also suggested that it might be helpful to invite an outside speaker to come and make a presentation to our faculty on what they have done at their institution.

- Guidelines
  The SLO Coordinator stated that she would like to provide outside evidence to show this is not just a local effort and that it is supported with evidence from across the nation; she requested that she be allowed time to make the formal presentation on guidelines to the Committee. The Chairperson suggested that since the Curriculum Committee will
need to develop guidelines for what faculty will be expected to do when writing SLOAs, the SLO Coordinator might just want to have a conversation with the Committee about the expectations for SLOAs and some of the issues that have come up such as the union’s position against benchmarks. A member of the committee asked if there has really been a great outcry by faculty of this issue. The SLO Coordinator responded that, from her personal experience working with individual faculty as well as discipline groups with course SLOs and program outcomes, she would agree that the outcomes, despite the trainings and workshops that have been provided are still very misunderstood. She stated that she would also agree that there are a variety of reasons including resistance as a result of attitudes; however the bottom line is that for whatever reason they are not doing SLOAs we need to look at those reasons and try to address them. When working with the faculty she found that there is definitively confusion and understandable frustration based on “this is how we were first to do it, then we were told to do it this way, and now we are told to do it that way”.

One of the main reasons this has happened is that the training received from ACCJC to begin with was very inconsistent, confusing, disjointed, and presented in a very piecemeal way, both as far as the components of the SLOs and where to start with SLOs. We were told to start at the course level, trained to start at the course level, so we started at the course level. She stated that when working with faculty she tells them they are totally correct, it has been a series of changes because it is an evolutionary process and so is the training. It was shared that she believes that the frustration also comes from the fact that people are looking for a cookie-cutter-approve to a developmental process and those two just don’t match.

When working with faculty on SLOs some will ask her to tell them what she wants them to write and they will do that. Her response to them is that she can’t do that; she needs to ask them questions. What are you doing in your courses? What are the most important things you want student to learn? What are the activities you are already doing to demonstrate the knowledge? From there she works with the faculty to write the SLOs always checking with the faculty member to be sure that is what they meant to say. She shared that the other thing that faculty get stuck on is testing verses authentic assessments. When faculty members say they use a test, she asks them to tell her how they know which part of the test measures these outcomes. This leads to a discussion of imbedded questions and suggestions of alternate assessment activities. The importance of working with faculty is to be sure that they are selecting the activities that make sense for their course and will work for them was stressed by the SLO Coordinator. With the exception of two faculty members who did not want to work with her on SLOs, she stated that the reactions of the faculty after they have been trained, after there is dialog and contextualization of the SLOs, have been extremely positive. Faculty members who had been angry or frustrated before the training have made comments such as “this really makes sense now” and one of them even stated that, “This really exciting stuff. I’m not going to wait to try this for my assessment, I’m going to use it in my class tomorrow and see how it works.”

The SLO Coordinator clarified the reason we are using CurricUNET for the entry of SLOs. Two canned SLO programs were reviewed by a committee of the different constituent groups. The committee was very specific that rather than purchasing one of the expensive canned products, they wanted to have the SLOAs added to the CurricUNET system. That is when the Academic Senate President, the CurricUNET administrator, the Academic Senate Staff Assistant and others involved with SLOs began to build the process into CurricUNET.

There are basically four components in the outcomes section and then the evaluation tool. These are the components we have applied as a committee when courses have been reviewed.

The first component is the benchmark or baseline that she refers to in three ways:

- How will you know when your course outcome has been met? If just one student achieves the outcome would you say that the outcome has been met, or is there a percentage of students that need to achieve the outcome for you to say it has been met?
- When you are doing a program to increase something or to look at something, such as joining Weight Watchers, the first thing that needs to be established is a baseline so you know how you carry out your
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program and how those things you do in your program effect your goal based on how close or far away from you goal you are.

- The course outcome data can be used to inform faculty on which outcomes they are doing well at start the dialog as to how to improve any outcome that may not be a successful as they had hoped.

The second component is the skill you want the student to demonstrate. The student needs to do something with the skill they have gained.

The third component is the assessment activity. This is designed to produce those authentic situations where students can demonstrate their skills and knowledge, not just transfer knowledge back on a true/false or multiple choice test. She also stated that there are some test questions that can be written in a way where there is not just a transfer of information, where critical thinking takes place and where they can apply and demonstrate their knowledge, so she is not saying that she is discounting tests.

The fourth component is the acceptable standard of student performance. You have the course outcome performance which is the baseline and benchmark at the front end, but then you have your individual student outcome performance which is the acceptable standard of outcome performance. At what level can you say that the student gets it, that they learned the outcome? This can be a grade, a level on a rubric, a percentage score, whatever the faculty choose as it relates to their assessment activity.

The last component is the assessment evaluation tool. There is a difference between the assessment activity and the assessment tool. How are you going to measure the success of the student performance of the activity? Are you going to use a rubric? If so, that is your evaluation tool? Are you going to use a test? If so, that is your evaluation tool? Are you going to use clinical activities where nursing assessments are used? Then that is the evaluation/assessment tool you are going to use.

The Chairperson stated that it is her understanding that the expressed concern has been about the benchmarks and asked if the CTA President wanted to respond to that. The offer was declined.

Committee members discussed and the information that had been provided by the SLO Coordinator. The concern of how this is to be presented in class, if it infringes on academic freedom, and how the information/numbers will be used at the end was raised. The SLO Coordinator stressed that the data is to be used by faculty and that the whole idea of SLOAs is to facilitate a collaborative process around teaching and learning based on what the faculty think should be happening, so there is not infringement on academic freedom. One member stated that confusion in her area over how to gather the data and what to do with the data once it is collected is making getting to the conversation impossible. Involvement of adjuncts in the process was also a concern that was raised. The Dean of Workforce and Economic Development stated that she believes there are a tremendous number of adjuncts that, if invited, would participate. They are here because they like to teach and they want to be involved and participate.

The SLO Coordinator responded to the question of data collection. This is not something that is going to be implemented right now but, in anticipation of the need, we are looking at an electronic data system that would have the program do all of the collecting, the aggregation of the scores, creation of reports, and pre-populate from the course outcomes to the program outcomes to the ILOs so that multiple data would not have to be entered. The FileMaker system that we are looking at right now in anticipation of the comments from faculty on how do they will need to collect this data will allow each individual faculty member to enter his/her course section data that will only have the access privilege of that faculty member. No one will know the individual section scores. The system will compute the course section data into one aggregate score and that is visible to the Discipline Division Curriculum Committee for discussion. Right now you have all kinds of assessment evidence and we are investigating the use of e-portfolios to store your documents/activities in some way. We are always trying to stay a step ahead of the questions faculty is asking. The SLO Coordinator stated she wanted to share this with the committee so that if they
or other faculty have any input on specific needs or how they would like to use the end process system that you would share this with the Curriculum Committee so we can have an idea of how to improve them.

The Chairperson stated that due to the time, the discussion would need to be concluded in a few minutes and wanted the Committee to come up with proposal of what to do now.

The CTA President asked if he could make one quick statement. He stated that he wanted the Curriculum Committee to understand the reason he was here and some of the meetings that have preceded this discussion. CTA did not go out there and beat on faculty doors and say who wants to raise the human cry against the SLOA process. He also shared that he agreed with everything that has been discussed at the meeting; that there has been a lot of confusion and misunderstanding and that CTA didn’t do things properly or they could have done better and that he was not being critical just making an observation. He also stated when faculty feels like something is not right, they come to CTA and that there are some faculty out there that want him to open up the casket of the SLOA and the Curriculum Committee and drive the stake through the heart of the SLOA process but that is not his role or what he is advocating at all. He shared they have addressed a lot of this in the pre-meetings for this and thinks they are moving in a positive direction. He also stated that he has learned a lot more in the past few days than in the last three or four years and that he has been writing student learning objectives in his classes for a period of time so he is not a person who is dragging his feet or trying to drag the process down. The next agenda item is communication strategies and he believes that is really the key to this. He stated that the faculty will have to accept what the Academic Senate chooses to do, acting on their relationship with the Board of Trustees and the administration and our role, as the message was to him, none of his business, beyond the work compensation and workload issues, and he stated he agreed with that. He stated he was here to learn and to listen and to just get a better grasp of what direction we are going and how this is all going to work so that he can possibly head off some of this disruption off and move it in a positive direction.

The CTA President stated that he had to leave for another meeting. The SLO Coordinator thanked him for his comments.

The Chairperson stated that the meeting would conclude in a few minutes. She asked if the Committee had any suggestion on what to do next. It suggested the Committee to take time to read over the information they had received and look at how some other colleges are treating SLOAs. The idea of forming a sub-committee to research this was suggested. The SLO Coordinator stated that, looking at the bigger picture, to be able to move ahead with communication and training and have the faculty more open minded or less fearful there needs to be a tentative agreement, or MOU that the faculty can see that states SLOAs and any data surrounding SLOAs will not be used in faculty evaluations. She added that, until we do that, there is going to be continued mania. Another issue that needs to be settled is the work load issue. CTA has put out a cease and desist and union members have told faculty that they cannot talk about SLOAS at their meetings. There is no way to communicate with faculty to train or to share information when the union is saying we cannot do it. You have seen the documents stating the union and the Senate are suppose to collaborate. We need for that to happen. The union has put a strongly worded cease and desist that contains a great deal of misinformation that has created an extra layer of distrust. This needs to be corrected and the administration needs to put out an equally forceful publication letting faculty know that the work load and evaluation issues have been negotiated. Until then we will be walking against a tidal wave and nothing will be resolved.

The Chairperson stated that the committee still needs to decide on what to do next and revisited the suggestion previously offered that a sub-committee be created to look at the issues. The Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Instructional Services shared her concern that a sub-committee may slow down the process even more and stated that she feels we need to get on this right away. She also suggested that perhaps the SLO Coordinator already had something that she could bring to the committee for their reaction and that there is no reason to reinvent
the wheel when there are already so many resources available for us to look at and adapt to our needs. She also stated that we need to find a way to get the information out to everyone.

It was the consensus of the committee that there needs to be written guidelines to provide to faculty. The SLO Coordinator agreed to bring the guidelines and the outline for the SLO process to the next meeting for the Committee to review. She also shared that a Web page for SLOs is available where all documents can be posted. A Committee Member suggested that the training material be provided in several forms to accommodate the different learning styles.

- Communication Strategies
  Tabled due to time constraints

3. Communication on Critical Issues – Dr. Kathy Hart, Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Instructional Services
   The Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Instructional Services stated that she feels that we really need to look at how we communicate with others outside of this committee. A recent example of this miscommunication revolved around a course was not completed in the curriculum process and as a result was scheduled to be removed from the CSU GE list. The course had already been given an extension to complete the process but the faculty had not followed through with getting the course review completed. The Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Instructional Services could not understand why she did not already know about the problem so that she could do something. Fortunately we were granted an extension but we will still need to make sure the course is completed. She stated that we all need to be consistently thinking about who need to know what we know and who can help us handle situations that arise. She added that this is just a small example of the larger issue; we have to start communicating better.

   Articulation Officer stated that he has a great deal of information that needs to be disseminated to different groups across the campus and that he finds it extremely frustrating that when he cannot get responses. He will need to meet with discipline groups, but that has proven difficult since many of them do not meet, or he cannot find out when they do meet. The Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Instructional Services shared that something that came up at a meeting recently was that faculty cannot ask other faculty members to call a meeting of the discipline groups; that the meeting needs to be called the Division Dean or another administrator. She stated that she would be willing to be the administrator to call the meetings or would work with the Division Deans to have them call the meeting.

4. Pending English Courses - Jeanne Marie Velickovic, Academic Senate 1st Vice President
   Tabled due to time constraints.

5. Justification of Need for New Courses – Dr. Jeanne Marie Velickovic, Academic Senate 1st Vice President
   Tabled due to time constraints.

ADJOURNMENT: 4:31 P.M.