UNOFFICIAL Minutes of the October 26, 2011 Meeting

Paul Lococo, Chair
Susan Lum, Vice Chair
Melanie Van der Tuin, Secretary

Senators Present: William Albritton, Paula Asamoto, Michael Bauer, Eunice Brekke, Eileen Cain, Christian Ganne, Candace Hochstein, Helmut Kae, Roy Kamida, Keith Knuuti, Eiko Kosasa, Michael Lane, Paul Lococo, Erin Loo, Tracie Losch, Susan Lum, David Millen, Kay Ono, Tara Rojas, Natalia Schmidt, Michael Scully, Melanie Van der Tuin, Greg Walker

Senators Absent: Blanca Polo, Kabi Neupane

Guests: Chris Matz (Head Librarian), Della Anderson (Interim Dean of Academic Services), Guy Nishimoto, Tracey Imper (Student Government President)

Additional Document Links: Meeting Agenda

I. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 3:13 p.m., with a quorum.

II. Approval of 08/31/11 and 09/21/11 Meeting Minutes

The August 31, 2011, minutes were approved unanimously.

The September 21, 2011, minutes were approved as amended.

III. Campus Report

A. Right to copy Dossiers after TPRC review

Faculty member Stan May of the Business Division informed the Senate that the right to copy dossiers after TPRC review is a new policy for Leeward CC, but it has been in place at all other campuses. It is still considered a “special request,” so faculty must make an appointment with Human Resources to see and photocopy their dossiers. Stan said it will be important to report this right to divisions, and for faculty members to contact UHPA (Chris Hanselman: kris@uhpa.org, tel.: 593-2157) if they have any trouble exercising it. Questions brought up were the following:

- Is there a “window” during which faculty can/need to copy their dossiers? (Sen. May said he assumes faculty who receive negative recommendations will be contacted right
away and have access then, but others probably won’t have access until fall.)

• For how long are dossiers kept? For how long can they be seen?

B. Library update (Chris Matz)

Librarian Chris Matz updated the Senate about progress on the Learning Commons renovations. Friday, November 18 is the last day of service on the second floor, and the entire building will be closed through Thanksgiving Break (Nov. 21-25). All materials will be moved to the third floor, and the Library will reopen on the 28th. UHWO and the KI office will offer a full array of services on the third floor while the LRC and Writing Center will vacate the first floor and move to BE-101 after finals week (and remain there for the duration of the spring semester). Though Chris hopes to “kick off” in August, he warns that summer will be transition period as spaces come available.

This is the link to our Learning Commons update site:
http://lcc.hawaii.libguides.com/learningcommons2012

The following questions were addressed:

Q: What about bank machines?
A: They will be relocated to the café, behind Subway, starting Nov. 28 (near the book buyback). He hopes they will eventually return to the Library.

Q: What about the Scantron machines?
A: They will be moved to Language Arts and Arts & Humanities divisions during construction, probably not to return to the Library.

Q: And newspaper subscriptions?
A: Deliveries can't be received at the Library after Nov. 28, so the Security office will take over reception.

Q: What about access to the different floors?
A: To enter the building, we will need to use the outside stairwell or elevator. (Once inside, we can use stairwells.) The elevator will be open to all three floors.

Q: And the after-hours Library dropbox (for dropoff of student evaluations of instructors)?
A: There will be no after-hours drop during construction. Chris will find and report an alternative.

Q: What about the computer labs like L-102?
A: The 3rd floor instruction area has 16 computers that will be open for use. When the building reopens in fall, the ground-level testing center will also have an instructional area with 44 computers, and there will be a 25-computer instructional lab (which used to be in BE-226) where L102 is. Library staff will work with the campus to make sure student needs are met.
Q: Where can we get this information?
A: Chris will send out a calendar of relevant dates, and a corresponding link to the Library Web page, which will post this information.

Chris said he wants the Library to be a “destination”—he is excited about the new tablet computers and E-book readers. (We will be the first UH library to circulate these; Librarian Toyama has created “portable” (phone/iPad) Library Web site for access to databases.) Asked whether iPads and Kindles can be checked out, and what sort of security will be provided for them, Chris responded that they can be checked out the same way laptops are circulated currently. A loan period has yet to be set, but overnight and multiple-day loans may be considered.

IV. Faculty Senate Reports

A. Standing Committees

1. Elections (Albritton/Polo)—Report

Chair Albritton reported that there are now 25 Faculty Senate candidates for 11 seats, and candidate photos/statements have been compiled. The election will take place online the second week of November (14-21), and results will be instant.

2. Curriculum (Lane)—Voting Items

The Curriculum Committee approved the following course/program modifications or course deletion proposals and asked the Faculty Senate to accept the committee’s recommendations.

**COURSE DELETIONS:**

ACC 141 Tax Preparation with TurboTax (1 credit)
ACC 142 Personal Accounting with Quicken (1 credit)
ACC 143 Home-Office Accounting Quickbooks (1 credit)
MATH 22 Pre-Algebra Mathematics (3 credits)
MATH 73 Algebraic Foundations I (3 credits)
MATH 83 Algebraic Foundations II (3 credits)

**Motion 11-41:**
To accept the course deletions above as recommended by the Curriculum Committee.

Motion was approved with 19 approvals, 0 disapprovals, 0 abstentions.
DIVERSIFICATION DESIGNATION PROPOSALS (effective Spring 2012):
PBT 141 Integrated Pest Management (DB)
PBT 200 Introduction to Plant Science (DB)
PBT 200L Introduction to Plant Science Lab (DY)
PBT 264 Introduction to Horticulture and Plant Propagation (DB)

Motion 11-42 (Ono/Cain):
To table voting on remaining items on Curriculum Committee report until November Faculty Senate meeting.

Discussion: Sen. Ono said that we have not had enough time to review the proposals and talk to other faculty members. She acknowledged that reviewing them is a lot of hard work but that we need to do our part (reading and reviewing them). She asked about a policy regarding how many days in advance of meetings we should receive the Curriculum Committee report.

The purpose of a broad-based Curriculum Committee was discussed, along with the fact that in the 1990s, printed copies of reports were circulated to senators prior to meetings, until the campus “went computerized” around 1996. At that point, the document was abbreviated (to the Chair’s summary).

Senators discussed the need for “due diligence” and the need to be able to address questions of originating instructors coming for information if problems arise with their proposals.

Chair Lococo asked whether the Senate would like to send back these particular proposals (above), for more information. Committee Chair Lane said this one-time occurrence makes no sense unless we come up with a long-term plan. Normally, he said, the Curriculum Committee can make the report available several days in advance of FS meetings, but this time the minutes were delayed due to a technical issue—votes were not tallied until the day before the FS meeting. Chair Lane pointed out that 20 Curriculum Committee members had already gone through the proposals, and he requested a Faculty Senate vote.

Sen. Ono stressed the need for FS to “be informed,” and she presented the issue of an AS proposal having been sent to FS before it passed through the Curriculum Committee. Sen. Cain said that FS should not be “rubber stamping” proposals approved by the Curriculum Committee without reviewing them first. Sen. Lane agreed and reminded senators that we all have access to the reports on Curriculum Central. He said that if vote tallies are in several days before an FS meeting, he can sent them out as well.

Sen. Schmidt asked whether holding off on voting on these proposals will make it “too late” for them to go through. She stressed the need to think about courses going into the catalog and asked about official procedures. According to Sen. Hochstein, the previous precedent was that
any proposals approved this year go into next year’s catalog; however, in the last few years, retroactive approval dates have been made.

Sen. Ono pointed out her desire to address potential problems specific to these courses (above) themselves.

**Motion failed with 2 approvals, 16 disapprovals, 1 abstention.**

Voting continued.

**Motion 11-43:**
To accept the diversification designation proposals above as recommended by the Curriculum Committee.

**Motion was approved with 16 approvals, 2 disapprovals, 2 abstentions.**

**COURSE MODIFICATIONS:**

ACC 124 College Accounting I (3 credits)
ACC 125 College Accounting II (3 credits)
ICS 151 Structured Database Programming (3 credits)
MATH 140X Accelerated Pre-Calculus: Elementary Functions, Trigonometry, & Analytic Geometry (4 credits)
PHIL 211 Ancient Philosophy (3 credits)

**Motion 11-44:**
To accept modifications to the courses above as recommended by the Curriculum Committee.

**Motion was approved with 20 approvals, 0 disapprovals, 0 abstentions.**

**NEW PROGRAM:**

**CCP Advanced Programming and Network Troubleshooting**

Catalog Description: This certificate provides students with advanced computer programming and network troubleshooting. Students will learn program organization paradigms, programming environments, implementation of a module from specifications, and the C and C++ programming languages. Students will also learn full network life cycle development including analysis, design and maintenance of Local Area Network (LAN) and Wide Area Network (WAN) technologies

Who will enroll in the program: Special target groups: One special target group is students from the US Navy. In Fall 2011, we have 20 students from the U.S. Navy signed up for both courses. In addition, we also want to target
students who are taking classes at Leeward CC, who want to transfer to the ICS program at UH Manoa.

Number of majors expected by year for first five years: As for number of majors, we currently have a MOA (Memorandum of Agreement) with the U.S. Navy for 20 students in Fall 2011. Potentially, if the U.S. Navy has a continuing need for this certificate each academic year, we can expect 100 students over five years from the U.S. Navy. In addition, we expect 20 of our regular students per year to complete this certificate, for a total of 100 over five years. This adds up to 200 total students in the first five years.

Expected service to non-majors: The ICS department has around ten students per year who transfer to UH Manoa and/or are UH Manoa students.

Evidence of student interest: Due to changes in the ICS Associate in Science Degree for Fall 2012, we expect student enrollment to increase for ICS 212 and ICS 294.

Motion 11-45:
To accept the new program above as recommended by the Curriculum Committee.

Discussion: Questions arose about some Curriculum Committee members having submitted “disapproval” votes; the issues were apparently logistical (not due to the program itself but caused by problems with the effective [Fall 2011] date and issues relating to Student Services needing a Banner code in order to award degrees). Dean Goodman confirmed the [military] funding, and the College made necessary accommodations.

Motion was approved with 15 approvals, 2 disapprovals, 3 abstentions.

An error regarding PACS 108 (as reported in the 8/31/11 minutes) was mentioned, and Sen. Lane said he will forward the correction.

3. Faculty (Ono)—Voting Items

NOTING UH CC COLLEGE CREDENTIALS

Three UHCC Common Academic Policy items were brought forward from the previous meeting for the Senate to vote on. Chair Kay Ono informed the senate that these are part of a total of 12 items on Vice-President for CCs John Morton's list of issues to be addressed.

To first item discussed was the motion on noting UHCC credentials which would have academic credentials automatically noted upon student completion of certificate and/or degree requirements.

Motion 11-46 (Ono/Kamida):
“To approve a UH-Community College’s policy to automatically note all University of Hawaii Community College academic credentials to students upon completion of certificate and/or degree requirements.

- The noting of credentials shall be posted on transcripts unless requested by student not to
This action of automatically noting academic credentials should be at no cost to the student.”

Discussion: Motion was sent by Sen. Hochstein to Student Services; counselors will discuss it Friday and may have comments to add regarding students not pursuing degrees. Other issues may be students not reading E-mails and students seeking multiple degrees (determined how; by computer, declared major, or some other means?). Where do counselors fit in to this process, and what about potential problems for Student Services and cross-campus issues? Manpower is still needed for checking computer records, etc.—a concern about funding for that greater workload? Also, requirements for multiple degrees/certificates might be missed.

Sen. Hochstein asked how students would be notified if they are no longer eligible for financial aid, and whether this motion has been posted to students. Student Government President Tracey Imper says students have not been notified about it, and John Morton did not bring it up at the meeting she recently attended. Sen. Hochstein added that issues like lecture/lab course sections mean computers are unlikely to be 100 percent effective for this process, and there will be back-end work.

Sen. Ono said her understanding was that this was an attempt to notify students about degrees they had earned but did not necessarily know about.

However, it was pointed out that sometimes students delay graduation on purpose, even if they have met the requirements for a degree or certificate. They stay in school, for example, to keep a student job, which they would otherwise lose. Sen. Ono asked what would serve our students the best.

**Motion 11-46, amended (Ono/Hochstein):**
To table voting on the UHCC Common Academic Policy (on noting UH CC credentials) until the November meeting of the Faculty Senate, allowing time for Student Government (Imper) to present the issue to students.

Motion was approved with 18 approvals, 0 disapprovals, 2 abstentions.

**MATRICULATION FEE**

Chair Ono agreed to table the motion on the Matriculation fee to the next meeting.

**ACADEMIC RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT**

The third UHCC Common Academic Policy item concerned the issue of academic residency requirement.

**Motion 11-47 (Ono/Lane):**
“To approve the following academic residency requirements for graduation from the University of Hawaii Community Colleges:

1. To graduate with a degree from a University of Hawai‘i Community College, a/the student must have earned a minimum of 12 credits of program courses in the degree/major;
2. Colleges may not impose additional academic residency requirements for graduation with a degree;
3. Exceptions to the policy, to reduce the number of required credits, may be made on a case-by-case basis by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, or designee, in consultation with the appropriate campus personnel, at the degree-granting college.”

Motion was approved with 20 approvals, 0 disapprovals, 0 abstentions.

**B. Ad Hoc committee: Review of Mission Statement (Lum)**

The committee would like feedback on the new mission statement since it is so different from the current mission. The committee reviewed mission statements from mainland colleges; many missions consist of a short statement and a list of “values.” Our statement could use this structure or just present the mission itself (and the values elsewhere). The revised statement will be presented at spring Convocation, for approval in March. It has not been sent out yet, but it is being reviewed by Campus Council. There will be an open forum next semester, after the unveiling of the draft. It won’t be presented to individual divisions, but feedback can be shared at the open forum.

Issues addressed were (1) the absence of “underserved”/“underrepresented” terminology (i.e., in terms of socioeconomics, ethnicity, etc.)—which the committee avoided in order not to single out races (with the exception of Native Hawaiians, who are included in the Strategic Plan)—and (2) potential ramifications of revisions to the mission statement (e.g., for Curriculum Central questions regarding courses' alignment with the mission statement—a “cascade effect” is possible).

Committee Chair Lum requested feedback via E-mail.

**V. Unfinished business**

**A. Student Success “Gatekeeper” (Student Success Committee) Notices**

Chair Lococo commended senators Cain, Rojas, and Walker for their work on the survey assessing faculty response to the Student Success memo discussed at last month’s FS meeting. The online survey sent to the Faculty included the following questions:

1) What are the main reasons students receive a final grade of D, F, or N in your classes? (Note: The N grade can be used in developmental classes.)
2) If you teach multiple sections of the same course, did the Student Success rate vary in different sections?

3) Should W grades be factored out of calculations of student success provided to individual faculty members?

4) Should the college conduct exit interviews to find out why students withdraw?

5) Should the college assess personal and affective variables which may influence student success?

6) Are you concerned that student success data based on final grades could be used in decisions about hiring or promotion?

7) Should student success data based on final grades be used in decisions about hiring or promotion?

8) Would you be inclined to give higher grades if you thought that decisions about hiring or promotion might be based on students’ success as measured by final grades?

9) Is it valid to correlate students’ final grades with instructor effectiveness?

10) Is it possible to make effective decisions about instructional practices based on information about final grades contained in the Student Success Rates Memo sent to faculty?

11) Do you believe that students are ultimately responsible for their success?

12) What are some important variables that enhance student learning? Check all that apply: college readiness, financial support, a career goal, completion of assignments.

13) If you think there are additional important variables that enhance student learning, please list them here.

14) What are some important variables that hamper student learning? Check all that apply: financial problems, family/other relationship problems, lack of college readiness, social problems, lack of interest in subject matter, assignments incomplete/not done, poor attendance, late registration.

15) If you think there are additional important variables that hamper student learning, please list them here.

16) Do you have any additional comments or questions?

Sen. Cain presented to the senate a graph displaying quantitative data responses, as well as highlighting comments to Question #1. She stated that there was a strong response (from 88 respondents) to the survey, mainly identifying the following needs: to determine and address the true causes of low student success, to avoid making assumptions (e.g., that low student success is due to instructor ineffectiveness), and to seek more information about the problem.

Sen. Cain requested suggestions for how to disseminate the results (including the raw data), which contain extensive comments.

Chair Lococo, having reviewed the survey responses, noted that the faculty comments include much detail and many very interesting suggestions—not just complaints—indicating that a large number of faculty take student success seriously and suggesting that while they don't necessarily agree on the manner to enhance it, the approach presented in the original memo is not perceived as the best way. Chair Lococo gave as an example one faculty member’s comment to the effect
of, “Okay, then I'll just give 70 percent of my students a C or above.”

Sen. Brekke asked whether anyone has talked to students about this issue, including the “Instructor Success Rate.” Sen. Cain said she would be interested in student reactions to questions #4 and #5 (regarding reasons that students withdraw and variables that affect their functioning in school). Tracey Imper said Student Government could conduct a student survey at the Pearl City and Wai‘anae campuses and come back next month with survey results.

Sen. Cain asked what senators want to do with the survey (e.g., post results online, disseminate them some other way) and whether comments should be sent out verbatim. Chair Lococo suggested that we make them available to all faculty. Sen. Brekke suggested first trying to code qualitative data but sending out numeric data immediately, and soliciting volunteers to help with the workload of reviewing faculty comments for themes.

**Motion 11-48 (Lane/Schmidt):**
To send all raw data from the student/faculty success memo survey out to all faculty.

**Discussion:** Sen. Losch asked whether accreditation representatives will have access and whether the survey questions might possibly come across as indicative of faculty not being concerned about the success of students, which might reflect badly on the college. Chair Lococo suggested that since more will need to be done, we might consider sending out the data and summarizing comments for now, in order to proceed. When the issue of potentially self-identifying information in the comments was raised, Cain responded that there was only one comment she thought might fit this category.

Chair Lococo pointed out that while faculty want statistical data, the Senate is expected to be even more active. Many faculty expect the senate to do something more with the results of the survey. Senator Kae asked for clarification on the point of survey, which Sen. Cain identified as finding out faculty views and feelings on the memo, and “following up on conversations in the hallways,” giving faculty a voice.

Sen. Scully brought up the possibility of data from the memo becoming “grading criteria” for us as instructors. Interim Dean Della Anderson responded that assumptions have been made about this memo being about instructor effectiveness. Sen. Cain pointed out the “Instructor success rate” term included in the memo, and Sen. Hochstein requested a qualifier identifying the source of the data.

**Motion was approved with 19 approvals, 0 disapprovals, 0 abstentions.**

The Senate will take up the issue again at its November 30 meeting and decide if further formal action is warranted. In the meantime, Sen. Cain and Sen. Brekke will summarize the data and draw up an analysis.

*DEAN DELLA ANDERSON PRESENTATION (on behalf of the Student Success Committee)*
Dean Anderson responded to faculty concerns about “W” grades being factored into “Student Success” rates; she reminded the Senate that the UHCC system agreed on incorporating the W in order to comply with the success rate formula used nationally, but she added that Guy Nishimoto also created another report in which the W grades were NOT a part of the equation.

Guy Nishimoto added that the Student Success Rate is an official term his office uses as part of the Gatekeeper course report, to determine the flow of students through (i.e., success in) gatekeeper courses. He said that the term is not an explanation of cause. He explained that the presence or absence of the W grades in his calculations made little difference; when calculating the Success Rate without the W grades, he found less than a five-percent difference, in only 25-30% of classes. All campuses across the system factor the “W” grades in (i.e., include them in the denominator) as standard procedure as taking them out can conceal problems (e.g., a class with an 89% success rate but a hidden 40% withdrawal rate inflating the success rate). Previous to these gatekeeper-course-specific reports, he claimed, the differences were hidden in broad averages of all courses, so everyone “looked okay,” with an overall average of 70%. However, he said, some courses’ data indicate patterns (e.g. a difference of 20% points or more in 1.5-4% of classes, which gets “buried”).

Guy also mentioned that in his nine years at Kapiolani CC, no administrators asked for success rates for hiring or promotion decisions, nor has this occurred in his four years here at Leeward CC. Although faculty, on the other hand, have requested this information, his office does not release it, and he has never been on a TPRC where success rates were considered unless the candidate had included this information on their own. He recommended analyzing and presenting data carefully.

Sen. Brekke asked about the “interaction” factor in teaching/learning and about how to go after that data as a campus. According to Guy, it is hard to interpret data from exit surveys and not helpful. (If a student is asked, “Why are you leaving?” and responds, “Because of my family,” what does that mean?)

Sen. Losch, also a member of the Student Success Committee, said the committee wanted to help its constituents by providing information to improve classes, (e.g., the memo statistics to be used as baseline data). Sen. Cain asked how a class can be changed if we don’t first know what’s wrong with it. Dean Anderson said she wants faculty to work in groups (by course) to request the data necessary for tracking down problems (e.g., prerequisites, class size, etc.). Sen. Cain pointed out that data with variables “mashed together” is not appropriate for determining changes to curriculum; we need to find out what variables cause students to drop out.

Sen. Losch discussed other activities engaged in by the Student Success Committee, and passed out a memo listing some of the accomplishments of the committee. The Developmental Education sub-committee’s use of a grant to examine students’ college readiness and do Maka’ala (intrusive counseling), two of the other “arms” of the project of which this was to be
one piece. A bid for Starfish (for electronic alerts) is another, as well as other measures to address underpreparedness, but that was not a concern of this subcommittee. Sen. Lum says this information should have been presented alongside the memo.

Also discussed was the fact that division chairs have been asking faculty not to include success rates in their dossiers, and that there is concern that student success rates are going to “become what student evaluations became” (i.e., not required in the past but expected now). Curriculum decisions are already being affected by low success rates (ramifications including pressure being put on certain faculty not to teach certain courses).

Chair Lococo pointed out that these ramifications are real even if small now, and Sen. Schmidt suggested that eventually a faculty member's NOT including success-rate data in his or her document could raise “red flags.”

Dean Anderson responded that if faculty members do not include this data in their documents, it will not become a practice. She encouraged looking at many data points (not just this one piece): Sen. Losch asked whether faculty members want to see completion rates.

Chair Lococo recommended continuing this discussion at the next FS meeting.

B. Review of Faculty Senate Charter and Bylaws

Chair Lococo asked that senators think about whether we should formally revise the Charter and Bylaws and, if so, how.

VI. Chair’s Report / new business

1. Senate Chair Lococo reported that at the recent 9/30/11 All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) meeting, a resolution was unanimously passed that called transparency in the use of all funds, including RTRF and UH Foundation. While the resolution was of particular concern to UH-Manoa faculty, Chair Lococo asked the Senate to consider how this resolution might be of use to us on the Leeward CC campus.

2. From the same ACCFSC meeting, Chair Lococo informed the Senate that to ensure that faculty are intimately involved in issues pertaining to distance learning, the Faculty-DLAC committee was re-authorized by ACCFSC. Greg Walker has agreed to continue as Leeward’s representative. A concern was expressed that the CC’s are being required to report all sorts of data on DE due to accreditation and Federal guidelines, so DE issues are particularly acute to CC faculty. As these issues will reach the 4-year schools eventually, there was a consensus that an all-campus F-DLAC could serve a very useful purpose.

3. A related concern expressed by several Senate chairs was the slowness (at times) of Laulima. Also, there were reports of faculty at several campuses suddenly losing data, emails not being
sent, etc. With DE instruction becoming increasingly important, this can seriously affect ability to deliver instruction. ACCFSC will discuss in more detail at its next meeting (10/28); and F-DLAC is also expected to take it up.

Chair Lococo asked senators to review/consider the following:

**A. International Statement**

Chair Lococo distributed a handout on whether FS should take on a formal role on international engagement, and he asked senators to think over next month about whether we should make a reaffirming statement.

**B. UCA Report on Auto-admit of AA students (Acceptance of Mainland Transfer Credits)**

Maui College pointed out that if one campus accepts a mainland transfer course, all colleges in the system may also do so. The question being presented is, “Is this good?”

**VII. Announcements**

A. Accreditation Update

Donna has requested written (online) feedback to the report draft. (Sen. Kae said Junie can show us how to make comments directly in the editable pdf-format document, and he encouraged senators to comment.) Chair Lococo added that eventually we (FS) will have to vote on the revised doc. He also recommended reading Sen. Kosasa's Legislative Committee memo.

**B. UHPA Update (Cain)**

Sen. Cain said that an UHPA meeting question/answer session indicated that faculty want a broader understanding of student success in terms of performance-based funding, especially in reference to students not enrolled for the sake of pursuing a degree. Students have diverse goals, she said, and there is a Mainland college trend toward certificates. Other concerns are the equating of student and faculty success, workload issues for assessment and accreditation, and a lack of transparency in terms of how funds are used. Faculty are interested in talking about workload, especially for lab sections.

Sen. Millen’s committee just met and will be notifying senators who need to submit information.

Sen. Brekke says that OPPA has drafted a statement and that the urgency of the upcoming accreditation visit is now focused on program review (not on courses), especially AA programs. Sen. Brekke is working with Dan Goodman to draft a report of SLOs aligned with General Education outcomes; the draft will move through review committees. The college needs to have something on paper documenting that we reviewed the AA program and will do
something on ANNUAL basis (e.g., including student voices/input/perceptions of what they are getting out of their degree programs and processes), not just every six years. Brekke asked whether there were any more volunteers for this task. In spring, there will be more to work with.

Sen. Rojas and Sen. Walker are creating a student evaluation process committee. (Fall 1988 was when process first implemented.) Natalia asked whether this policy should be created at the division level. According to Chair Lococo, there is no campus policy. Tara explained that the committee will look at how student evaluations slowly became standard. (Chair Lococo said that the original evaluation form had the same questions for all campuses but that individual campuses could add to it.

Sen. Losch invited questions about the Student Success Committee's initiatives. She also reported that WCC has proposed an AA in Hawaiian Studies, and a system ATP was granted across the system, but we have to create the program proposal for ours by Nov. 18, which means it will come to FS for a vote on Nov. 30 (to reach the BOR in April). Chair Lococo said that our administration is okay with something by April. We can create the proposal anytime, but if we want this hassle-free window, we need to be communicating now.

Next meeting: November 30, 2011.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:51 P.M.