Members present: Jeff Dean, Jeff O’Connell, Jeff Roberts, Jennifer Harper, Nicole Sandoval, Diane Berkland, Bob Mitchell, Terry Taskey, Jim McManus, Wayne Yuen, Alyce Reynolds, Chieko Honma

Members absent: Luc Desmedt, Carrie Dameron

Others present: Sally Bratton, Jim Wright, Rob Smedfjeld

The meeting was called to order at 3:32 p.m.

Before announcements, Sally Bratton, Director of the Student Health Center, provided information to the Senate on a new program relating to student mental health. The program, STEP up Ohlone, is being funded by money generated from Proposition 63 and seeks to promote mental health in the student population and reduce the stigma sometimes attached to seeking help for mental health issues. A number of different colleges are participating in this program.

A website has been created, which explains the program: http://stepupohlone.org/

Sally encouraged faculty with questions about the program to contact Christine and/or Sang, who are heading this initiative, which includes different components, including peer-to-peer support, social media outreach and developing partnerships with faculty members, who can encourage students to take advantage of this resource if they need help.

Sally also raised the issue of the new initiative to make the Fremont campus smoke-free and recalled the educational efforts made in the past when smoking was restricted. If people are interested in volunteering to be part of the educational campaign, they should contact her. Lastly, the question of mentioning the resources of the Student Health Center in course syllabi was raised. She encouraged faculty who feel comfortable doing so to note this information in their course syllabi.

A copy of Sally’s PowerPoint presentation will be posted on the Senate website: http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/joconnell/senate/

SLOAC Update (I): Sherman and Wright

Dr. Wright complimented Jeff O’Connell on his work leading up to the recent election.

Rachel Sherman provided documents that were previously distributed to the Senators on also available on the SLOAC website: http://www.ohlone.edu/org/sloacomm/ and the Senate website: http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/joconnell/senate/
Sherman noted that SLOAC created a two-year action plan to increase our proficiency with regards to SLOs. Now SLOAC is a robust committee working on this issue. It meets five times a semester and has presentations by faculty members illustrating how they are doing assessments in their courses.

Sherman indicated that things are in a good place right now and that Get It Done Day in August had a strong turnout, with a great deal accomplished.

Sherman stated that the focus the immediate future is to set priorities and work on tracking and documenting the assessments being done. She also noted that SLOAC is now gearing up to write the part of the accreditation self-study referring to our assessment strategies and accomplishments. This is why faculty have been surveyed about ongoing and new assessment projects.

There was a Master Course List created, indicating which courses were being assessed. It is posted on the SLOAC website: [http://www.ohlone.edu/org/sloacomm/](http://www.ohlone.edu/org/sloacomm/)

Another step noted by Sherman was the identification of GE courses that need to be assessed. Lastly, she noted that work is being done on a FAQ document to answer faculty questions relating to SLO assessment.

Dr. Wright gave brief overview of self-study requirements with regards to assessments. He went over a framework document, illustrating how cycles of assessment connect. This document is posted on the Senate website: [http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/joconnell/senate/](http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/joconnell/senate/)

Wright noted that 90 different entities complete a Program and Services Review, 48 of which are from instructional areas. He noted that a previous accreditation review recommended an increased link between these reviews and the budgeting process. He noted that there has been concern raised about the usefulness of some of the Curricunet modules. An assessment is planned for Curricunet by a user group. It is hoped that by the end of Spring 2013, Governet can work on the areas of concern that have been identified.

Wright indicated that colleges must now submit an annual report to the accreditation commission to demonstrate our proficiency with assessment. He noted that he has been working with Wayne and Heather on concerns raised by faculty about the increase in SLO work being asked of faculty. Lastly, he encouraged faculty to come to SLOAC meetings to see how different faculty are approaching assessment work and how they are benefitting from it.

Dean asked about the change from Program Review from every three years to once a year and if this change was a shared governance decision. Sherman replied that the decision to move to make it annual came out of a task force created after our last accreditation evaluation. Wright indicated that this change was made after review from College Council and that it was included in the mid-term accreditation report that was approved by Senate. O’Connell noted that the move to an annual cycle was not an individual item approved, but was part of the mid-term report. Sherman noted that the move to make it annual was intended to make the process easier. Wright noted that perhaps the concerns relate to communication issues and that there is a definite need to simplify tools in Curricunet to make annual program review simpler.

Smedfjeld asked about the FAQ document and what it was addressing. He was told that it would relate to the SLO framework document.
Sherman and Wright are asking for Senate to endorse the framework.

Dean noted his concern regarding an increase in the burden on faculty to do program review annually. Wright noted the presence of faculty coordinators in larger areas and how those coordinators are responsible for working on assessment. Yuen asked about the faculty coordinators and how the existence of them is inconsistent across departments. This led to a longer discussion about reassigned time to complete assessment documentation and the larger issue of department chairs. Wright indicated that there are resources available for this, including Rachel and Deb Parziale, who is still working on assessment as a contract employee.

Endorsement of the framework will be voted on at the next meeting.

**Announcements**

Proposition 30 passed and courses previously held back from the schedule are being restored into WebAdvisor in advance of registration.

Measure G focus groups are being put together on campus. Please see the email from Dr. Browning sent on November 2. O’Connell noted that it is important for faculty to be involved in these groups.

**Approval of Minutes from October 17, 2012 (A): All**

**Motion:** Roberts  
**Second:** Berkland  
**Approved with one abstention**

**Support for Adjunct Instructors (I): Sandoval**

An update was provided on the survey distributed to adjunct faculty. Well over half of adjunct faculty responded to the survey. Sandoval noted that the results showed an overall positive impression by adjunct faculty towards the College and their respective departments. There seemed to be a strong feeling of support. There were comments made by adjunct faculty about a desire to be kept in the loop and being contacted by their departments.

Wright noted that the negative comments related to negotiable issues such as pay and guarantee of classes. There was some expression of not feeling reached out to. Wright noted that it is important for full time faculty to be aware of this feeling.

More analysis will be done by Wright, Sandoval and O’Connell on the results and they will determine when and how to distribute the results to both adjunct and full time faculty.

A question was asked about the information fair and the reception. O’Connell noted that the information fair (held at the start of each semester) will continue as will the reception sponsored by Senate, held in the Spring.
Tenure Review/Evaluations (I): Roberts

Initial work was done by a UFO/Senate group, including Roberts, Dameron and Yuen on a proposed revision to the tenure/evaluation process for full-time faculty members. Draft documents are posted on the Senate website: http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/joconnell/senate/

Roberts noted that this is still very much a work in progress and that Senate will not make the ultimate decision on this issue since this is a negotiable item and more related to the UFO. But the group working on this is looking for feedback from faculty on the proposed revisions.

Smedfjeld recalled that he was here when the peer evaluation component was added and it was a contentious issue and that there was a lot of discussion and that our process of evaluation does appear to be unique compared to other institutions.

Roberts indicated that the group is bringing this to Senate first for feedback before proceeding to see if the group seems to be on the right track, then this will be distributed to the faculty at large.

Harper indicated that she thought the work was on the right track, but it did not seem to address the different kind of work done by counselors and librarians. Yuen asked about the relevance a portfolio for faculty like counselors. Roberts noted that he would take this feedback back to the group.

Mitchell expressed concern that this might create more work. Roberts noted that the group wished to create a framework that would make the process easier, though he acknowledged that creating a portfolio might be a concern for faculty members used to doing their evaluations in a particular way.

Smedfjeld advised the group to take adequate time to proceed and achieve buy in before initiating the process of wishing to change the process, since both parties involved, faculty and administrators, should be pleased with the proposal before it gets to the point of negotiation.

Taskey noted her positive experience with the current form of self-evaluation, since she was able to create a meaningful project. She noted that perhaps there is inconsistency between departments in how evaluation is completed.

Roberts stated that the intent for already tenured faculty is to have more focused reviews.

O’Connell stated that this could be the subject of discussion for the all-faculty meeting at the start of the next semester, since it is one of the few times when all are assembled.

Approval of "Easy" Administrative Procedures (A): O’Connell

The group of previously reviewed and edited Administrative Procedures, noted in the “easy” category on the Senate website: http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/joconnell/senate/

Motion: Yuen
Second: McManus
Approved unanimously
Discussion of the next two APs was postponed.

Other

There will be no meeting on November 21, 2012.

The next meeting of Senate will be December 5, 2012, back in our regular room, 7101.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.