Minutes
Ohlone College Faculty Senate
October 6, 2010
3:45 - 4:45
Room NC 1222

Members Present: Diane Berkland, Jeff Dean, Claire Ellis, Chieko Honma, Alan Kirshner, Jim McManus, Bob Mitchell, Jeff O'Connell, Alyce Reynolds, Jeff Roberts, Nicole Sandoval, Terry Taskey, Wayne Yuen

Members Absent: Luc Desmedt, Kim Stiles
Others Present: Rachel Sherman, Deb Parziale
Meeting called to order at 3:47 p.m.

1. Announcements:
   - Phone Banking for Measure G has started. There has been a great turnout by faculty.
   - State Stuff:
     SB 1440 has passed. More information will be on the Senate website
     Call for nominations for the 2010-2011 Exemplary Program Awards. More information on the Senate website
   - Jeff Watanabe is a father.

2. Approval of Minutes from September 15, 2010 (A):
Kirshner expressed concern over how the minutes reflect the meetings. Solution to one concern: When there is a particular motion, it will be highlighted in bold print. Further concern noted about reflection of specific comments made during general discussions, even when no vote is taken. Corrections to the previous minutes will be noted.

Roberts moves to approve the Minutes from September 15, 2010. Taskey seconds. Approved unanimously.

3. Assessing Student Learning Outcomes: (I) Parziale/Sherman
Updated information on program-level SLOs (PSLOs) was provided to the Senate. This is, for most departments, a continuing process, following-up from previous information given regarding the creation and revision of PSLOs/SLOs for courses and for programs/departments. A handout, providing information on upcoming deadlines is available online, and from Deb. The handout provided specific definitions of PSLOs and SLOs as well as examples of direct and indirect assessments being done by Ohlone faculty. Some key upcoming dates: “All program faculty are required to write a plan to assess each program outcome by May 2011. At least one PSLO must be assessed each year. All PSLOs must be assessed by May 2015.” A review of a program or course’s SLOs involves evaluation of how well they measure how well students are learning and how effective the course materials and instructional methods are.
Rachel wanted to emphasize that departments should indicate what they plan to assess for this academic year. A plan of what will be assessed is going to be required from each department.
These assessments will be gathered together and will ultimately become a part of the College’s strategic plan/program improvement objectives.
Kirshner commented that there is concern at the state union level about administrations using these kinds of assessments as assessments of faculty. This has not been the case at Ohlone, but this issue has created splits at other schools between administrations and faculty.

4. Should all classes be closed on the first day of school? (I): O’Connell
Follow-up information was provided: 4,155 students were added after the first day. Not clear how many of them added into open classes versus ones signed in to full courses with instructor permission or from waitlists.
If a faculty member is concerned about this, he/she can talk to his/her dean about closing individual classes before the first day of classes.
Kirshner reported on surveying the history faculty. They were unanimous in wishing their classes to be closed. He read a statement from one faculty member expressing concerns about the current situation allowing students to add an open class after the first day without the instructor’s approval. Kirshner expresses concern over ability of not just full-time, but part-time faculty to ask that their classes be closed.
Taskey clarified the issue of late adds (with instructor permission and from waitlists) vs. open classes.
Berkland reports that counseling faculty discussed this and that students are sometimes uncertain about how much of a workload they can handle. She wonders if perhaps this is more of a technical issue with the waitlists.
O’Connell suggests that the Senate look again at this issue, but first educating faculty about the already-existing features and options in WebAdvisor. Perhaps this can be done at fixed Flex day.
Kirshner indicates that effort should be made to educate part-timers who are not available on fixed Flex day.
Taskey notes that Chris Williamson is a resource for information regarding waitlists and open classes.
Berkland suggests also looking at those late-adding students and their performance as the semester proceeds. Anecdotal information suggests that those students who add themselves after the first date without attending are likely to perform poorly, as they lack basic information and orientation to the course. Sandoval suggests looking at the technical issues involved and disseminating information to full and part-time instructors.

5. **Plan to rebuild faculty - Next steps (I/A): O’Connell**

Senate previously approved Jim Wright’s plan. Wright would like guidance on how the faculty members for this committee will be selected. Those who already approached O’Connell are from the same division. Will Senate select these faculty members or will the deans select them?

Kirshner expresses concern that if each dean is represented, that creates an imbalance, since each dean does not oversee an equal number of faculty members.

There is also not clarity about the distinction between replacing faculty who took SERP or had some other type of retirement. Question before the Senate is how those faculty members for the committee will be selected. Again, concern was expressed about the unevenness of faculty distribution between deans.

A discussion about past practice took place. Concern was expressed by Sandoval: Is the College really moving in a different direction or are we beginning to fall back to previous method for prioritizing faculty positions?

**Motion by Kirshner:** That past practice be followed and that a faculty representative selected by the division dean represent that particular area on this committee.

**Seconded by Roberts**

McManus abstention. Otherwise, all those present voted yes.

6. **Measure G (A): O’Connell**

Can/should the Faculty Senate endorse Measure G? Kirshner wishes to clarify his statement from the previous meeting. Union lawyer said there was no problem for the Senate to endorse candidates. It is Kirshner’s view that this logically means that there should be no problem with the Senate endorsing Measure G.

**Motion to endorse Measure G:** Kirshner. Seconded by Yuen. Approved unanimously.

7. **Other**

- Committee on committees needs to be reactivated. Information is outdated at this point. Berkland and O’Connell will work on this.
- Letter from Ron Staszkow:
  “After 3 years, I have returned to the campus and I am shocked at the condition of the grounds. There are weeds and trash everywhere. The campus looks unkempt and dreary. When weeds are even growing on the edges of the main street into campus, it does not give a good impression to anyone. What has happened? Can the Senate bring this topic up? What can be done? Ohlone can be a beautiful place. Please help, Ron Staszkow.”

O’Connell: Is there something Senate can do about this? Is this a Facilities issue?

Kirshner: Perhaps this is an issue relating to a closer focus on the new buildings rather than maintaining existing buildings and the grounds.

O’Connell will talk to Lucky Lofton. Taskey suggests mentioning very specific issues as examples.
- The next meeting is scheduled to be a forum with the candidates for the Board. Format will be similar to the previous forum held with the Assembly candidates two years ago. Kirshner suggests clarifying the format before the event so candidates know if they have opening statements. Sandoval asked if candidates would be directly debating. Kirshner suggests following the previous format rather than direct debate, since candidates will later need to be collegial and work together. O’Connell will formulate a plan with Sandoval and send it out to the Senate.

Meeting adjourned: 5:06