

**LEARNING COUNCIL MINUTES**  
April 24, 2009, Boardroom 1:00 – 2:45 p.m.

**Present:** Sonya Christian, Kate Barry, Lida Herburger, Michael Levick, Mark Williams, Dennis Gilbert, Ken Murdoff, Shelley Gaudia, Phil Martinez, Roma Cusimano

Item	Notes
Announcements	<p>Gilbert: Faculty Council will be meeting re: evaluation of governance system, forum for board seats (whether open to everyone is not decided yet).</p> <p>Herburger: Summer term CE offerings due soon and have been asked to increase their offerings.</p> <p>Levick: Parthemer doing a student retention survey and has gotten about 50 responses which have been interesting. Students are indicating that they would like standardization in online classes.</p> <p>Barry: \$100K grant from the Walmart Foundation for work with veteran students.</p> <p>Christian:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Joe Escobar will not be webmaster next year. Ian Coronado &amp; Vicki Kilpatrick will be working as replacing him. The webmaster title has been changed to Faculty technology Specialist.</li> <li>2- Faculty, Mgr, &amp; Classified staff development around technology literacy; especially web 2.0</li> <li>3- Received funding from the national emergency grant for the retraining of Hynix workers.</li> <li>4- Federal Stimulus (ARRA)- have gotten funding already and now targeting more funding sources</li> <li>5- College Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looking at budget proposals</li> <li>• Bargaining is happening at the same time</li> <li>• Smoke free campus initiative is being discussed and will be voted on soon</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Approval of Minutes from previous meeting	Approved without amendment
Final Discussion of Assessment Team Workplan  Mary Brau, Guest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brau got Gilbert proposals [Gilbert proposals on top, AT original workplan in middle &amp; AT final recommendation at the bottom] and the Assessment Team (AT) reviewed (see attached). Language on the left side was approved because it reflects the accreditation language. Left out “credible” because AT did not want to make judgments about the work being done. AT is in a supportive role and not judging the work.</li> <li>• Gilbert clarified that his concern was not just around “credible” but more broadly is about the use of internal information instead of also including external sources of assessment information – what is effective in improving student learning. (handed out attached model). These external sources of information are “credible”, broad based, and relevant in addition to internal information.</li> <li>• Discussion about the model. Nothing precludes the use of double loop learning and it would be encouraged in the AT work. Use of external resources are appropriate for use in the work of the AT. Issue of whether this use of double loop learning needs to be specifically acknowledged in the AT Work Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Vote to approve Assessment Team Work Plan: 3 voted no to the AT revised language</b></p>

	<p>Options from here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approve the language as AT revised it and have the 3 people who voted no connect with the AT to engage in a conversation about the meaning intended by this language</li> <li>- Tell AT that LC voted no and tell AT to come back with revised language</li> <li>- Support AT language if replace “credible” with “valid and reliable” with the bullet points in Gilbert version.</li> </ul> <p>Decision without objection: Tell AT that LC was unable to reach agreement on the language of Item 12 of the AT Work Plan and will ask that AT connect with Gilbert, Martinez and Cusimano to see if they can reach agreement on the language.</p>
<p>Report on Standard 2</p> <p>Mary Brau, Guest</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Handed out draft &amp; will be revising the visual at the beginning to make it graphically more appealing and clearer</li> <li>• Questions required to respond to are in the draft but will be reorganized into themes to focus on improvements that have been made in response to assessment; strategic initiatives, etc...</li> <li>• Curriculum is organized around our curriculum. This will change and reflect standard elements and indicators.</li> <li>• Will not repeat information in Section B if it appeared in Section A.</li> <li>• NWCCU has changed the process: Now a 7 year process that for the first cycle will be compressed into 4 years.</li> <li>• The new standards are more integrated than in the past and are cumulative in nature.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cusimano &amp; Gilbert expressed concern about the new programs that are mid- &amp; high- cost programs and how they affect the rest of the programs that must support them. Brau said that the new programs were driven by workforce needs and are offset by the elimination of programs that are no longer supported by workforce needs.</li> <li>• Gilbert noted that since PTA (&amp; other CT programs) have specific accrediting staffing requirements, they get more resources than the transfer credit programs. Needs to be addressed. Discussion about the decision to start the PTA program.</li> </ul>
<p>Discussion on Workplan Elements</p>	<p>With the amount of time left in this year, looking at the list of items, what do we intend to do with these items?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Gilbert</u>: Discussion of FT/PT faculty is a major issue and needs to be discussed. Need to structure our work into work teams. This issue is part of our charter and there has been legislative action this and last session around this. This is central to learning on this campus. This is specifically addressed in the Learning Plan. Could use criteria that were used in California (3 year PT consolidated into FT &amp; what cost) and could look at the legislation that has been forwarded and see the impact. Could be done in the time available.</li> <li>• <u>Williams</u>: Data tracking because it would inform all kinds of work including and especially assessment; this is ‘closing the loop’ work. A team could spearhead or it could be a distributed process.</li> <li>• <u>Christian</u>: There are parts of the Learning Plan that might provide some focused work that the Council could do. Budget, assessment, underserved students, and PT/FT. Assessment #1 and Technology #2. This work is happening and would allow input for engagement over the summer.</li> <li>• <u>Herburger</u>: Supports data tracking and the assessment work. We don’t get the information that we currently need. Also, Title III and SAGA will be covered at our next meeting.</li> <li>• <u>Martinez</u>: Individual member effectiveness is somewhat based on the expertise. Faculty expertise focus on FT/PT faculty, assessment and technology.</li> <li>• <u>Gaudia</u>: Strong desire to talk about PT/FT faculty but abstain because of philosophical disagreement with list approach.</li> <li>• <u>Cusimano</u>: FT/PT is critical and no one else is working on it. There are people working on the other issues.</li> </ul> <p>Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gilbert will work with a team to develop recommendations.</li> <li>2. Williams, Herburger, Martinez work on data tracking and technology.</li> </ol>

<b>Next Meeting</b>	<b>May 15<sup>th</sup> from 1-2:45 p.m. in the Boardroom- Joint meeting with Student Affairs Council</b>