

2. Consent Agenda

Motion 2: Senator Kennedy moved to approve the consent agenda; motion seconded; motion approved unanimously.

3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

A. Academic Senate President – Loren Sachs:

Budget Committee: Will meet Friday and Senator Ely will provide an update next week.

District Consultation Council: The committee prioritized a couple of goals for the coming year, one of those goals is student engagement. Our Guided Pathways group along with the two other colleges will be sharing that at DCC in January and we'll bring updates when we reconvene in the spring.

Accreditation Committee: VPI

Other senators noted that this would be a good thing for OCC in regards to the survey results, although we need to know exactly what OCC students think is missing from faculty-student interactions.

- D. Academic Rank Committee - Academic Rank Committee Chair Loren Sachs: Last week something in Class Climate was updated and right now we are unable to pull the report for academic rank changes. It's being worked on and as soon as they can access the data the changes will be published.
- E. Ad Hoc Committee on Dual Enrollment with OCC in Japan: VPI Ballinger reported that this MOU draft is just informational, as the committee is talking about issues and working on development. VP Madjid Niroumand will engage the conversation with NIC. This draft MOU is an example of what we're thinking about and we're asking the Senate for any suggestions, as we're in the very early stages of this initial draft.

4. Unfinished Business

- A. Comprehensive Evaluation for Continuous Improvement Processes - Anna Hanlon and Kelly Holt

Anna Hanlon informed the Senate the topic is evaluation of processes. There is an integrated planning process that starts with assessment, program review, and building strategies. The strategies are used to create ARR's to get the things that we need to implement our strategies. Every three years we evaluate our processes to ensure that they're working for us. The last evaluation was in spring 2017. The method used was that Gabrielle Stanco came to the different participatory governance committees and conducted a focus group with questions and gathered qualitative data. There was also a campus-wide survey sent out to all employees regarding our process of program review, assessment, planning, and ARR's. The data was analyzed by the researchers and the analysis was shared with the Intentional Effectiveness Committee. The group drafted some recommendations that were brought to the representative bodies, the planning councils, the senates, for further discussion for feedback, changes, and endorsement. One of the changes that resulasss a0 1 250.73 3612 792 ren

prior evaluation, two about the general evaluation done in the past and a comprehensive review with regards to some of our other processes, and finally an in-depth evaluation of how we're using TracDat.

Kelly Holt noted that they were looking for four different projects and a working group to flesh out these specific areas. The first one being to investigate improvements to comprehensive program review. There are some comments that have not been addressed yet but looking to incorporate them into the new process:

- o Developing a mechanism for departments to identify what data they need because the existing data was not meeting their needs. We hope to get a working group together to let the Institutional Effectiveness Office know what type of data is needed for program review.
- o SLOs and AUOs being redundant.
- o CTE faculty reported that they have internal accreditation, bi-annual review, program review, SLO ... and are serving a lot of masters, so is there a way to streamline everything that we do in CTE programs?
- o General review of comprehensive evaluation, including outcomes assessment, program review, peer review, and planning processes; how is it working, what can be added and be different?
- o Looking at the prompts. Are they meaningful, useful? Can we change them?
- o Focusing mostly on this review looking at how midterm review went. Did we like it? Was it meaningful? Do we stick with it?
- o Reviewing program outcome assessments two years ago, PSLO assessments. Will do a focused review on those two things to see how we have done in the past.
- o TracDat has a new version that is coming out. It will look a little different in the new version. We want to make sure that the way the new version is rolled out, is as good as it can be. We can do some minor edits to it. So, getting some faculty to use it and give feedback in terms of what going to work will be helpful. This will be a great opportunity to get a larger group of faculty to give input that will effectively impact how the migration happens and how we use TracDat.

Anna Hanlon asked for questions and stated that they are seeking endorsement.

- o A senator suggested that for accreditation, they had to do one extra thing in program review, but it's not on the list. We had to address why the goal didn't work.

Kelly Holt noted that they need to include addressing goals that did not work. There is also a recommendation that we strengthen the way in which we address area

- B. BP/AP 7310: Anti- Nepotism – Senator Kennedy, Vice Chancellor of HR, Dr. Baeza and, Vice-Chancellor of Instruction, Dr. Serban:

Senator Kennedy explained that the original Board Policy (BP) that was proposed by the

5. New Business

New business moved to next week's agenda.

6. Adjournment of the Regular Meeting

President Loren Sachs adjourned the meeting at 12:32pm.

