The De Anza Academic Senate
Approved Notes of the meeting of
November 29th, 2010

Senators and Officers Absent: Annen, Cruz, Guevara, Mello, and Yang

DASB: Ali Masood  Classified Senate:
Administrative Liaison:
Guests: Truly Hunter, Andrew LaManque, Ze-kun Li, Mallory Newell, Geg Lewis, Julie Ceballos, Beth Grobman, Mary Sullivan, Peter Maxwell, Nick Girard, and Michael Mannina
SLO coordinators/Staff Development: Toño Ramirez and Mary Pape
Curriculum Co Chair:

[NOTE: Item numbers are reflective of agenda numbers in the order they are actually taken up at the meeting.]

The meeting was called to order at 2:33, a quorum being present.

I. Approval of Agenda and Notes: The agenda was approved as distributed. The notes of the meeting of November 22nd were approved as distributed with minor editing plus the noting of an incorrect deadline statement made during the meeting’s Item IV.

II. Needs and Confirmations: None

III. Officer’s Reports: Setziol said that he had received two of the remaining division reviews of the Courses Into Disciplines and FSAs Report (Social Sciences and Language Arts) and had been assured that two others (IIS and Special Education) would be done within a short period of time. This left Creative Arts and Child Development unaccounted for.

Lee-Wheat reported continued work on items mentioned at the meeting of November 22nd.

Anderson first focused on support for student efforts presented at the November 22nd meeting and urged faculty to work with the students towards their announced ends including allowing student leaders to speak directly to classes. He then acknowledged the presence of former De Anza institutional researcher now District researcher Andrew Lamanque and the new De Anza institutional researcher Mallory Newell. Newell introduced herself and examples of current
work. She also made the group aware of the fact that the office of Institutional Research would be responsive down to the level of the classes of an individual instructor as well as all the kinds of things the college has expected.

IV. Course Studio: Drake Lewis and Julie Ceballos presented this Portal based opportunity for faculty. It was characterized as being in between simply sending and receiving electronic mail messages and a full blown faculty website. A handout titled Online Instructional Tools was distributed. Groups of students and types of activities and documents as well as messages can be organized using this tool. Those wishing to use it will have to get their students to check in to the system on a regular basis in order for it to be fully effective.

V. Tech Task Force: Beth Grobman introduced herself as the faculty representative responsible for conveying questions, complaints, and other messages from faculty to the Tech Task Force and advocated for increased communication between the Executive Committee and the Task Force.

VI. La Voz Update: Nick Girard, Peter Maxwell, and Michael Mannina were present to describe the work of La Voz including awards recently won and the first amendment nature of the paper, free from censorship or coercion from faculty or staff. They also introduced the group to the online version of La Voz and said they welcomed feedback of all kinds. Finally, they suggested that faculty who were reluctant to be interviewed could request to review quotes attributed to them before an article is published.

VII. Request for Representation from Student Development Division: Anderson read a formal request from the four faculty members comprising the Student Development Division for a voting member position on the Executive Committee. He clarified that, by the Academic Senate’s constitution, they had a right to such representation. Mary Sullivan and Truly Hunter were present to represent the division. After further clarification on definitions of a division and the revelation of a precedent for a group having one rather than two representatives it was MSC (Pesano/Hanna) to grant the request.

IX. SB1440: Anderson and Setziol spoke briefly about the attractiveness of the Transfer Model Curriculum approach to achieving at least minimum compliance. Questions were answered about transfer to the University of California (unaffected, although there could be a shift of offerings towards courses specifically designed for the Transfer Model Curriculum) and it was stated that it would be possible for an individual discipline to have both a state modeled degree and a “grow your own” degree in consultation with San Jose State. Anderson concluded by acknowledging that the college is just beginning to deal with the implementation of SB1440 and that the effects could be profound.

VIII. SLO Timeline: Mary Pape and Toño Ramirez gave the group an update on and answered questions about timelines and methods for program level student learning outcomes assessments. Pape mentioned February 26th as the catalog deadline for the
coming year. She recommended considering the means of assessment prior to finalizing Program Level Outcomes statements. Both Toño and Mary will be happy to attend department meetings to assist faculty. Feedback to departments on the drafts from departments submitted on opening day will come in January. At that point departments will begin to determine which Institutional Core Competencies are addressed in their courses and decide when they can promise their Program Level Assessments will actually be assessed using the form templates that the SLO coordinators will supply division liaisons and or curriculum representatives.

X. For the Good of the Order: - Anderson strongly and enthusiastically urged the group to collaborate with students on the food drive getting underway. 
- The Automotive Technology department has collected a great deal of food by itself.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:28
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