

Senators present:

Leonor Aguilera
Morrie Barembaum
Shawn Cummins
Doug Deaver
Michael DeCarbo
Steven Deeley
Corinna Evett
Jim Granitto
Eric Hovanitz
Danny Martino
Mary Mettler
Craig Nance
Randy Scott
Nooshan Shekarabi

Jolene Shields
Barbara Sproat

Non-Voting Members

CIC

Craig Rutan

ASG Representatives

Angel Lazo

Guest(s):

Aracely Mora
Caroline Durdella
Lotar Vallot
Jim Watkins

Call to Order

I Order of the Agenda

A request is made and granted to move the SLO discussion to the beginning of the meeting.

VI Discussion Items

B SLO/Assessment Caroline Durdella (Appendix 1 – Self-Assessment)

- 1 March 31, 2012, SCC must submit a required annual report to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation team.
- 2 October 15, 2012, SCC must submit a report to ACCJC (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges) demonstrating compliance with SLOs proficiency requirement.
- 3 In the last year, substantive progress has been made toward compliance.
- 4 There are two ends in the continuum of outcome assessment; one side wants overt direction and the other wants to be left to create assessment as they deem fit.
- 5 In an effort to accommodate both ends of this continuum; the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment (IEO) office has provided clear instruction for one side and personal guidance for the other.
- 6 A list of the courses without assessment of record has been compiled and the Deans and Chairs will be rigorously seeking to create instruments for implementation.
- 7 92% of our programs have at least one SLO.
- 8 One of the areas of focus for next year will be the implementation of TaskStream, the management software recently purchased.
- 9 Faculty development activities will continue to take place; this summer the focus of workshops will be on data analysis and reporting assessment results.
- 10 The IEO office is working towards a benchmarking workshop and activity for standards of outcome assessment.
- 11 The final project will be the creation of an Annual Institution Effectiveness Report.
- 12 The October 15 report must contain 100% of courses with SLOs, 100% assessment of record on file, and ideally 100% of courses with some form of assessment data.
- 13 The calendar of compliance must be communicated across campus. (Appendix 2 – Calendar)

- 14 Meeting the mandate is just the tip of the iceberg regarding accountability; the federal government is going to require more and more of SCC.
- 15 President Barembaum is concerned about meeting the requirements for the October 15 report and suggested that on the Thursday of Fall Flex, all Departments meet independently and discuss the findings of their course assessment.
- 16 Professor Evett asked whether it was true that this was already happening in Departments throughout the College and suggested that SCC could set this date as a deadline rather than the date it must be worked upon and completed.
- 17 Dean Durdella asked for Department minutes that reflect a discussion of SLO assessment.
- 18 Vice President Mora asked for the Senate to lead the entire Faculty in being prepared for the October 15 report.
- 19 Dean Durdella asked that Departments that are well underway on SLO assessment to offer assistance to Departments in need.

II Approval of Minutes

A February 7, 2012

Professor Deeley moved to approve

Professor Hovanitz provided the second

The minutes are approved without dissent

B February 21, 2012

Professor Deeley moved to approve

Professor Hovanitz provided the second

The minutes are approved without dissent

III Public Comments

- 1 Gemology Professor Lotar Vallot introduced himself to the Senate and explained how the Gemology Department leads directly to jobs and careers.
- 2 Professor Martino announced that State Chancellor Scott will be retiring.

IV ASG Report Angel Lazo

- 1 A Town Hall meeting will soon be held with debates on the smoking policy; also students will have access to laptops and be able to “like” SCC pages.

V Action Items

A Library Resolution (Appendix 3 - S2012.4)

- 1 Amendment to S2012.4

Professor Martino moved to adopt the amendment

Professor Cummins provided the second

During discussion

Professor Martino explained that concern of setting a precedent for other requests for Senate support of programs is why a specific dollar amount was removed from the resolution.

Professor Sproat stated that the Library is friendly to the amendment.

Typographical errors are rectified in the newly added resolve to read:

Resolved, that the Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate reaffirm to Santiago Canyon College President the importance of re-establishing consistent Library funding to maintain a collection of current and new publications.

The amendment is passed without dissent

2 Resolution S2012.4

Professor Sproat moved to approve the resolution

Professor Granitto provided the second

During discussion

Professor Scott stated that he was concerned that it would start a slippery slope of requests for Senate support of programs.

Professor Nance responded that even if the flood gates are opened, the Senate can grant or deny those requests as they come in.

Professor Evett responded that the Library serves all programs so it is not necessarily for any one specific program.

Professor Granitto responded that the precedent was set when the Honors Program was affirmed by the Senate.

Professor Martino asked if the Senate wanted to continue to hear such requests and take on this role.

Professor Rutan stated that this is the role of the Senate; the Senate is representative of the Faculty and should direct resources as the Faculty deems fit.

Professor Sproat stated that the Library serves the entire Faculty and all programs.

The perfected resolution passes without dissent.

VI Discussion Items

A Senate Elections Corinna Evett

- 1 The ballot for the Executive Officers was sent out last night
- 2 Discipline Groupings must determine 2012-13 representatives by March 12, 2012.

B SLO/Assessment

- 1 Moved to the beginning of the meeting.

C Orange County Teacher of the Year

- 1 President Barembaum announced that the OC Teacher of the Year committee will no longer accept an applicant from each community college; instead, they will accept only one per district.
- 2 It was decided amongst the Senate Presidents that next year's nomination will be from SAC.
- 3 In light of many requests and new information, President Barembaum will request that SAC reconsider forwarding Dr. Ball for the award next year.
- 4 Professor DeCarbo reported that the Faculty Recognition committee has many suggestions to consider regarding future action and will report back to the Senate.

D Safety Drill Debrief

- 1 Professor Nance requested an "all clear" bell.
- 2 Professor Sproat asked if other Faculty had difficulty getting students to comply.
- 3 Professor Martino asked about the process and order of exiting the Science Center hallways.

E SCC's Direction in these Budget Times

- 1 President Barembaum said that there is an all-Chairs meeting on March 14 and they will need to discuss where future monies will be cut; he cautions that that it can no longer be across the board cuts; that there must be a more decisive strategy.
- 2 Professor Evett applauded the Faculty for attending budgetary meetings and asked that they speak up more at these meetings.
- 3 Professor Nance reported that in the past, Faculty have complained that they have not had a say in the budget and that now is the opportunity.
- 4 Professor DeCarbo reminded the Senate about the recently passed Faculty Vision and how it should influence the decisions made at this meeting.

VIII Reports Discussion

A Curriculum

- 1 February 10, 2012, the District Curriculum committee met regarding the computer skills proficiency requirement and decided to remove the requirement.
- 2 The first draft of the College catalog will arrive next week; all Faculty are asked to review their respective program areas.
- 3 March 19, 2012, the District Curriculum Instruction Council will meet to discuss possible changes to the shared curriculum policy.

B SLOARC

- 1 No report given

C SAC Senate Report

- 1 No report given

D Technology – Professor Scott

- 1 Professor Nance said that there needs to be a backup plan if/when the H drive goes down.
- 2 Professor Evett said that yes, there needs to be a backup plan, but also warns the Faculty to regularly backup files on their own.

E Facilities – Craig Nance

- 1 No report given.

F College Council – President Barembaum

- 1 No report given.

G President's Report – President Barembaum

- 1 64% of the FARSCCD members voted and 94% rejected the District's offer.

Professor Martino moved to adjourn

Professor Deeley seconded the motion to adjourn

The meeting is adjourned without dissent.

**Santiago Canyon College
Self-Assessment
ACCJC Rubric – Student Learning Outcomes**

ACCJC – Development Standard

The college has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.

This standard has been met. The college has utilized the Curriculum and Instruction Council (CIC) as well as the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Review Committee (SLOARC) to develop student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. To date, 100% of courses have the required minimum of two Student Learning Outcomes. By fall 2012, 100% of programs are expected to have the required minimum of at least one program SLO. Currently there are 170 degree and certificate programs listed in the college catalog. Of these programs, 92% have the required one program SLO. The college has established and adopted 12 institutional learning outcomes.

The college has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.

This standard has been met. The college has provided faculty with training regarding authentic assessment strategies for course, program, and institutional learning outcomes. Additionally, the college adopted a Statement of Assessment Practice for Instructional Programs which specifies that direct assessment methods will be used at the course level and for highly structured programs and degrees and that indirect assessment methods will be used to assess more flexible, menu style programs and institutional level outcomes.

Existing organizational structures (e.g. Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.

This standard has been met. Student learning outcomes definition and assessment are supported through faculty senate committees – SLOARC and CIC. SLOARC is the body that first considers issues of definition and practice as they relate to outcomes assessment for instruction. A member of SLOARC regularly participates in the CIC meetings and reports progress on outcomes definition and assessment to

the CIC. The Chair of the CIC reports to the Senate progress and other issues for faculty consideration as they relate to outcomes assessment.

Leadership groups (e.g. Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.

This standard has been met. The establishment of the SLOARC as a subcommittee of CIC is indicative of the acceptance of responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.

Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.

This standard has been met. Currently, the resources available to support outcomes and assessment are funded through a Title V HSI grant. These resources consist of an Assistant Dean, a Research Specialist, and a Faculty Facilitator. In addition, the federal funds will provide for the acquisition of an assessment management system as well as other hardware and software tools to facilitate direct and indirect assessment at the course, program, and institutional level. Additionally, other district resources, such as faculty and other administrators, have been assigned to participate on the SLOARC and in the CIC.

Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.

This standard has been met. 100% of all courses at SCC have established student learning outcomes, 73% have assessments of record, and 41% have completed at least one cycle of assessment. In terms of instructional program assessment, 92% of all degree and certificate programs have at least one PSLO specified, 21% have an assessment of record for the PSLO, and 12% of degree and certificate programs have completed at least one cycle of assessment.

Additionally, the Student Services area reports that 100% of all programs have developed SLOs and have reported on outcomes data in their last program review cycle. Administrative services units are working toward developing outcomes and a program review template.

ACCJC – Proficiency Standard

Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs, and degrees.

This standard is partially met and work is ongoing. SLOs are in place for all courses and the college is working toward getting them in place for all degree and certificate programs. 100% of all courses at SCC have established student learning outcomes, 73% have assessments of record, and 41% have completed at least one cycle of assessment. In terms of instructional program assessment, 92% of all degree and certificate programs have at least one PSLO specified, 21% have an assessment of record for the PSLO, and 12% of degree and certificate programs have completed at least one cycle of assessment. The college is also working toward establishing an assessment for institutional level outcomes.

All Student Services programs have identified outcomes and have conducted assessments. As well, the administrative services units are also working toward identifying outcomes and methods of assessment.

Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices.

This standard is partially met and work is ongoing. Results of assessment are reported through the program review process to the Educational Master Planning Committee and are also reported under separate cover to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment. Throughout the year, results from the program reviews are presented to College Council. Currently, results from course and program level assessment are recorded in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment. Acquisition and implementation of the assessment management system is expected to facilitate the mapping of course level outcomes results to program level and institutional level and improve the college's ability to report results of assessment and meet this standard.

There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results.

This standard is partially met and work is ongoing. Currently, there is dialogue about assessment results in the following venues: individual department meetings, a standing agenda item at the Dean's meetings, the program review process which is connected to the Educational Master Planning Committee, and a standing item related to accreditation at the College Council. The Educational Master Planning Committee and the College Council serve as the main planning bodies for the institution. The Statement on Standards of Assessment Practice for Instructional Programs specifies that all departments dialogue about assessment results at least

once annually and report the results of their discussions with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment. The acquisition and implementation of the assessment management system will enable the college to develop comprehensive, institutional reports related to outcomes assessment results and engage in dialogue about these results at the institutional level.

Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward improving student learning.

This standard is partially met and work is ongoing. Currently, decision-making that includes dialogue related to the results of assessment occurs within specific program areas, such as Basic Skills and Title V STEM, and at the program level through the program review process. Adjustments are made to service delivery, pedagogical practices, and in the case of categorical programs, resources, based upon reports of assessment results. It is anticipated that the acquisition and implementation of the assessment management system will enable the college to develop comprehensive, institutional reports of outcomes assessment results and engage in dialogue and decision-making at the institutional level.

Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine tuned.

This standard has been met through the acquisition of federal funds to support the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment; however, it is anticipated that additional IT resources to support the implementation and maintenance of the assessment management system will be needed.

Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis.

This standard has been partially met and work is ongoing. Currently, the college uses a five-column report format to report assessment results at the course and program level. These reports are paper-based and stored in a notebook in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment. It is anticipated that acquisition and implementation of the assessment management system will facilitate the mapping of course, program, and institutional level results thus furthering the development of comprehensive assessment reports. The college has selected an assessment management system and is in the process of purchasing the system. The timeline for completing the successful implementation of the system is anticipated to be end of Fall 2012.

Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.

This standard is partially met and work is ongoing. All course SLOs have been mapped to the institutional SLOs in the Curricunet system. Formal documentation of course level SLOs with program SLOs and program SLOs to degree SLOs is in progress. It is anticipated that all course to program and program to institutional level learning outcomes will be completed by the end of fall 2012 and coincide with the implementation of the assessment management system.

ACCJC -- Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement Standard

Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement.

This standard has been partially met and work is ongoing. Outcomes assessment at the course and program level has been made systematic through the adoption of a standard assessment calendar (adopted on Nov. 1, 2011). Outcomes assessment is tied to the program review process and every program reports the results of their outcomes assessment through program review. These results are then reported to College Council. The college needs to be able to demonstrate evidence of ongoing cycles of assessment for all courses and programs. Part of the challenge in meeting this standard has been the paper-based documentation process. It is anticipated that a fully implemented assessment management system will make the process more transparent and visible to campus community and thus facilitate “closing the loop” with assessment results.

Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive, and robust.

This standard is nearly met. The adoption of the Statement on Standards of Practice for Assessment of Instructional Programs (adopted Fall 2011) specifies that dialogue about assessment results occurs at least once per year and that the dialogue is formally documented with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment. The document also formally codifies the assessment calendar and cycles of assessment. The assessment calendar and cycle of assessment ensure ongoing, pervasive, and robust dialogue within departments and programs. Additionally, dialogue about student learning and assessment results occurs through the program review process. The college needs to be able to demonstrate evidence of ongoing cycles of assessment for all courses and programs. Part of the challenge in meeting this standard has been the paper-based documentation process. It is anticipated that a fully implemented assessment management system will make the process more transparent and visible to campus community and thus facilitate more dialogue and “closing the loop” with assessment results.

Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.

Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.

Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.

This standard is nearly met. All units undergo program review every three years. Outcomes assessment is a part of all program review templates in Instruction, Student Services, and Administration. Each unit is expected to report on assessment of all outcomes during their program review cycle. Once the template for Administration is completed and adopted, this standard will be met. It is anticipated that this will occur by the end of Spring 2012.

Santiago Canyon College

Statement on Standards of Assessment Practice for Instructional Programs

In order to meet the mandate of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges ACCJC standard for proficiency in outcomes assessment by fall 2012 as well as to prepare for the acquisition and implementation of an assessment management system, the college has developed the following statement on standards of assessment practice as it relates to instructional programs.

Assessment of instruction at Santiago Canyon College meets each of the following criteria:

- 1) identification of at least two student learning outcomes for each course and one for each program on file,
- 2) use of direct and indirect assessment methods,
- 3) current and specific assessments of record for course and program level SLOs on file,
- 4) a regular, explicitly stated cycle of assessment for all courses and programs on file,
- 5) reports of assessment results and action plans on file.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment serves as the central repository for receiving assessment information. Assessments of record, cycles of assessment, and reports of assessment results for all courses and programs should be filed with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment.

The five criteria stated above represent the threshold for assessment practice in instruction for the institution. They enable the institution to describe a common core of learning to external stakeholders and agencies. The college invites and encourages faculty to engage in outcomes assessment practices that go beyond the threshold established by the criteria.

Each of the criteria is elaborated further below.

Number of Course and Program Learning Outcomes

As previously agreed upon by the Curriculum and Instruction Council, each course is to specify a minimum of two student learning outcomes. Each program must establish at least one program outcome. Faculty are strongly encouraged to work collaboratively to develop a set of student learning outcomes that best reflect the broad or overarching goals of their courses and programs. At SCC, student learning outcomes at the course level are stored on the Course Outline of Record in

CurricUNET; as such, they are widely available to the public. It is important that faculty regularly review their student learning outcomes to ensure that they are in alignment with the stated course purposes and instructional content, activities, and assignments that are described on the Course Outline of Record.

Use of Direct and Indirect Assessment

The primary purpose of assessment at Santiago Canyon College is to understand and improve the teaching and learning process. To accomplish this, Santiago Canyon College strongly encourages *direct assessment* of student learning outcomes at the course level. Direct assessment of learning should be embedded in course activities and assignments. Direct assessment is aligned with the stated course purposes and objectives and connected to graded student assignments. Further, direct assessment uses summative measures to describe the achievement of learning outcomes rather than student self-assessments or perceptions of learning in the course. Direct assessment methods are preferred at the course level because they provide *evidence* or confirmation that learning has occurred as a result of the course rather than an *indication* that learning has occurred. Some examples of direct assessments include evaluations of: exams, quizzes, papers, reports, presentations, performances, and projects.

Direct assessment is also strongly encouraged for highly structured programs, those that involve a common core of coursework or a prescribed sequence of courses. For highly structured programs, direct assessment is best accomplished through graded assignments developed for capstone courses that reflect the cumulative knowledge a student would acquire as a result of taking a common core of coursework or course sequence.

In contrast to direct assessment, which provides evidence of student learning, *indirect assessment* provides an indication or suggestion that learning has occurred. Because indirect assessment is not considered evidentiary, its use is reserved for programs which are more flexibly structured. Programs which lack a common core of coursework or a prescribed sequence of courses. These loosely structured programs are often characterized by a menu style approach, which allows students to select particular courses from within specific content areas to meet the requirements of the program. For example, the Liberal Arts degrees in Arts, Humanities, and Communication, Math and Science, Multi-Cultural Studies, and Social and Behavioral Sciences are loosely structured programs as described above. As such, these programs are more individualized, and direct assessment of learning is not easily accomplished. Additionally, indirect assessment is reserved for assessment of institutional level student learning outcomes. An example of an indirect assessment method is a survey measuring student perceptions of learning in specific content areas.

Faculty are strongly encouraged to use direct assessment methods whenever possible to describe the achievement of stated learning outcomes as well as any other assessment methods they deem necessary to explain assessment results. Effective use of direct and indirect assessment methods ensures that the college will be prepared to provide consistent and uniform evidence to the ACCJC that reflects a more complete view of student learning and meets the proficiency requirements.

Assessments of Record

Assessments of record for courses and programs identify in very specific ways both the type of assessment to be used and the evaluation criteria that will be used to determine the degree to which stated outcomes are achieved. Faculty are encouraged to work collaboratively within their disciplines and departments to develop common forms of assessment and uniform evaluation criteria which reflect the collective knowledge of the faculty in the discipline, foster department consensus over individual preferences, and ensure continuity and consistency in expectations for students and the evaluation of student work samples. In developing assessment instruments and evaluation criteria, faculty should strive to balance individual teaching styles with the need to develop consistent results that can be meaningfully interpreted across sections of the same course.

For example, a common type of assessment might consist of a final exam with a set of shared, embedded questions measuring a single student learning outcome or set of outcomes. Using this type of assessment, faculty could implement the assessment instrument across sections of a course. Uniform evaluation criteria using this type of assessment would include identifying the common test items for the exam, mapping test items to course or program SLOs, and specifying the number or percent correct that is needed to meet the stated learning outcome.

Similarly, faculty could implement a term paper on a specific topic as a common type of assessment. With a term paper, the parameters of the assignment could be specified with some degree of flexibility; however the evaluation criteria would need to be uniform and correspond to domains of learning associated with the SLOs and the achievement levels associated with the stated learning outcomes for the course. This can be accomplished by developing and implementing a common or standardized rubric. Common or standardized rubrics should be normed by the faculty and specify domains of learning and the levels of achievement for each of the domains.

Common forms of assessment and uniform evaluation make learning expectations and standards of performance explicit for students and enable the institution to validly and reliably describe core achievements within and across specific areas of student learning.

Cycle of Assessment

The institution expects faculty to assess achievement of student learning outcomes using a regular cycle of assessment that is connected to the program review schedule. This schedule specifies that all programs are reviewed once every three years. In keeping with this schedule, the institution expects that the achievement of *all* course and program level student learning outcomes will be evaluated holistically, using longitudinal data when possible, at least once within a three year cycle. For example, during the program review process, programs and disciplines should discuss the degree to which all course and program outcomes were achieved rather than specific outcomes for a particular course at one point in time.

Further, in an effort to ensure that each discipline and department continues to make progress in achieving the standard of sustainable, continuous quality improvement as well as engages in a robust dialogue related to the achievement of student learning outcomes, the college uses a standard calendar for course level outcomes assessment. This calendar specifies the assessment schedule as follows:

- course outcomes associated with courses offered in both fall and spring terms are assessed in the fall with results reported during the spring term;
- and course outcomes associated with courses offered once or less than once annually should be assessed during the term in which they are offered with results reported in the subsequent term.

Assessment and dialog about student learning should occur at least once annually for courses offered in fall or spring terms and as often as is possible for those courses offered less than annually. Disciplines and departments may choose to evaluate all course outcomes for a course within a given term or they can choose to evaluate specific outcomes for a course within a given term. For example, if a course has three outcomes, and is offered in fall and spring terms annually, the department might choose to assess all three outcomes at once or assess one outcome each fall for three successive years. However, if the department chooses to assess all course outcomes in one term, assessment for that course would need to be conducted each fall to meet the requirement that course outcomes be assessed and dialog about student learning occurred at least annually. Each course and program outcome should be evaluated at least once within the three-year cycle and each department or discipline should follow the standard assessment schedule when assessing and submitting their results.

Using the three-year cycle of holistic assessment in conjunction with the standard calendar for course level outcomes assessment creates a systematic cycle of

assessment that is connected to larger college planning and resource allocation processes and helps to develop widespread dialog about student learning across course and program offerings. Frequent assessment and dialog about student learning are necessary to foster deep learning and demonstrate proficiency with the ACCJC standards for outcomes assessment. Appendix A contains a sample Assessment Cycle report.

Results

Assessment results are used by faculty to understand and improve the teaching and learning process. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment serves as the central repository for receiving assessment reports. Faculty should file reports of assessment results for all courses and programs with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment. Reports should use the five-column format and identify the degree to which stated outcomes have been achieved as well as any plans for improvement or change (see Appendix B). Rather than submitting multiple reports for different sections of the same course, annual reports of course outcomes should be aggregated by course prior to submission.

Appendix A

Assessment Cycle

All SLOs should be assessed at least once within a three-year cycle. A complete assessment cycle includes: gathering assessment data, analyzing assessment data, sharing results within the department or discipline, and reporting results. In the matrix below, indicate the term in which each of your course SLOs will be assessed (inclusive of the entire assessment cycle).

SLO	Data Gathered	Data Analyzed	Data Shared Improvement Dialogue	Results Reported	Changes Implemented
Sample: SLO 1 (analyze statistical data)	Fall 2011 – by November 1	Late fall 2011 – before end of term	Flex – mid-January	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
SLO 1					
SLO 2					
SLO 3					
SLO 4					

Appendix B

COURSE SLO ASSESSMENT REPORT, SCC

Department: _____ Course: _____

Year: _____ Semester: _____

Faculty Member: _____

1) Outcome to be assessed	2) Means of assessment and criteria of success	3) Summary of data collected	4) Analysis of data	5) Plan of action/what to do next

--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 3 - S2012.4

Amendment to Resolution S2012.4
Resolution in Support of Library Collections
Moved: Danielle Martino
Seconded:

Amend the Third Whereas:

Whereas SCC ~~the~~ line item for library books with monies allocated from ~~the~~ discretionary budget ~~in~~ the past seven years has either not been funded, ~~insufficiently~~ funded, or ~~inconstantly~~ supplemented with lottery funds;

Strike Second Resolve:

▼

Add a New Second Resolve:

Resolved, that the Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate reaffirm the importance of the Library to maintain current and new publications to support curriculum as described in the Library's Collection Management Policy.

Add a New Third Resolve:

Resolved, that the Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate reaffirm to BAPR (? Or College Council?) the importance of re-establishing Library funding to maintain a collection of current and new publications.

Original resolution:

Resolution S2012.4
Resolution in Support of Library Collections

Moved: Barbara Sproat
Seconded:

Whereas the mission of the Santiago Canyon College Library is to support the learning community of the college and to make available a variety of information resources in recognition that the Library exists to further the research and scholarly needs of the college community

Whereas the Library is dedicated to acquiring books to support the curriculum of the College and analysis of the Library's book collection and budget parameters indicates that funding levels are not sufficient for the acquisition of current and topical books to meet the curriculum needs of our students

Whereas SCC has a line item budget for library books with monies allocated from SCC's discretionary budget, but the line item during the past seven years has either not been funded, or insufficiently funded, or supplemented with lottery funds applied on an inconsistent basis

Resolved that the Santiago Canyon Academic Senate share with the Budget Committee budget and collection data prepared by SCC Library Faculty

Resolved that the Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate requests that the Budget Committee minimally funds the library book budget at the previously established baseline of \$30,000 per annum in order to insure the availability of a viable, pertinent collection of books as described in the Library's Collection Management Policy in support of the College's curriculum

martino_danielle 2/28/12 5:42 PM
Deleted: has a

martino_danielle 2/28/12 5:43 PM
Deleted: budget

martino_danielle 2/28/12 5:43 PM
Deleted: SCC's

martino_danielle 2/28/12 5:43 PM
Deleted: , but the line item during

martino_danielle 2/28/12 5:43 PM
Deleted: or

martino_danielle 2/28/12 5:44 PM
Deleted: applied on an inconsistent basis

martino_danielle 2/28/12 5:46 PM
Deleted: Resolved that the Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate requests that the Budget Committee minimally funds the library book budget at the previously established baseline of \$30,000 per annum in order to insure the availability of a viable, pertinent collection of books as described in the Library's Collection Management Policy in support of the College's curriculum

Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate

8045 East Chapman
Orange, CA 92869

(714) 628-4831
FAX (714) 532-2055

SENATORS

Business and Career Education

Deeley, Steve, 2012
Salcido, Andrew, 2013

Continuing Education (OEC)

Shields, Jolene, 2013

Counseling & Student Services

Aguilera, Lenor 2013
Mettler, Mary 2012

Humanities and Social Sciences

Deaver, Doug, 2012
Elchlepp, Elizabeth, 2013
Granitto, James, 2013
Isbell, James, 2013
Shekarabi, Nooshan, 2012

Fine & Performing Arts and Communication

Womack, Melinda, 2013

Library

Sproat, Barbara, 2012

Mathematics and Sciences

Cummins, Shawn, 2013
Hovanitz, Eric, 2012
Martino, Danny, 2013
Nance, Craig 2012
Scott, Randy, 2013

Adjunct

Matthews, Evangline, 2012

OFFICERS

President

Barembaum, Morrie, 2012

Vice President

Evet, Corinna, 2012

Secretary/Treasurer

DeCarbo, Michael, 2012

Curriculum

Rutan, Craig - Chair

Resolution S2012.4

Resolution in Support of Library Collections

Moved: Barbara Sproat
Seconded: Craig Nance

Whereas the mission of the Santiago Canyon College Library is to support the learning community of the college and to make available a variety of information resources in recognition that the Library exists to further the research and scholarly needs of the college community;

Whereas the Library is dedicated to acquiring books to support the curriculum of the College and analysis of the Library's book collection and budget parameters indicates that funding levels are not sufficient for the acquisition of current and topical books to meet the curriculum needs of our students;

Whereas SCC has a line item budget for library books with monies allocated from SCC's discretionary budget, but the line item during the past seven years has either not been funded, or insufficiently funded, or supplemented with lottery funds applied on an inconsistent basis;

Resolved that the Santiago Canyon Academic Senate share with the Budget Committee budget and collection data prepared by SCC Library Faculty; and,

Resolved that the Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate requests that Santiago Canyon College minimally funds the library book budget at the previously established baseline of \$30,000 per annum in order to insure the availability of a viable, pertinent collection of books as described in the Library's Collection Management Policy in support of the College's curriculum

Date Presented:

Date Approved:

Santiago Canyon College is an innovative learning community dedicated to intellectual and personal growth. Our purpose is to foster student success and to help students achieve these core outcomes: to learn, act, communicate and think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing an accessible, a transferable, and an engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 4/12/2011)