



Business Meeting Minutes

April 13, 2010

(12:30-1:30 in the Room 838)

Members Present: Jessica Amato, David Angelovich, Amanda Badgett, Steven Balassi, Glen Bell, Kate Benscoter, Stephanie Burns, Shawna Bynum, Dan Clemens, Michael Conroy, Emily Cosby, Tom Dana, John Dotta, Sheryl Fernandez, Michael Gianvecchio, Stephanie Grohs, Ann Gross, Julie Hall, Betty Hopperstad, Karen Larsen, John Liscano, Sherry Lohse, Tia Madison, Robert Millay, Rob Miller, Lynda Monger, Bonnie Moore, Forest Quinlan, Ron Rhyno, Denise Rosselli, Debra Saunders, Rebecca Scott, Erik Shearer, Jerry Somerville, Diane Van Deusen, Maria Villagomez, Jeff Wachsmuth, Nadine Wade-Gravett, Eve-Anne Wilkes, and Lisa Yanover.

Guests Present: Sue Nelson, Edward Beanes, Alex Shantz, and Mario Fernandez.

1. Welcome

2. Adoption of Agenda –msp

-There was some discussion about the length of the agenda and the need to have time to carefully consider the agenda items.

3. Approval of Minutes from 3-09-10 -msp

4. Public Comment

-Alex Shantz, a representative from ASNVC presented a position paper supporting courses that serve and support the diverse student population at NVC.

-Voting is now taking place for Union Officers. Please vote with faculty secretary.

-Textbook committee is reminding faculty to put a copy of the text they are using on reserve in the library.

-Faculty need to be advised that faculty web pages will be changed to the Share Point format on June 30, 2010. Contact the TLC for training dates.

5. Action Items

- 5.1 Curriculum Packet – msp, 2 opposition
-Amended to include the AS Degree change for Natural Science to Associate Science.
- 5.2 Emeritus Status
-Carole Chassereau, Lauren Coodley, Agapito de la Garza, Judith Heys, Jan Molen, Helen Ortega, Ron Rhyno, Niles Severy, Linda Simpson, Jerry Somerville, William Weddington.
-msp
- 5.3 AS Degree Definition – msp, 1 opposition
-New language shall be: Napa Valley College defines the Associate of Science Degree as an associate degree in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) or in the area of career technical education (CTE).

-Discussion about the possible ramifications includes course requirements for degree and degree transfer. For example, the AS Degree currently does not require Political Science.
- 5.4 Bylaws Revision (2nd Reading) – msp, 1 opposition, 2 abstention
-The following changes have been proposed:
a) Committee terms are changed from 2 to 3 years (with a 6 year maximum)
b) Standing Committee size changed to allow for flexibility
c) Non-tenured chairs need approval by the Executive Committee
d) Basic skills is a new committee

-The item was msp to amend section C to say “Non-tenured Chairs require the consent of the Executive Committee”.
- 5.5 Curriculum Process Change
-Discussion focused on the issues as identified by the Ad-hoc Committee: Simplify the process, streamline the process, and allow for early intervention for review by Division Dean and Division Chair prior to coming to Curriculum Committee.

-It has been proposed that check off sheets be developed.

-The Ad-hoc Committee was also questioned regarding best practices as identified by state Academic Senate. If the new process is adopted how do issues like library support and financial feasibility get examined? Note: Librarian is permanently represented on committee.

-The motion was amended to add the change to the general education list for substantive review.

-msp

-Process change with amendment was msp, 1 opposition, 3 abstentions

5.6 Curriculum Bylaws Change (1st Reading)

-Item proposes a change in voting membership. Senate voting members shall include faculty chair, articulation officer (if faculty), one faculty from each of the 9 instructional areas: Arts and Humanities, CTE/Business, Counseling, Health Occupations, Language and Developmental Studies, Librarian, Physical Education and Athletics, Science, Math and Engineering, and Social Sciences. All other roles will be non-voting.

-Discussion also focused on the requirement of Dean's to attend the Curriculum Committee if they do not vote or have any division curriculum to report. It has also been proposed to remove all Division Chairs from voting members, as it was discussed that they perform administrative duties on the committee.

-An amendment was proposed to remove Division Deans from the Curriculum Committee. The motion failed.

-As proposed the motion was msp, 3 opposition, 2 abstention

-This is a first reading and will be discussed again at the next meeting.

6. Discussion Items

6.1 Ethics Policy

-The new language is proposed because the previous policy was unenforceable as it required faculty to discipline faculty. Looking at existing best practices, the committee developed a policy that places faculty in more of a collegial manner. All serious infractions would be managed as an administrative review.

10. Adjournment 1:30 pm

Information Items and Reports to be submitted via email.

7. Information Items

7.1 Enrollment Management Team

- proposing to limit summer school students to 7 units. It will be

proposed to have no late registration. After 1st day, students may only be enrolled with a faculty signed add card.

- 7.2 Disruptive Students Handout
 - The office of Student Services is working with the Student Standards and Practice Committee to modify this handout so that instructors are given clear instruction to contact college police or 911 when they feel threatened or in danger.
- 7.3 Power Awards Nominations Open
 - Awards for excellence in the Student Learning Outcomes areas. Shawna sent out an email earlier this month. Nominations are due May 31st. Email Shawna if you would like more information.
- 7.4 Senate Assignment Requests: Submit by April 18th
 - Requests for Senate assignments for next academic year need to be emailed to Shawna by Sunday April 18th.
- 7.5 Classified Appreciation Week: May 3rd – 7th
 - There will be a lunch on Friday May 7th. Please contact the Social Committee if you can help that day with set up or clean up.

8. Reports

- 8.1 Officers Reports
 - 8.1.1 President – Shawna Bynum
 - I'll be at the State Senate Spring Plenary this week. Thank you to all of you who participated in the discussions around resolutions. I'll let you know how it goes.
 - 8.1.2 1st Vice Pres. – Erik Shearer – no report
 - 8.1.3 2nd Vice Pres. /FCC Report– Rebecca Scott
 - Contract and tenured faculty are in the final months of the evaluation process. Tenured faculty being evaluated next year have been notified that they have until April 15 to select a coach to evaluate them. After this date, coaches will be assigned.

 - FCC: The upcoming FCC meeting is on 4/20. FCC members will be making evaluation recommendations at this meeting. Final recommendations will be presented to the Academic Senate at the May meeting.
 - 8.1.4 Secretary – Nadine Wade-Gravett – no report.

- 8.1.5 Treasurer – Julie Hall
 - The Academic Senate Dues Fund has a current balance of \$1885.04. That includes a deposit of \$186.50 that I'll make today.

8.2 Standing Committee Chair Reports

- 8.2.1 Academic Standards & Practices– Stephanie Grohs – no report.
- 8.2.2 Curriculum – Steven Balassi
 - S.Balassi is working with Office of Instruction on the catalog.

 - The GE subcommittee is done. The next meeting is May 7th; committee will approve their work as the CC. It should be ready for the AS/BOT's votes next month. The plan is to get it into the catalog.
- 8.2.3 Faculty Standards & Practices – Ann Gross – no report.
- 8.2.4 Learning Outcomes Assessment – Erik Shearer – no report.
- 8.2.5 Professional Development – Rebecca Scott
 - The PDC has finalized Flex Day plans and forwarded to the Office of Instruction. In the fall, Flex Day will be in a "conference style" format where participants will choose from a menu of workshop topics.
- 8.2.6 Social Committee – Susan Engle
 - End of the year /Retirement party – save the date May 14 Barbeque at Dave's house.
- 8.2.7 Student Standards & Practices – Rob Miller
 - The committee is recommending changes to the "How to Deal with Difficult or Disruptive Students." We'll bring a copy to you once completed. We've been talking about the no-smoking policy and have elected our chair for next year (Rob Miller).

8.3 Shared Governance Reports

- 8.3.1 Budget – Walter Unti – no report.
- 8.3.2 Planning – Stephanie Burns --no report

9. Next Meeting Items

- 9.1 Next Meeting Date: May 11, 2010
- 9.2 Next Meeting Topics
 - Curriculum Bylaws Change

Respectfully submitted by Nadine Wade-Gravett

Curriculum Packet

Spring 2010

Statement of Philosophy of General Education at Napa Valley College

General Education, an integrated program of courses, is the foundation of the Associates Degree. General Education courses introduce students to the achievements, the methods of inquiry and the major principles and concepts in the humanities, the social sciences, mathematics, and the natural sciences. Graduates possess in common a foundation of knowledge for understanding their physical environment, culture and society and the skills of inquiry, reflection, and expression for personal growth and lifelong learning.

Approved by the Academic Senate March 2010

General Education Outcomes

Upon successful completion of the program of courses, offered at the freshman and sophomore level, that comprise General Education at Napa Valley College, students will have attained the following outcomes designed to enable them to:

Develop the ability to think critically and analytically by understanding the relationship between language and logic

Effectively use written, spoken, mathematical and other symbolic forms of communication

Apply the scientific method in examining the physical universe, its life forms, and natural phenomena

Develop awareness of the methods of inquiry used in the social and behavioral sciences to critically examine people as members of society and how they act in response to their society

Critically examine cultural activities and artistic expression throughout the ages and across cultures with aesthetic understanding. Develop awareness of religious and philosophical thought in the expression of human beings

Demonstrate intercultural competence through the analysis of the contributions and perspectives of underrepresented cultural and gender/affection* groups in contemporary American cultural life

Apply knowledge, values, and skills which lead to lifelong health and wellness

Demonstrate knowledge of American history and the development of common American political institutions and to assess the value of civic responsibility and engagement

**sexual orientation*

Approved by the Academic Senate December 2009

NVC GE Descriptions

A. Natural Science

Courses in the natural sciences are those that examine the physical universe, its life forms, and its natural phenomena. To satisfy the general education requirement in natural sciences, a course will be designed to help the student develop an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method. These courses will also impart to the student an understanding of the relationships between science and the world around them. This category will include introductory or integrative courses in astronomy, biology, chemistry, general physical science, geology, meteorology, oceanography, physical geography, physical anthropology, physics and other scientific disciplines.

B. Social and Behavioral

Courses in the social and behavioral sciences are those that focus on people as members of society. To satisfy the general education requirement in social and behavioral sciences, a course will be designed to develop an awareness of the methods of inquiry used by the social and behavioral sciences. It will be designed to stimulate critical thinking about the ways people act in response to their societies and should promote an appreciation of how societies and social subgroups operate. This category will include introductory or integrative courses in cultural anthropology, cultural geography, economics, history, political science, psychology, sociology and related disciplines.

C: Humanities:

Courses in the humanities are those that study the cultural activities and artistic expressions of human beings. To satisfy the general education requirement in the humanities, a course will be designed to help the student develop an awareness of the ways in which people throughout the ages and in different cultures have responded to themselves and the world around them with artistic and cultural creation. These courses will help the student develop aesthetic understanding and an ability to make value judgments. This category will include introductory or integrative courses in the arts, foreign languages, literature, philosophy, religion, and related disciplines.

D: Language and Rationality

Courses in language and rationality are those that develop for the student the principles and applications of language, whether it be written, spoken or symbolic. These courses will explore language in all its various stages; from logical thought to a clear and precise expression of that thought, including critical evaluation of the process. Three components of this area will be required.

- (i) **English Composition:** Courses fulfilling the English composition requirement will focus on written language. To satisfy the general education requirement in

English composition, a course will be designed to include substantial instruction and practice in both expository and argumentative writing.

- (ii) **Communication and Analytical thinking:** Courses fulfilling the communication and analytical thinking requirement will focus on spoken or symbolic language. To satisfy the general education requirement in communication and analytical thinking, a course will be designed to help the student achieve an understanding of the relationship between language and logic, leading to the ability to communicate ideas, analyze and solve problems, and identify the assumptions upon which particular conclusions depend. This category will include introductory or integrative courses in oral communication, mathematics, logic, statistics, computer languages and programming, and related disciplines.
- (iii) **Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning:** Courses fulfilling the mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning requirement will focus on symbolic language. To satisfy the general education requirement in mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning, a course will be designed to help a student successfully process information requiring quantitative analysis, calculation, and the ability to use and criticize quantitative arguments. This category will include courses in mathematics, specifically those which meet or exceed the math competency requirement, including statistics.

E. Multicultural/Gender Studies

Courses in multicultural/gender studies introduce students to multiple cultural and gendered analyses of contemporary social life. To satisfy the general education requirement in multicultural/gender studies, a course shall be designed for the analysis of the contributions and perspectives of underrepresented cultures. Such analysis is to be explicit, not implicit, in the course of study. Courses shall include at least three of the following groups: African American, Chicano/Latino, Asian American, Native American, those defined exclusively by sex, sexual/affection groups, disabilities and those defined by age. A significant portion of the course of study shall offer gendered analysis, with special attention paid to the perspectives and contributions of women. Historical perspectives may be used to provide background and context and/or to reflect contemporary social conditions. This category will include introductory courses in a variety of disciplines that reflect multiple cultural and gendered analyses of contemporary social life.

Approved by the Academic Senate February 2010

AS Degree Definition

Napa Valley College defines the Associate of Science Degree as an associate degree in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) or in the area of career technical education (CTE).

Approved by the Academic Senate April 2010

Approved Course Changes

New Courses

ANTH 120L	HUMA 121
ARTH 180	LEGS 100
BUSI 140	LEGS 110
COUN 199	LEGS 120
COUN 288	LEGS 130
DART 282	MUSI 85
DRAM 156	MUSI 87
DRAM 89	MUSI 89
FILM 105	NURS 247
FILM 106	PHOT 310
FILM 115	PHOT 152
FILM 117	PHOT 153a
FILM 120	PHOT 153b
FILM 121	PHOT 155
HUMA 105	PHOT 180
HUMA 106	PHOT 181
HUMA 115	PHOT 282
HUMA 117	PHOT 290
HUMA 120	PHOT 291

Archived Courses

ART 133a	FREN 260
ART 133b	FREN 261
ART 184	HELH 110
ART 185	HUMA 176
ART 186	HUMA 178
ART 187	HUMA 179
ART 190	HUMA 188
ART 227	ITAL 240
ART 233	MUSI 155
ART 235	MUSI 221

ARTH 150
ARTH 215
ASL 130
BIOL 190
CHEM 298
CISA 100
CISA 134
COMS 134
FILM 102
FILM 103
PHYE 120
PHYE 121
PHYE 126
PHYE 156
PLEG 298
PLEG 300
PLEG 301

MUSI 222
PHOT 160
PHOT 227
PHOT 260
PHOT 301
PHOT 303
PHOT 304
PHYE 102
PHYE 110
PHYE 116
PLEG 302
PLEG 303
PSYC 190
SPAN 102
SPAN 103
THEA 160

Modified Courses

ACCT 127
CFS 270
DDGT 110
DDGT 120
DDGT 121
DDGT 201
DDGT 202
DDGT 203
DDGT 205
DDGT 207
DDGT 208
DDGT 230
DDGT 231
DDGT 240
DDGT 241
DRAM 140
DRAM 220
DRAM 244
ENGL 123
ENGL 125
ENGL 200
ENGL 201
ENGL 202

HUMA 104
MATH 121
MATH 221
NURS 141
NURS 142
NURS 143
NURS 144
NURS 246
NURS 248
NURS 249
NURS 250
PHIL 120
PHIL 121
PHIL 125
PHIL 126
PHIL 133
PHIL 134
PHYE 130
RESP 120
RESP 140
RESP 150
RESP 160
WELD 120

ENGL 220
ENGL 91
FREN 120
FREN 121
FREN 240
FREN 241
GEOG 121
GEOG 130
GEOG 131

WELD 130
WELD 132
WELD 133
WELD 150
WELD 151
WELD 241
WOEX 190
WOEX 191
WOEX 193

Modified Programs

A.S. in Photography
Certificate in Photography
Concentration In Accounting
Digital Asset Management Certificate

New Programs

Entrepreneurial Certificate
Economics Certificate
Machine Tool Technology - 1Year Certificate

AS Degree Definition:

Napa Valley College defines the Associate of Science Degree as an associate degree in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) or in the area of career technical education (CTE).

Bylaws Revision Summary

(Page 6 of 17)

In addition, the Academic Senate shall appoint five faculty members (including at least one EOPS counselor) to work with the EOPS/Financial Aide Department on scholarships. These faculty shall serve a ~~two~~ **three** year term in place of their senate committee work.

Section 1: Academic Senate Standing Committees and Subcommittees (Page 7 of 17)

Academic Senate Committees are established by and internal to the NVC Academic Senate, which holds authority for these committees. Standing committees of the Academic Senate whose only members are members of the Academic Senate are:

1. Executive Committee
 - Nominations & Elections Subcommittee (Convened prior to elections.)
2. Faculty Standards & Practices Committee
3. Professional Development Committee
4. Social Committee

Standing committees of the Academic Senate which have representatives from outside the Senate are:

1. Academic Standards & Practices Committee
2. Curriculum Committee
3. Student Standards & Practices Committee
 - Student Conduct and Complaint/Grievance Subcommittee
4. Scholarship Committee
5. Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee
6. **Basic Skills Initiative Committee**

3 Year Committee Terms

Section 7: Terms on Committees (Page 8 of 17)

The term for serving on a committee shall ordinarily be ~~two~~ **three** years, with the provision that the committee or the division may recommend to the Executive Committee that an incumbent be reappointed. The Senate shall confirm the reappointment. No committee member shall serve for more than two consecutive ~~two~~ **three** year terms unless the Bylaws stipulate that his/her position be represented on that committee, ~~or unless there is a unanimous reappointment by the Executive Committee.~~ The Senate shall confirm each reappointment. Provisions shall be made for staggering the terms at initial implementation of a new committee.

Floating Committee Size

Section 2: Faculty Standards & Practices Committee (Page 11 of 17)

Membership: The committee will consist of ~~5~~ **four to five** Academic Senate members, including the First Vice President.

Section 3: Professional Development Committee (Page 12 of 17)

Membership: The committee will consist of ~~5~~ **four to five** Academic Senate members, including the Second Vice President, and one non-voting member, the TLC Director.

Section 4: Social Committee (Page 12 of 16)

Membership: The committee will consist of ~~5~~ **four to five** Academic Senate members.

Section 5: Academic Standards & Practices Committee (Page 13 of 17)

Membership: The committee will consist of ~~5~~ **four to five** Academic Senate members, including at least one counselor, and one librarian. Non-Senate members are the Vice President of Instruction, one classified representative, and one student appointed by the Associated Student Body.

Section 7: Student Standards & Practices Committee (Page 14 of 17)

Membership: The committee will consist of ~~5~~ **four to five** Academic Senate members, including a counselor. Non-Senate members are: the Vice President of Student Services, the Coordinator of Student Life and one student appointed by the Associated Student Body.

Section 10: Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (Page 15 of 17)

Membership: The committee shall consist of the following Academic Senate representatives: a Faculty Co-Chair, who shall be the Learning Outcomes Coordinator; and **four to six** (~~6~~) additional faculty including one from Counseling. Non-Academic Senate committee members shall include the Director of Institutional Research, who shall be the administrative Co-chair, the Dean of Instruction; one (1) ASB representative; and one (1) Student Services representative.

BSI Committee

SECTION 11: BASIC SKILLS INTIATIVE COMMITTEE (Page 15 of 17)

The Basic Skills Committee shall provide institutional direction to integrate validated effective practices for underprepared students to succeed at college level learning. The committee shall be responsible for developing and assessing a yearly basic skills plan reflecting the state's *Basic Skills Initiative*.

Membership: The committee shall consist of the following Academic Senate representatives: a Faculty Co-Chair, who shall be the Basic Skills Coordinator; and **four to five** additional faculty including one from English, Math, ESL and Counseling. Non-Academic Senate committee members shall include one to three individuals from the following list: Vice

President of Instruction, Dean of Learning Resources, Dean of Occupations one of whom will serve as Co-Chair

The Basic Skills Committee shall:

1. Review all policies and procedures for the *Basic Skills Initiative*
2. Review validated information on effective practices in providing instruction and support services to underprepared students
3. Recommend basic skills activities
4. Provide institutional guidance in implementation of effective practices
5. Develop the yearly basic skills plan
6. Create and implement assessment of basic skills activities
7. Provide budget direction
8. Submit mid-year and yearly *Basic Skills Initiative Budget*
9. Provide feedback to the Academic Senate and campus on basic skills progress

Chairs Must Be Tenured

Section 9: Committee Chairs (Page 9 of 17)

For Academic Senate Standing committees, the chair shall be a Regular ~~or Contract~~ faculty member elected by the committee (unless approved by the Executive Committee). The Curriculum Committee Faculty Chair shall be a Regular faculty member (unless approved by the Executive Committee) elected by the Senate representatives on the committee.

For Shared Governance committees, the Academic Senate Co-Chair shall be a Regular ~~or Contract~~ faculty member (unless approved by the Executive Committee) appointed by the Senate President and Executive Committee and confirmed by the Senate.

For District committees, the Academic Senate Co-Chair shall be a Regular ~~or Contract~~ faculty member (unless approved by the Executive Committee) appointed by the Senate President and Executive Committee and confirmed by the Senate.

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

Findings and Recommendations on Curriculum

Spring 2010

I. Proposed Changes to the Curriculum Proposal Approval Process

All curriculum proposals will follow the process delineated below. Proposals are forwarded through each step at or prior to deadlines established by the Curriculum Committee Co-chairs.

Step 1: Proposal Preparation:

Discipline faculty will follow the instructions in the Curriculum Handbook to develop course and program proposals. The faculty author will work with all discipline faculty, the Division Chair/Dean, the librarian, the DE coordinator, and other faculty as needed to ensure complete, accurate, and well-written proposals. All curriculum proposals will follow the standards and best-practice guidelines set forth in the Curriculum Handbook and will be free of grammatical and spelling errors. Completed, accurate proposals will be entered into WebCMS and submitted for approval.

Step 2: Administrative Review:

The Division Chairs/Deans review the proposal using a check off sheet developed by the CC co-chairs (found in the Curriculum Handbook). Division Chairs/Deans will work with the faculty author to ensure these components are correct prior to submission to the Faculty Chair.

Step 3: CC Faculty Review:

The CC Faculty Chair assigns the proposal to one of the three faculty review teams. Each member of the team reviews the proposal using a check-off sheet developed by the CC Faculty Chair. Changes are recommended to the author and the proposal goes back and forth until approved by the team. If the review team recommends edits to any components requiring administrative review, the appropriate Division Chair / Dean will be included in the discussion between the committee and the faculty author.

Step 4: Articulation Review:

The articulation officer reviews all proposals for articulation-related components and consults with the author regarding any necessary changes.

Step 5: Curriculum Committee Review and Approval:

Once approved through all of the above steps, the CC Faculty and Administrative Chairs place the proposal on the agenda for full committee review.

II. Proposed Revisions to Agenda Placement and Faculty Attendance

Course and program proposals will be placed on the CC agenda in one of three categories. Faculty authors are only required to be present at CC meetings for Full Review agenda items. Faculty authors may designate another discipline faculty member or a Division Chair / Dean to speak on their behalf with advanced notice to the CC Faculty Chair.

A. Full Review (Requires Faculty Author to Attend CC Meeting for Voting and Discussion)

Proposals meeting the following conditions will be reviewed, discussed, and voted on separately by the Curriculum Committee:

- New Course or Program
- Substantive Course or Program Revisions, defined as follows:

- Change to Prerequisites (Form A)(Title 5 mandate)
- Addition of Distance Education course delivery (Form D) (Title 5 mandate)
- Changes to Units, Hours, and/or Course Format
- Course Proposed for Multi Cultural and Gender Studies GE Area (Form E)
- Major changes to the direction, structure, or nature of the course. *This does not include updating the course for six-year review or a revision that updates new or revised fields on the COR. Updating a course is not a substantive change, only a major change of the course's substance falls under this category.*
- Change to degree or certificate units, core requirements, pre-requisites, or graduation requirements.
- Changes to the Associates GE list.

B. Consent Review (Faculty Author not Required to Attend CC Meeting)

Proposals meeting the following conditions will be placed on CC agendas as consent items:

- Course or program revisions that do not meet the above-stated criteria.

C. Information Items (Faculty Author Not Required to Attend)

Proposals meeting the following criteria will be placed on CC agendas as information-only items. Proposals in this category do not require committee vote.

- Technical edits for catalog or schedule publication,
- Edits to ensure consistency between curriculum and enrollment databases.
- Minor articulation edits.
- Approval of 88/298/398 courses by CC Chairs.

III. Proposed Removals from the COR

The following elements on the Course Outline of Record ask for information that is not under CC purview and should be handled through the yearly planning and budget process. Their inclusion on the COR predates the development of our Unit Plan and PEP processes. The CC has no authority to approve or deny resource or budget requests.

- Resources: Library
- Resources: Computer Support
- Resources: Learning Skills and Testing Center
- Facilities
- Equipment
- Expendable supplies

**The Curriculum Handbook and the Division Chair Handbook will be modified to reflect the above changes.*

Section 6: Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee shall evaluate and make recommendations on matters related to the credit and non-credit curriculum. Course and program additions, deletions, or significant changes or program requirements or in course outlines must be acted upon by this committee.

Membership: The committee will consist of the following Academic Senate members: the Faculty Chair, Articulation Officer (if faculty), and one faculty from each of the nine instructional areas: Arts and Humanities, Career Technical/Business, Counseling, Health Occupations, Language and Developmental Studies, Librarians, Physical Education/Athletics, Science Math and Engineering, Social Sciences

Non-Senate Nonvoting members of the committee are: the Vice President of Instruction (Administrative Chair), the Division Deans, the Division Chairs, the Credit Schedule Developer (Classified representative), and one student representative appointed by the Associated Student Body.

The committee should also identify chair-in training. If the chair-in training is recruited from outside the committee than the faculty member would sit on the committee for up to one year.

The Curriculum Committee will have a Faculty Chair and an Administrative Chair. The Faculty Chair shall be elected by the Academic Senate members of the committee. The faculty chair will receive secretarial support from the Office of Instruction.

The Curriculum Committee shall:

1. Develop written procedures for new course and program submission and approval. The Senate is to approve processes and procedures.
2. Act as a resource to the Academic Standards & Practices Committee on issues relating to curriculum, such as changes in graduation or general education requirements.
3. Review and make recommendations on proposed new courses and new programs and on course and program revisions. Recommend additions, deletions, and/or changes in course outlines for new and established courses.
4. Classify courses into appropriate disciplines and indicate which are transferable. The committee will determine if a course is classified as General Education and into which category it should be placed.
5. Review and make recommendations on proposed course deletions and inactive status.
6. Make recommendations concerning course and program changes to the Academic Senate and to the NVC Board of Trustees for approval. Minutes and agendas of all meetings shall be sent to the Academic Senate President and to the Academic Standards & Practices Committee Chair, and shall be posted on the Senate bulletin board.

NVC Faculty Ethics Policy – Final Draft
Faculty Standards and Practices
March 16, 2010

Ethical Guidelines

As academic professionals, the faculty of Napa Valley College endorse the “Statement on Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), which has identified five areas of faculty responsibility, including responsibility to their: 1) disciplines; 2) students; 3) colleagues; 4) institutions; and 5) communities. In addition, the faculty endorses the Board of Directors’ Statement of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) – “Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility,” which clarifies the balance between academic freedom and academic responsibility.

In connection with the principles laid out in the above listed documents, faculty has a primary obligation to take reasonable precautions to respect the confidentiality rights of those with whom they work or consult, i.e., colleagues, staff, students and potential students, recognizing that confidentiality may be established by law, institutional rules, or professional or scientific relationships.

The faculty will adhere to these ethical principles to support the mission and values of the institution.

Process for Addressing Alleged Ethics Violations

Faculty ethics guidelines are designed to promote academic integrity and respectful, collegial communication. Any suspected violations will be addressed following these same principles.

Faculty ethics violation complaints will follow a process that is designed to promote collegial conflict resolution at the lowest level possible. That is, the complainant will meet directly with the faculty member to discuss the perceived violation. At that meeting, the complainant will identify the specific behaviors that were problematic, the ethical standards that the behavior appeared to violate, and the specific changes in behavior that the complainant believes would be more appropriate. To protect both parties, a written record of date and outcome of the meeting should be agreed to and maintained by both individuals.

Because of the power differential that may exist between students, staff and faculty, the complainant may access an ombudsman throughout the process. The ombudsman will be selected from the Academic Senate Faculty Ethics Advisors (FEA). The ombudsman may attend any meetings with the complainant, and his/her role will be to clarify the process and facilitate constructive dialogue between both parties.

In cases in which both parties cannot reach agreement, or when a faculty member repeatedly violates one or more standards of ethical behavior, the complainant may take the issue to the Academic Senate Faculty Ethics Advisors (FEA) for review. The FEA will meet with both the complainant(s) and the faculty member in question to review the specifics listed above and facilitate a resolution. The focus of the meeting will be to help ensure that each person’s perspective is heard, to clarify the college’s expectations for ethical behavior, and to reach agreement on future standards for

behavior. If an agreement cannot be reached, the FEA will refer the issue to the District, for administrative review under the progressive discipline policy.

Serious infractions involving alleged violations of campus policies, professional responsibilities, Ed. Code, etc. will be addressed by the District through the progressive discipline process described in the Faculty Agreement, or through legal channels.

The Academic Senate Faculty Ethics Advisors will consist of three to four faculty members, at least one of whom will be a Counselor. They will be selected from the entire tenured faculty by vote every five years (or as needed to replace members), and will convene only as needed to review specific complaints. Members will be selected based on their demonstrated record of effective and collegial communication skills, intercultural competence, evidence of critical thinking and problem solving abilities, and overall fairness in dealing with others.

Timelines

The complainant has 10 working days from the date of the alleged ethics violation to request a meeting with the faculty member. That meeting must occur within 10 working days of the request to meet.

If the initial meeting does not resolve the issue, either party may contact the FEA to schedule a follow-up meeting with the FEA. That meeting will occur within 10 working days of the request. In the rare circumstance in which not all parties are available to meet during that time period, the FEA may extend the time period to accommodate the needs of the individuals involved.

If the FEA determines that the severity of the alleged ethics violation or a pattern of ethics violations merits a District investigation, they will notify the faculty member, the complainant and the District within five working days of their meeting with the involved parties.

The District will initiate its investigation within 10 working days of the date it was notified of the alleged infraction, and will notify all parties of the outcome of that investigation within 30 working days after initiating the investigation.

Statement on Professional Ethics

The statement that follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by the Association's Committee on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Association's Council in June 1987, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting.

Introduction

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The *Statement on Professional Ethics* that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to ensure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and the Committee on Professional Ethics, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, or the applicable provisions of the Association's *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

The Statement

1. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
 2. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.
 3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas
- AAUP Policy Tenth Ed.2 10/26/06 1:32 PM Page 171
172
- professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
4. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility

**AAC&U Board of Directors' Statement
January 6, 2006**

Also available for [purchase](#) or [download \(pdf\)](#)

Academic freedom and responsibility have long been topics for public concern and debate. Academic freedom to explore significant and controversial questions is an essential precondition to fulfill the academy's mission of educating students and advancing knowledge. Academic responsibility requires professors to submit their knowledge and claims to rigorous and public review by peers who are experts in the subject matter under consideration; to ground their arguments in the best available evidence; and to work together to foster the education of students. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), in concert with the American Association of University Professors, helped establish the principles of academic freedom early in the twentieth century, and recently AAC&U joined with other associations to reaffirm them.*

Today, new challenges to academic freedom have arisen from both the right and the left. On the right, conservative activist David Horowitz, founder of Students for Academic Freedom, has fashioned an "academic bill of rights" that is being considered in several states ostensibly as a means of protecting "conservative" students from alleged indoctrination by the purportedly "liberal" views of faculty. This bill inappropriately invites political oversight of scholarly and educational work. On the left, anti-war protests by students have interrupted speeches by proponents of current national policies. Some protestors have sought to silence—rather than debate—positions with which they do not agree. These challenges prompt AAC&U to revisit the basic principles involved and to discuss the role of academic freedom.

There is, however, an additional dimension of academic freedom that was not well developed in the original principles, and that has to do with the responsibilities of faculty members for educational programs. Faculty are responsible for establishing goals for student learning, for designing and implementing programs of general education and specialized study that intentionally cultivate the intended learning, and for assessing students' achievement. In these matters, faculty must work collaboratively with their colleagues in their departments, schools, and institutions as well as with relevant administrators. Academic freedom is necessary not just so faculty members can conduct their individual research and teach their own courses, but so they can enable students—through whole college programs of study—to acquire the learning they need to contribute to society.

As faculty carry out this mission, it is inevitable that students will encounter ideas, books, and people that challenge their preconceived ideas and beliefs. The resulting tension between the faculty's freedom to teach—individually and collectively—and the students' freedom to form independent judgments opens an additional dimension of academic freedom and educational responsibility that deserves further discussion, both with the public and with students themselves.

The clash of competing ideas is an important catalyst, not only for the expansion of knowledge but also in students' development of independent critical judgment. Recognizing this dynamic, many well-intentioned observers underline the importance of "teaching all sides of the debate"

in college classrooms. Teaching the debates is important but by no means sufficient. It is also essential that faculty help students learn—through their college studies—to engage differences of opinion, evaluate evidence, and form their own grounded judgments about the relative value of competing perspectives. This too is an essential part of higher education’s role both in advancing knowledge and in sustaining a society that is free, diverse, and democratic.

Intellectual Diversity and the Indispensable Role of Liberal Education

In any education of quality, students encounter an abundance of intellectual diversity—new knowledge, different perspectives, competing ideas, and alternative claims of truth. This intellectual diversity is experienced by some students as exciting and challenging, while others are confused and overwhelmed by the complexity. Liberal education, the nation’s signature educational tradition, helps students develop the skills of analysis and critical inquiry with particular emphasis on exploring and evaluating competing claims and different perspectives. With its emphasis on breadth of knowledge and sophisticated habits of mind, liberal education is the best and most powerful way to build students’ capacities to form their own judgments about complex or controversial questions. AAC&U believes that all students need and deserve this kind of education, regardless of their academic major or intended career.

Liberal education involves more than the mind. It also involves developing students’ personal qualities, including a strong sense of responsibility to self and others. Liberally educated students are curious about new intellectual questions, open to alternative ways of viewing a situation or problem, disciplined to follow intellectual methods to conclusions, capable of accepting criticism from others, tolerant of ambiguity, and respectful of others with different views. They understand and accept the imperative of academic honesty. Personal development is a very real part of intellectual development.

Beyond fostering intellectual and personal development, a liberal education also enables students to develop meaning and commitments in their lives. In college they can explore different ways to relate to others, imagine alternative futures, decide on their intended careers, and consider their larger life’s work of contributing to the common good.

Building such intellectual and personal capacities is the right way to warn students of the inappropriateness and dangers of indoctrination, help them see through the distortions of propaganda, and enable them to assess judiciously the persuasiveness of powerful emotional appeals. Emphasizing the quality of analysis helps students see why unwelcome views need to be heard rather than silenced. By thoughtfully engaging diverse perspectives, liberal education leads to greater personal freedom through greater competence. Ensuring that college students are liberally educated is essential both to a deliberative democracy and to an economy dependent on innovation.

What Is Not Required in the Name of Intellectual Diversity?

There are several misconceptions about intellectual diversity and academic freedom, and we address some of them here.

1. In an educational community, freedom of speech, or the narrower concept of academic freedom, does not mean the freedom to say anything that one wants. For example, freedom of speech does not mean that one can say something that causes physical danger to others. In a learning context, one must both respect those who disagree with

oneself and also maintain an atmosphere of civility. Anything less creates a hostile environment that limits intellectual diversity and, therefore, the quality of learning.

2. Students do not have a right to remain free from encountering unwelcome or “inconvenient questions,” in the words of Max Weber. Students who accept the literal truth of creation narratives do not have a right to avoid the study of the science of evolution in a biology course; anti-Semites do not have a right to a history course based on the premise that the Holocaust did not happen. Students protesting their institution’s sale of clothing made in sweatshops do not have a right to interrupt the education of others. Students do have a right to hear and examine diverse opinions, but within the frameworks that knowledgeable scholars—themselves subject to rigorous standards of peer review—have determined to be reliable and accurate. That is, in considering what range of views should be introduced and considered, the academy is guided by the best knowledge available in the community of scholars.
3. All competing ideas on a subject do not deserve to be included in a course or program, or to be regarded as equally valid just because they have been asserted. For example, creationism, even in its modern guise as “intelligent design,” has no standing among experts in the life sciences because its claims cannot be tested by scientific methods. However, creationism and intelligent design might well be studied in a wide range of other disciplinary contexts such as the history of ideas or the sociology of religion.
4. While the diversity of topics introduced in a particular area of study should illustrate the existence of debate, it is not realistic to expect that undergraduate students will have the opportunity to study every dispute relevant to a course or program. The professional judgment of teachers determines the content of courses.

Academic Freedom and Scholarly Community

A college or university is a dedicated social place where a variety of competing claims to truth can be explored and tested, free from political interference. The persons who drive the production of knowledge and the process of education are highly trained professors, and they, through an elaborate process of review by professional peers, take responsibility as a community for the quality of their scholarship, teaching, and student learning. Trustees, administrators, policy makers, and other stakeholders also have important roles to play, but the faculty and their students stand at the center of the enterprise.

The development of a body of knowledge involves scientists or other scholars in developing their best ideas and then subjecting them to empirical tests and/or searching scholarly criticism. Knowledge is not simply a matter of making an assertion but of developing the evidence for that assertion in terms that gain acceptance among those with the necessary training and expertise to evaluate the scholarly analysis. In order to contribute to knowledge, scholars require the freedom to pursue their ideas wherever they lead, unconstrained by political, religious, or other dictums. And scholars need the informed criticism of peers who represent a broad spectrum of insight and experience in order to build a body of knowledge.

One of the great strengths of higher education in the United States is the integration of scholarly research and educational communities. Students benefit enormously when their learning is guided by thoughtful and knowledgeable scholars who come from diverse backgrounds and who are trained to high levels in a variety of disciplines.

A discipline consists of a specialized community that, through intense collective effort, has formulated reliable methods for determining whether any particular claim meets accepted criteria for truth. But assertions from any single disciplinary community as to “what is the case” are themselves necessarily partial and bounded, because other disciplinary communities can and do provide different perspectives on the same topics. Economists, for example, see poverty through one set of lenses, while political scientists and historians contribute different, and sometimes directly competing, perspectives on the same issue.

Any assertion from a particular individual or a specific intellectual community is necessarily simpler than the complexity it attempts to explain and describe. This is the central reason both scholars and students must work within a communal setting that involves multiple academic disciplines, and that fosters an ethos of communication, contestation, and civility. By creating such communities of inquiry, the academy ensures that no proposal stands without alternatives or arrogates to itself the claim of possessing the sole truth. The advancement of knowledge requires that intellectual differences be engaged and explored even as individuals with different points of view are also respected.

Intellectual Diversity and the Development of Judgment

Although one often hears that faculty “impart knowledge” to students, the reality is that, in a good liberal education, substantial time is devoted to teaching students how to acquire new knowledge for themselves and how to evaluate evidence within different areas of knowledge. To do this well, professors in the classroom also need academic freedom to explore their subjects—including contested questions and real-world implications—with their students.

To help students think critically about a subject or problem, faculty members need to take seriously what students already know or believe about that topic and engage that prior understanding so new learning modifies the old—complicating, correcting, and expanding it. This process of cultivating a liberal education is a journey that transforms the minds and hearts, and frequently the starting assumptions, of those involved—both teachers and students. Because knowledge is always expanding, the eventual destination is uncertain.

To develop their own critical judgment, students also need the freedom to express their ideas publicly as well as repeated opportunities to explore a wide range of insights and perspectives. The diversity of the educational community is an important resource to this process; research shows that students are more likely to develop cognitive complexity when they frequently interact with people, views, and experiences that are different from their own.

Expressing one’s ideas and entertaining divergent perspectives—about race, gender, religion, or cultural values, for example—can be frightening for students. They require a safe environment in order to feel free to express their own views. They need confidence that they will not be subjected to ridicule by either students or professors. They have a right to be graded on the intellectual merit of their arguments, uninfluenced by the personal views of professors. And, of course, they have a right to appeal if they are not able to reach a satisfactory resolution of differences with a professor.

Learning to form independent judgments further requires that students demonstrate openness to the challenges their ideas may elicit and the willingness to alter their original views in light of new knowledge, evidence, and perspectives. Just as a crustacean breaks its confining shell in order to grow, so students may have to jettison narrow concepts as they expand their

knowledge and develop more advanced analytical capacities. As they acquire the capacities to encounter, grasp, and evaluate diverse points of view, they also gain more nuanced, sophisticated, and mature understandings of the world. Every college student deserves to experience the intellectual excitement that comes from the capacity to extend the known to the unknown and to discern previously unsuspected relationships.

Students may, in the end, reaffirm the worldviews and commitments that they brought with them to college. But they should do so far more aware of the complexity of the issues at stake and far better able to ground their commitments in analysis, evidence, and careful consideration of alternatives.

Teaching Students to Form Their Own Judgments

Research shows that students tend to develop intellectual and ethical capacities through a series of predictable stages. Students frequently enter college with a “black and white” view of the world, see things as either good or bad, and expect their professors and textbooks to serve as definitive authorities. Part of the job of becoming educated involves breaking out of this dualistic mindset. Students’ growing awareness of intellectual diversity frequently leads to a second cognitive stage that may be described as naive relativism. Once students see that ideas and methods are contested, and that their teachers may differ among themselves about interpretations of truth on certain questions, students often decide that “any idea is as good as any other.” While this is a predictable phase in their intellectual development, it is a phase that their teachers must recognize and challenge. Students cannot be allowed to be content with the notion that there is no legitimate way—beyond arbitrary choice—to determine the relative value of competing claims.

Thus it is vital that liberal education be organized to help students progress to a third, more mature, mental framework in which they form judgments—even in the face of continuing disagreement—about the relative merits of different views, based on careful evaluation of assumptions, arguments, and evidence. One of the central purposes of majoring in a particular discipline or academic field is to come to the understanding that different fields of endeavor provide well-grounded intellectual criteria for making decisions about alternative claims. Using these criteria, students can learn to discriminate by arguing the evidence, with the understanding that arguments exist for the purpose of clarifying ideas, evaluating claims, considering consequences, and making choices.

In this process, it is important that students be asked to assess competing points of view and to address them in making their own arguments. A good analysis does not simply ignore competing perspectives; rather, it takes them thoughtfully and carefully into account. Students need to learn, through the kind of extended and direct experience afforded by study in depth as well as general education courses, to be able to state why a question or argument is significant and for whom; what the difference is between developing and justifying a position and merely asserting one; and how to develop and provide evidence for their own interpretations and judgments.

Accomplishing this kind of educational result cannot be taken for granted or left to students’ unaided musings. There must be curricular space, capable guides and models, and a supportive institutional culture to encourage students as they learn to develop their own critical judgments. Freedom to learn is indispensable for both students and professors as they examine and assess disparate points of view within and across disciplinary boundaries. In the best

designed college curricula and assessments, ample opportunity exists for students both to work on these intellectual skills and to demonstrate to the community their level of achievement in analyzing complex questions.

Further, this kind of intellectual journey often has the greatest impact on students when they apply their knowledge and inquiry skills to issues and problems beyond the academy. Students sometimes envision education as being removed from the “real world,” but direct involvement with communities beyond the academy can illustrate the actual power and significance of their learning. In such community settings, students may encounter new forms of intellectual diversity, forms that emerge from working with people whose histories, experiences, perspectives, and values may be decidedly different from their own—and also, perhaps, from that of the scholarly community. Service learning, community-based learning, community action research, internships, study abroad, and similar experiences all provide opportunities for authentic learning that engage students in using their critical skills to understand and to better the world.

Those outside the academy readily see the enrichment value of providing students with hands-on experience in community or organizational settings. However, they must also recognize that real-world learning may involve students with issues and problems that have been highly politicized. Indeed, some of the same experiences that enhance the knowledge, skills, and motivation of students to become more engaged in civic betterment are precisely the ones that are politically contested. As a result, faculty whose courses include community-based learning experiences often find that they must help students assess controversial topics that—at first glance—might be thought extraneous to the subject of the course. When such controversial topics emerge, faculty have to use their professional judgment in deciding whether to devote class time to them. If they do, they have a responsibility to ensure that students hear and assess diverse views on these topics.

The Ideal versus the Real

Academic freedom is sometimes confused with autonomy, thought and speech freed from all constraints. But academic freedom implies not just *freedom from* constraint but also *freedom for* faculty and students to work within a scholarly community to develop the intellectual and personal qualities required of citizens in a vibrant democracy and participants in a vigorous economy. Academic freedom is protected by society so that faculty and students can use that freedom to promote the larger good.

This document articulates an ideal that is based on historic conceptions of academic freedom and extends those precepts to include responsibilities for the holistic education of students. In reality, practice often falls short of these norms. Departments and sometimes whole institutions do not always establish widely shared goals for student learning, programs may drift away from original intentions, and assessments may be inadequate. Some departments fail to ensure that their curricula include the full diversity of legitimate intellectual perspectives appropriate to their disciplines. And individual faculty members sometimes express their personal views to students in ways that intimidate them. There are institutional means for dealing with these matters, and in all of these areas, there is room for improvement. The key to improvement is clarity about the larger purpose of academic freedom and about the educational responsibilities it is designed to advance.

*The Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) began work on this issue in the early 1920s. Then, through a series of joint conferences begun in 1934, representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges established the principles set forth in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. In 2005, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, along with twenty-eight other higher education organizations, endorsed Academic Rights and Responsibilities, the American Council on Education's statement on intellectual diversity on college and university campuses.

Call for Nominations!

2010

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES P.O.W.E.R. AWARDS

Promising Outcomes Work and Exemplary Research Awards

Student Learning Outcomes assessment serves as an important means of demonstrating improvement and institutional change.

Student Learning Outcomes assessment directs our instructional, student service and administrative unit work by clearly describing and documenting the student knowledge, skills and values as a result of student learning activities and service interactions. It is also an important means of improving student success and guiding practice and driving institutional change. Well-designed SLO assessment goes beyond compliance and can address multiple goals—sustainable and learner-centered implementation methods, demonstration of student progress in classes and programs and the generation of reliable, statistically valid data that document success and help guide interventions and improvement.

As a way to showcase effective practices in learning assessment, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges/RP Group SLO Assessment Cooperative is seeking nominations for the second annual Promising Outcomes Work and Exemplary Research (POWER) Awards. Winners will be featured on the SLO Assessment Cooperative website, have their work documented on RP's national assessment listserv and the ASCCC website, and receive an award at the SLO Coordinators Pre-Conference session at the Strengthening Student Success Conference in Orange County on October 6, 2010.

You can read up on the award categories and make a nomination here: <http://sloassessment.com/> where you will also find the latest updates on SLO Assessment and statewide activities. You will be asked to provide a name, contact email, and phone number as well as a short paragraph describing the work including evidence substantiating why the work is worthy of consideration (This can include data, course, program or institutional change, websites, professional development materials or other types of evidence.). The deadline for nominations is May 31, 2010. Winners will be announced on August 1, 2010. Applications are submitted electronically at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/XB56YQC>.

If you have questions or want help with the application process, contact Bob Pacheco at rpacheco@barstow.edu or Janet Fulks jfulks@bakersfieldcollege.edu.

(Categories identified on the subsequent pages.)

2010 P.O.W.E.R. AWARD CATEGORIES

1. Exemplary Use of Program SLO Assessment to Reinvent Program Review This award recognizes relevant reworking or rewrite of an existing program review process that connects SLOs assessment planning and budgeting. *(Evidence to consider: sustainability, understanding across the campus, well-defined processes, changes in programs, initiates or expands collaborations)*

2. Exemplary General Education/Institutional Outcomes This award recognizes a faculty member, SLO coordinator, researcher or colleague who has done exceptional work in outcomes assessment that specifically addresses general education outcomes assessment. *(Evidence to consider: assessment methods understood across the college, analysis of data, sustainable processes, means of recording and storing the data, venues discussing the assessment process or data, initiates or expands collaborations)*

3. SLO Coordinator/Mentor of the Year This award recognizes an SLO coordinator who has modeled or mentored outcomes assessment at the home college, peer institution and statewide level – a leader of leaders. (*Evidence to consider: activities, relationships or changes instituted by this change-agent*)

4. Exemplary Professional Development Program for SLO Assessment This award recognizes a faculty member, SLO coordinator, researcher or colleague who has successfully developed a sustainable faculty development process for SLO assessment. (*Evidence to consider: examples of the professional development schedules and content, eventual outcomes across campus, diffusion of SLO assessment throughout the college, initiates or expands collaboration*)

5. Exemplary Documentation and Communication of SLO Assessment This award recognizes exemplary collecting, publishing and disseminating of SLO assessment results that increase dialogue to improve student learning and communicate data and how to contextualize and use it. (*Evidence to consider: publications on the web, in a journal or other document, college-wide venues, cultures of inquiry, unique dissemination ideas*)

6. Exemplary Change Agent in SLO Assessment This award recognizes a faculty member, researcher, SLO Coordinator or colleague who has used outcomes assessment to effect the greatest positive change. (*Evidence to consider: changes in practice on the college, sustainability, wide-spread understanding about the power of assessment, initiates or expands collaborations*)

7. Exemplary SLO Assessment in Student Services This award recognizes exemplary application of outcomes assessment in student services. (*Evidence to consider: examples of student service related assessment plans, data and changes in practices, methods of training student service professionals, initiates or expands collaborations*)

8. Exemplary SLO Assessment in Noncredit This award recognizes exemplary application of outcomes assessment in noncredit education. (*Evidence to consider: Noncredit SLO assessment practices that have closed the loop, effective noncredit assessment plans and reporting of data, changes in practice subsequent to SLO assessment, the use of SLO assessment for the elusive noncredit accountability, initiates or expands collaborations*)

9. Exemplary SLO Assessment Course Outcomes This award recognizes a faculty member, SLO coordinator, researcher or colleague who has done excellent work in outcomes assessment at the course level. (*Evidence to consider: Course curricular changes stimulated by SLO assessment, unique and effective assessment practices, curricular alignment, course outcomes that initiate or expand collaborations*)

10. Exemplary SLO Assessment Program Outcomes:

This award recognizes a faculty member, SLO coordinator, researcher or colleague who has done excellent work in outcomes assessment at the program level. (*Evidence to consider: Course curricular changes stimulated by program SLO assessment, unique and effective assessment practices, curricular alignment, course outcomes, initiates or expands collaborations*).

11. Exemplary Faculty-Research Collaboration This award recognizes an exemplary connection between a faculty member and researcher that has married data, evidence and inquiry to improve learning at the course, program, student services or institutional level. (*Evidence to consider: Data reporting, dialogue venues, programmatic or curricular changes, new knowledge concerning SLO assessment, important and actionable information as a result of the collaboration*)

12. Exemplary SLO Assessment in Administrative Units

This award recognizes an exemplary application of outcomes assessment for administrative and other non-instructional units. (*Evidence to consider: Methodology for creating and assessing administrative outcomes, connections to student learning, sustainability, college-wide dialogue as a result of the SLO assessment, initiates or expands collaborations*)

13. Exemplary High Level Administrative Support of SLO Assessment

This award recognizes a high level administrator who —gets|| SLO assessment, and helps to nurture college ownership of assessment results, data and widespread dialogue. This administrator enables campus SLO assessment and has led the college to successfully create a vital connection between that assessment and budgeting and planning. (*Evidence to consider: college testimonials, unique support mechanisms for SLO assessment, process development that transparently links budgeting and planning, college-wide, statewide or national profile in promoting value in SLO assessment*)

14. Hall of Fame Lifetime Achievements in SLO Assessment

This award is presented to professionals with distinguished careers in advancing student learning. (*Evidence to consider: Long term activities and affect of this leader's influence, publications, presentations, outcomes, relationships, and change associated with particular aspects of this person's influence, extent or level of statewide, local or national involvement*)