MINUTES OF THE LOAC MEETING  
DATE: October 23, 2014  
TIME: The Entire Solar Eclipse

Esteemed Members Present:  Kate BENSCOTER, Antonio CASTRO, John DOTTA, Sharon  
GOCKE, Gwen KELL, Faye SMYLE, Robyn WORNALL

Esteemed Members Absent in Body, but Present in Spirit: Jessica MILLIKAN, Janet STICKMON,  
Jan WHITIMER

1.0 Meeting brought to order by Presiding Chair, John Dotta at precisely 3:15, the exact  
time originally scheduled for this meeting.

2.0 GENERAL BUSINESS:  Gwen conveyed that petitions for graduation are due Friday,  
October 24, 2014.

3.0 Public not present; therefore, no comments or announcements from public sector.

4.0 John suggested we adopt the proposed agenda.  Sharon so moved, and Gwen, (bless  
hers heart,) seconded.

5.0 The committee tabled the approval of the minutes from the last meeting agreeing to  
wait until Kate types them up and distributes them to the committee members, (a very  
sagacious move.  Extrapolating from Plato’s brilliant observation that one cannot think  
about or discuss nothing as distinct form “nothingness”, we as a committee saw the  
efficacy in not approving that which was not in existence.)

6.0 Comporting with the official agenda for the day, the committee embarked on a  
DISCUSSION of the appropriate committee membership of LOAC.

6.1, et seq.

A subcommittee spearheaded by Faye Smyle and held at Starbucks discussed the  
multifarious ways we might expand the committee membership. (The more, the merrier,  
as the saying goes.) Kate (bravely) rendered a summary of the Starbucks meeting.  
Faye conveyed to the committee that according to the Bylaws regarding Faculty Senate  
composition, the LOAC committee as it stands now is in compliance with its  
membership, and the committee even sports an extra faculty member.  Faye  
alerted us to the fact that while two versions of the Bylaws exist, the one we need to  
heed is the PDF version.  A quorum is three.  Discussion ensued regarding possible  
future representation on the committee. (Here the scribe was rendered too bemused by  
the multifarious specific possibilities presented, so a truncated rendering is herein  
presented.)

The committee needs to consider whether it wants to follow Article IV of the Bylaws  
[Academic Senate Committees] or Article VII [District Committees] for proper  
committee membership. Depending on which Article the committee follows, LOAC could  
(proudly) retain up to circa 22 members! Sharon (bewilderingly) asked if converting  
LOAC to a District Committee wouldn’t lend a protracted nature to all the projects LOAC  
needed to accomplish.  Silence, then Gwen (astutely) asked how the LOAC committee  
would initiate such a change in membership.  Faye (deftly) answered that the committee  
would send the proposal to the Executive Council of the Academic Senate.  Robyn  
(pointedly) declared that training of committee members is essential, and the most
salient point of the training is that assessment needs to be driving our curriculum, which needs to be linked to the budget (because as in all things American, if you follow the money, you have arrived at the crux of the matter). John (swiftly) responded that there is regular turnover of membership, so ongoing training is a given. Antonio (brilliantly) asked what constituted “governance” because the definition might lead to a more balanced judgment on which tack the committee should take on this question of membership.

Faye (tactfully) indicated that the committee needed to take all of these considerations to the VPs for their considered judgment. All heads nodded (presumably in agreement). She also (bravely) stated that some community colleges hold the following policy: “Submission of final grades is not considered complete without each instructor having completed ILO, PLO, and SLO assessment on TracDat.” (Unspoken implication: Without receiving written evidence from each faculty member of having submitted grades and having completed assessment, the college will withhold all forthcoming paychecks. This is a mighty way to entice faculty to get on the ball.)

Lastly, the committee addressed “Problems to Solve”.

1. Outcomes assessment was lost. ILO assessment through the inquiry process failed. John contributed these comments.

2. Committee will write a proposal to include the rationale for the possible changes in committee membership. The scribe forgot who proposed this and #3 below.

3. The committee shall vote on the above (#2) and then send it to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

The committee forgot to adjourn, so as it is officially still ongoing, Sharon (diffidently) adds that the LOAC committee needs an experienced, professional scribe to record the minutes, which is most painfully obvious from the foregoing. The committee forgot to address the completion of the handbook, which would lend encouragement to faculty to complete the assessment process and to keep it going in perpetuity. Would anyone else care to add to the minutes here?

DISCLAIMER: All comments found within parentheses are solely the responsibility of Sharon, who, as is well known, is often hopelessly clueless at Faculty Senate Committee Meetings. After the committee revises and votes to adopt these notes, then Sharon is no longer solely responsible.