

Mathematics and Computer Science Department Meeting Minutes

9/12/2014

Room 61-2316

Present: D. Beydler, A. Birca, L. Chan, D. Chavez, S. Childress, B. Edwards, C. Graham, H. Griffith, S. Guth, P. Hosea, M. Johnson, K. Khoddam, C. Kim, A. Kirchgraber, S. Lancaster, J. McMullin, M. Munro, B. Nguyen, A. Nitta (Chair), H. Parra, C. Perez, H. Pop, D. Rivers, J. Tamayo, J. Terreri, F. Tran, C. Troxell, T. Vo, J. Wakefield, P. Young, S. Zicree

Absent: R. Loyd, V. Tatoian, T. Kojima (on leave), M. Summers (on leave), J. Sholars, C. Sun, T. Takashima (on leave)

The meeting began at 2:53.

Old Business

- 1) **August 2014 Minutes:** The August minutes were approved, with minor revisions.

New Business

- 1) **Report: SLO for Math 110: Stephen:** In one of the questions, we had a word (majority) that seemed to affect the results. Discussion followed about whether or not the question measured what it intended to measure. **Debbie:** I have to be honest here. I find the SLO process a huge waste of time. There are other things that faculty could be spending their time and energy on that would benefit students. **Scott:** if that's the case, it may be that we haven't created a process that generates enough introspection and greater self-awareness. **Stephen:** we need more involvement at the committee level.
- 2) **SLO for Math 140: Heidi:** Math 140 needs to have its SLO re-evaluated. Is there a requirement that we test both SLOs in a given testing cycle? **Bao-chi:** I believe that we do. **Heidi:** I'm thinking I might just want to run one question through the cycle, then the other. **Scott:** I think that would fit with the school's approach. **Steve:** I think the idea is to measure learning outcomes at the end of the course. **Heidi:** Ok. I also want to know if it's okay to change the rubric for the question. **Scott:** The idea is that you test initially, then go through the improvement cycle, then test again. **Steve:** I'm just wondering, is anyone aware of an example where instruction has changed as a result of SLO data? Discussion followed. An example from Math 181 was mentioned and discussed. **Debbie:** My issue is when the focus of an SLO is narrowed down to a particular question – is it really worth all the effort to fix that one question? Why not just have faculty get together and look at where students are not doing well on the final?

- 3) **Special Guest: Erica Ledezma from the WIN program:** **Erica:** Our main goal is for our students to be successful on and off the field. Our facility is about 1300 sq ft. Tutoring in many levels of math, science, English is offered. Most of our students start at Math 50. I need to get them out in two years so they don't lose their eligibility. I'm wondering if some of you would want to do office hours or supplemental hours there at the center. We have every book covered. Most of our tutors have degrees and go through the same training as other tutors. My extension is 4239. Email: eledezma@mtsac.edu
- 4) **Math Department Representative to the Academic Senate:** **Art:** Scott was elected to serve as a Director on the Executive Board the Academic Senate; we now have a need for another Senate representative to replace him. Alina is one of the reps this fall. Melody will be one in the Spring. **Scott:** we can't be passive, or we will lose ground. **Heidi, et al:** we need a math voice. **Debbie:** Joan said that if no one is available, she could do it. **Stephen:** I could redesign my schedule and do it in Spring. **Heidi:** maybe someone who is not here could be approached before we ask Joan. **Art:** I will send out an ftmath email for a final call for volunteers.
- 5) **Math 280 CI-D Scott:** I submitted a very long list of measurable objectives to CI-D. They were very persnickety, and requested more specific details in two areas. I made two changes: to items #6 and #10. **Art:** CI-D has granted us conditional approval for this course. We need to submit a revised course by sometime next year. **Heidi:** I move to approve the new Math 280 objectives and course outline of record, as amended by Scott. Motion passed by acclamation.
- 6) **C-IDs for 260 and 290:** **Scott:** our Math 260 is the CI-D 250 course, and our Math 290 is the CI-D 240 course. Both the Math 260 and Math 290 courses are in stage 5 with Mt Sac's curriculum committee. The Cal states will be looking at these courses in March. When we get it back, we will then ask the UCs to review the courses.
- 7) **The CIDs:** **Art:** Last year, we applied for CI-D approval for several of our transfer-level courses. We first focused on courses that are part of a AA/AS-T degree. But there are other transfer-level courses that we can submit for CI-D approval. These classes are important for our transfer students as well. **Debbie:** will these CID numbers be listed in our schedule of classes? **Art:** I'm not sure.
Art: I would like to ask the curriculum committees to review the CI-D course descriptions for courses listed in the meeting agenda, and see if our courses align with their descriptors.
- 8) **DSPS Scribes:** **Debbie:** DSPS Scribes are coming. Give me your feedback about any issues you encounter. **Heidi:** I am floored by the number of accommodation forms I've received that involve notetakers. Others agreed. **Jimmy:** I have 12 students in one class, and 9 in another, who need notetaking. **Scott:** I'm trying to explore ways where students don't have to be frantically writing notes. **Hugh:** I'm wondering if the notetaking isn't now a default accommodation for all DSPS students. **Linda:** I'm a kinesthetic learner, so I need to take notes during a lecture.

Reports

- 1) **ACADEMIC SENATE: Scott:** Math 110S has officially been approved for GE area B4 at the CSUs. **Heidi:** did they have any issue with the prereq of the prerequisite course?

Scott: A task force is being formed to explore Mt Sac offering bachelor's degrees. At some point we will be voting on the recommendations of the task force. The AS President will probably appoint the task force. **Janet:** I'm interested in serving on this task force.

- 2) **FACULTY ASSOCIATION: Alina:** The FA and the District are exploring Interest Based Bargaining **Debbie:** I'm concerned about the direction we're going in, this Interest Based Bargaining.

MOU Proposal: There is a proposal to change the rehire rights language for adjunct faculty. We are going from a five-year cycle to a four-year cycle. Under the new contract fifth year faculty will have rehire rights. MOU proposes that faculty in the fourth and fifth years of the old contract to be phased into the new contract. A straw vote was taken: department voted 18 to 3 to ask our reps to vote in favor of the MOU.

Al: PERS said that American Fidelity has to complete its eligibility process by October. So they pulled out. Now there's a company, HMS, that we believe will select people randomly to verify their dependents' eligibility and send them a letter. So not everyone will have to do this. Also, open enrollment is coming up. The VSP frame allowance is going up \$20 October 1st.

Our benefits are going down by \$100 per month. Some insurance rates are going up, so plan for that.

- 3) **DEPARTMENT CHAIR: Art:** The State Academic Senate wants volunteers to attend the basic skills courses descriptor workshop. This is similar to the CI-D descriptors, but for basic skills courses. We should be getting more printers, and we have funding to purchase some Elmos to keep in reserve. For the new printers I will work with Karen Long to place them where they are most needed. I believe the replacements for the stolen Elmos have been ordered by the division.

For winter semester, I don't think we need to grow much too more. But since the school wants to grow, if you are interested in teaching additional courses, please let me know your availability. There will be opportunities.

Announcements:

- 1) **Art:** For the CMC Mini-Conference, conference registration through PayPal is now available at the website.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 pm

Submitted by:

Department Chair
Art Nitta

Recorder
Cameron Troxell