

SOAC Comment in Response to CBT Report on Infomart May 8. 2013

While appreciating that assessment is one of the five major aspects of the CBT Educational Master Plan, the document implies that all previous work is irrelevant.

The proposed future teams may deteriorate the growing culture of assessment that has been built with faculty leadership and administration support, not the other way around in the apparently proposed dictatorial manner.

When writing about the structure of the College Academic Senate and committees the CBT says, there is a "delay in decision making" I would argue that this "delay" is actually due process. When a committee is making changes in curriculum or assessment practices it is vitally important that there is a process of testing and revision before implementation. If a change in assessment is going to impact hundreds of instructors and students it should be made after careful thought and debate.

Faculty should not be a part of curriculum and assessment they should be CREATING it. If the student success is not in the hands of the instructors then how can it be measured? This is not a top down corporation run by a CEO. This is an institution of higher learning it should be student centered and faculty focused.

I am not trying to disparage what they administrators do, as I am confident they work hard and they believe they have the best interests of in institution in mind. However, unless some one is in the classroom day in and day out they have no idea what it's like. Administrators are not qualified to make decision about what we should teach or when we should schedule our classes.

Individuals who chair committees in addition to their other full time responsibilities should continue to receive compensation for the hard work they do. The Senate and the committees are more than a place to get to together to complain about the administration as suggested in the CBT documents. Shared governance is VITALLY important to the health of the college.

Faculty and staff are at the bottom of the structure in this new top down model. And while I agree that we are the FOUNDATION of OCC, in the hearts and minds of our students, we ARE OCC. Surely we are more than just "doers" we are drivers and shapers of minds. We are the connection to the community at large and the individual student to suggest any thing less is frankly, hurtful and insulting.

It appears that the Assessment of Student Learning plays a rather prominent role in the new EMP. The recommendations of the CBT seem congruent with what is already being done by SOAC. I am not clear as to what they think is "broken" that they need to "fix."

The development of common course outcomes, benchmarks, etc. is already part of SOAC's work.

My concerns about the information I have read relate to the composition of the "Academic Leadership Team," which consists of administrators and no faculty. Committee membership will be limited to those "selected" by the ALT. I have serious concerns about the lack of shared governance in this plan.