VICTOR VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Convocation Fall 2013

Comprehensive Report – Narrative Version 2.0

Tracy Davis, Academic Senate President
9/23/2013

VVC Academic Senate 2012-14
Voluntary In-Service Day Report, August 30, 2013

On August 30, 2013, all the constituency groups of Victor Valley College participated in an all-college convocation day. The objective of this college-wide convocation was to formalize an institutional practice of reviewing, discussing and committing to continuous quality improvement for the institution as a whole.

This convocation was an outgrowth of smaller all-constituency meetings held throughout the 2012-2013 academic year, which were organized as 'Campus Communication Days'(CCD), and were initiated by response to a campus climate survey distributed to all groups in Spring 2012. One CCD was held per month in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. Topics included accreditation updates; role and responsibility of shared governance committees; technology in the classroom; curriculum and Transfer Model Curriculum Degrees; and SLO and PLO assessment. These CCD were facilitated and attended by faculty, administration and classified employees. At many of these events, students were also in attendance.

In addition to the CCD, workshops in Distance Education, SLO/PLO assessment and curriculum, facilitated by faculty, classified and administration, were held in both Fall 2012 and Spring 2013.

These year-long events naturally progressed to the official Fall 2013 convocation on August 30, 2013, which responded to the need of the institution to further develop a culture and practice of self-assessment and improvement.

The convocation began at 9 a.m. with a 'State of the College' address, facilitated by Peter Allan, Interim Superintendent/President; Peter Maphumulo, Vice President of Instruction and Student Services; and GH Javaheripour, Chief Financial Officer. ACCJC recommendations 2 (Program Review), 3 (SLO/PLO Assessment) and 6 (Financial) were outlined, and questions from the constituencies were addressed.

The VVC Academic Senate was charged with organizing faculty-centered workshops designed to further inform faculty (and other constituencies) of the progress of ACCJC recommendations. At 10:15 a.m., the first of these workshops, 'Accreditation Update', was a faculty-based panel discussion by the SLO Coordinator, Instructional Program Review Committee Chair, SLO Assessment Committee Chair, and the Vice President of the Academic Senate.

From 12:45-2:00 p.m., workshops were held in the classrooms of the Performing Arts Center (PAC) for each academic division in completing 'robust dialog' for inclusion in Instructional Program Review. Members of the Instructional Program Review and SLO Assessment Committee facilitated these workshops.

From 2:15-3:45, programs due to complete their comprehensive Program Review (Track 'A', according to the three-year calendar established) attended a workshop hosted by the chair of the Instructional Program Review Committee. Other programs were provided the option of self-directed SLO/PLO discussions, and the Communication Center was reserved, as it had several small breakout rooms for faculty to use. In addition, the Curriculum Committee chair hosted a curriculum workshop, and for Adjunct Faculty, the Academic Senate Adjunct Representatives hosted a question and answer session.

From 4:00-4:45 p.m., the Victor Valley College Faculty Association facilitated a question and answer workshop for faculty regarding the role of faculty discipline facilitators.

Throughout the afternoon, rooms were made available for any programs/disciplines who wished to hold department meetings in the Performing Arts Center classrooms.

For a detailed description of the faculty-centered program of events, please see the attached report.

After the 'State of the College' address by Interim Superintendent/President Peter Allan, Vice President of Instruction and Student Services Peter Maphumulo, and Vice President of Administrative Services GH Javaheripour from 9-10 a.m., the first of several faculty-centered workshops was held in the Student Activity Center (SAC) from 10:15-11:30 a.m. This was a panel discussion on accreditation progress on ACCJC Recommendations 2, 3 &6. The presenters were David Gibbs (Biology/Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee chair); Jessica Gibbs (Biology/Instructional Program Review Committee chair); Claude Oliver (Computer Integrated Design and Graphics/VVC Academic Senate Vice President); and Lisa Harvey (Biology/Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator/Past President VVC

Academic Senate). Peggy Mayer (Counseling) provided documentation of the discussion. Ninety-five faculty were in attendance.

Summary of panel discussion:

The discussion commenced with David Gibbs reporting that the annual report of SLOs, PLOs and service outcomes will include all courses with narrative and will explain percentages completed.The six-year action plan will be looked at to know what to assess and do it. The goal is to assess every SLO in a 5 year period and give a copy to everyone in the dept. When receiving the copy look at assessment levels and be imaginative (possible each year) and consider using different methods of assessing in the future. When teaching the same course the SLOs need to be the same no matter who is teaching it. Examples of implementing SLOs/ILOs and assessment results for faculty include: SLOs could be used to improve teaching in the classroom; ILOs evaluated on reading, critical thinking, writing and math; graphs were developed and critical thinking needs improving; faculty need to submit assessments to SharePoint and save a copy for themselves.

Jessica Gibbs reported recommendation #2 has not been truly "completed", even though reports are on SharePoint. Reports need *meaningful* discussions of outcomes to increase their quality. More dialogue will happen this afternoon in workshops and input needed by Monday.Outcome data and assessment need to be used in planning for college goals. Even if actions successful, *document it* (ie. what funding is needed to continue success). The PRAISE cycle has 3 tracks: A=comprehensive, large and detailed (Humanities, Arts & Social Science, due Oct. 1, 2013). Peer reviews with constructive feedback to make the report competitive so faculty can receive the funding and assistance needed to truly improve their programs. Reports will be turned into the Instruction Program Review folder on October 7, 2013.

Claude Oliver reported the $28M reserve may be $60M in 10 yrs, and we need to meet ACCJC recommendation #6. We have been running in "structural deficit mode" for about 4-5 yrs. Need faculty member on the shared governance Finance, Budget and Planning Committee. Faculty (and others) need the process of: 1) recommendation to cabinet 2) find out in Spring what was approved for the fall budget and 3) then the president announces all the budgets before the fall starts.Document at every meeting by someone other than the chair then submit to SharePoint.

Lisa Harvey reported she will no longer be the SLO coordinator, after collecting all assessment date and inputting into TracDat. CSEA will be in charge of inputting data from now on. Much concern expressed about a non-faculty member inputting data that person may not understand. Some assessments were fabulous and those people may be asked to train others.

This panel discussion ended at 11:30 a.m.

After lunch,12:45-2:00 p.m., the second breakout session, "Including robust dialog in assessment materials", was held in the classrooms of the second floor of the Performing Arts Center (PAC). These workshops, open to <u>all</u> faculty, were designed to assist faculty in documenting evidence of assessment dialog for accreditation! Disciplines/Departments will be assisted by members of the Instruction Program Review (IPRC) and Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committees (SLOAC).

VVC Academic Senate 2012-14
Voluntary In-Service Day Report, August 30, 2013

For this series of workshops, attendees were divided into division disciplines for personalized attention/assistance in completing Program Review elements related to documenting dialog regarding assessments.

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) Chair David Gibbs (Biology) facilitated the STEM group. Documentation was completed by Michael Butros (Physics). Eleven division faculty participated, and the following disciplines were represented: biology, math, astronomy, child development, CIS, geography, geology, and physics.

The discussion was centered on how to complete the robust dialog form in the STEM disciplines. Different disciplines shared what they did – and were currently doing -- to complete the form for inclusion in their 2013-14 Annual Updates. Another discussion analyzed what exactly constitutes a "program", and therefore who is required to complete PLOs.

A suggestion was made for interdisciplinary cooperation for completion of the dialog form. One suggestion used the example of math and physics working together.

After going over the form and what was needed to complete it, the meeting was adjourned.

Instructional Program Review Committee Chair (IPRC) Jessica Gibbs (Biology) facilitated the HASS discussion. Patty Golder (English) provided documentation. Thirty-four faculty were in attendance (HASS contains the largest and most diverse programs at Victor Valley College); disciplines participating included English, Theatre Arts, Business/Economics, Sociology, Foreign Language, Communication Studies, Art/Photography, Political Science, History, Music, Philosophy and Religious Studies. Peter Allan, Interim Superintendent/President, also participated.

Background information was provided to the group regarding the number of courses assessed — not all courses have been assessed due to factors such as not all courses have reached the point of assessment on a six-year cycle (also referred to as the action plan). The cycle reflects that all courses will be assessed two times in a three-year cycle. In addition, some courses are not yet at a finalized stage through CurricuNet — they are moving *through* the CurricuNet process. Other reasons exist as to why not all courses have been assessed. To date, 771 of 800 courses have been assessed.

A robust sideline discussion regarding the VVC fiscal status was inserted in the discussion here.

Two handouts were discussed. The first handout referenced relevant information that should be included in an SLO discussion. The form can be modified to reference a PLO discussion. A major point is that in both SLO and PLO discussions, robust dialogue is needed. Outcomes discussion is mandatory for accreditation purposes. All disciplines should engage in robust dialogue. If relevant to a discipline 6-year plan, PLO and Transfer Degree should be included in the recorded dialogue. Note: Peter Maphumulo's office can report on programs not used anymore, and this information can be distributed to disciplines/programs. Note: PLO pilots can be done prior to the required PLO assessments; for example, English is piloting an assessment prior to the required assessment.

Types of assessment tools were discussed: performance, knowledge-based quizzes and tests, pre- and post-tests. The assessments and subsequent dialogue generated lead to meaningful dialogue and eventual student success. All dialogue should be tied to funding necessary for resources. We need to reference Program Review. Loops should be closed — two assessments completed in subsequent semesters/years. For example, discuss changes and outcomes improvement, success attained, and plans for further assessment.

Share information with other colleagues; maybe reference other schools' programs outcomes and assessments. Remember that PLO assessment is broad-based and SLO assessment is more specific. Both assessments should be unique.

The second handout on meaningful data generated questions and suggestions — a truly robust dialogue. If one SLO changed or a tool changed, report changes and how and why courses changed. Methodology is the key. Remember that the result is student success, and sometimes a change in an SLO is necessary to reflect an improvement to student success. Continuous improvement is an important goal. Another discussion revolved around how to identify students for PLO assessment since not all students are in the same class. A possible answer is to identify a cohort of students who will graduate and test them — issue an exit exam. Identify of this cohort could be generated through Admissions and Records. The cohort could be identified as a capstone class perhaps, and the same assessment tool could be used. A problem is with transfer degrees since multiple classes are taken across disciplines. Another problem is teaching to a test. Another problem is having a "luck of the draw," low-level student population who may not do well on an exit exam perhaps because they do not take the exam seriously. Problems also may be because students have no basic skills or they have not been held to student success in individual classrooms by particular instructors. The point is conversation is needed. Maybe counseling can hand out a test from which feedback can be gleaned. One of the suggestions is that we need a state model test. The bottom line is that VVC needs to reflect student success and more students to matriculate to four-year institutions. We need dialogue, robust dialogue within and between disciplines/programs.

Claude Oliver (Computer Integrated Design and Graphics/CIDG), VVC Academic Senate Vice President and member of the IPRC, led the discussion for Career and Technical Education (CTE) and Allied Health (AH); Gary Menser (Welding) provided documentation. Twelve faculty attended, and the following disciplines were represented: CIDG, Welding, Electronics, Automotive, Cooperative Education, Child Development, Computer Information Systems and Media Arts. Patricia Luther, Dean of CTE/AH and Joseph Morris, Director of Nursing, also attended.

Claude Oliver distributed dialog forms to the participants. Program Reviews (Annual Updates) are in, and need dialog forms included. In addition, the quality of the program reviews need improvement. All SLOs in the six-year SLO Assessment Calendar need to be completed (an example was given in Cooperative Education, which has already implemented their six-year calendar.

Participants were reminded that the Student Learning Outcomes in syllabi must match the SLOs in the official Course Outline of Record (COR), which can be found in CurricuNet. Problems with calculating exact number of SLOs assessed, due to old, inaccurate SLOs in some CORs for classes which have not been taught in several semesters. In addition, new courses which have been passed through curriculum, but not taught, have not been assessed. Data bases and other lists of courses do not match (such as Datatel and Colleague); corrections need to be made to accurately determine percentage of courses with complete SLO Assessment.

The group discussed course deactivation and reactivation; reactivating courses requires updating to Title V standards. Repeatability of courses also discussed, with examples of Kinesiology, Theatre Arts and Dance required at UC and CSU for transfer. These programs offer 'A', 'B', 'C' and 'D' classes (as one example); the hours offered in this configuration was discussed related to how some programs are affected by repeatability issues.

VVC Academic Senate 2012-14
Voluntary In-Service Day Report, August 30, 2013

Compliance with completing SLOs, PLOs and Program Reviews, and the inherent challenges for many programs was outlined. A proposed solution was to not offer extra class load until compliance was achieved.

The Riverside Community College repeatability policy was reviewed. Departments need to confirm accurate SLOs and PLOs, and make sure correct versions are entered and match in CurricuNet, TracDat, and in all syllabi.

Action items: coordinate data bases of courses offered, and 'clean up' inaccuracies and old data; repeatability table distributed and discussed so those affected can use it for implementation; review of programs offering 'A', 'B', etc, sections at the same time.

PLO assessments should be at a 'higher level' than SLOs, and need to be assessed with separate, authentic assessments. Usually, this can be done using a 'capstone' course if there is an appropriate course that summarizes a student's proficiency in that program. Joseph Morris described the process Nursing used to write and review SLOs/PLOs for their courses.

Lisa Harvey (Biology), Past President of the Academic Senate and member of SLOAC, led the group composed of Librarians and Counseling, Public Safety Training Center and Kinesiology. Debby Blanchard (Kinesiology) took notes for this workshop. Twenty faculty participated from Kinesiology, Theatre Arts/Dance, Counseling, Library, and Paramedic/EMT.

In the past, data was collected and reported in Program Review. Now, data must also be interpreted and assessment tools must be discussed, proving students are learning, and how are students using this information when they leave VVC.

Examples of good and 'not so good' assessment discussion on what to do if the following scenarios become apparent in the assessment and evaluation process: too many students succeed (or too few); too many fail (and too few); data does not reflect authentic success or failure.

Discussion of resources as needed, and examples of resources; discussion of PLOs and data.

A reminder to all that this is a *department-wide* process, not just individuals; the importance of inclusiveness was stressed.

The next sessions, 2:15-3:45 p.m., included four choices for faculty: Program Review, Annual Update, Curriculum, and Adjunct Faculty issues.

In the Program Review workshop members of IPRC worked with Track 'A' faculty on comprehensive Program Reviews due December 1, 2013. Jessica Gibbs facilitated this workshop. Ed Heaberlin (Theatre Arts), Tom Miller (Music) and Carol Delong (Geography) provided documentation. Twenty-two faculty participated in this workshop, representing Sociology, Communication Studies, English as a Second Language (ESL), Theatre Arts, Computer Information Systems, Art/Photography, Business/Economics, Computer Integrated Design and Graphics, Foreign Language, History, Geography, Music, Political Science, and Biology.

Several handouts regarding the comprehensive program review were distributed: the Program Review template, the dialog template, and the budget worksheet. The updated PR template was projected, and the document was dissected; extensive discussion took place regarding the importance of content and

clarity. Program Reviews should not be e-mailed to the IPRC chair, but posted on Sharepoint under the Program name. There was a discussion about the difference among the submission year (when due), the plan year/s 2013-2014 and the Budget development year 2014-2015.

Program Review for Track A is due for those programs this semester; however, every program must turn in a Program Update (such as the Annual Update).

The Program Review Handbook can be found at SharePoint. The Program Review instructions were gone over step by step in the first part of the meeting.

A distinction was made between the Program Review, Annual Update and the Educational Master Plan: Program Review and Annual Update is short-term planning, and the Educational Master Plan is long-term planning.

Faculty were encouraged to complete the item Community Service Outreach section, as it looks really good on these reports, and demonstrates attention by Programs to the community at large.

The "Needs Assessment" section must agree with the Budget worksheet or your requests may not be approved. Program TOPS code and Budget code usually match.

In the Facilities Committee and the PRAISE and Program Review process, the Facilities Committee as a group went through all PRAISE update documents(Annual Updates) in early Spring 2013 to extract any reference to facilities needs, whether new, repurposed or remodeled, or to maintenance issues such as HVAC, classroom utilization, etc. These are being considered in developing the Facilities section of the Master Plan and in the Facilities long range planning document currently being updated. The Facilities Committee is pleased that the new Program Review document has a specific input section for facilities needs as this will make collecting and analyzing this information much more efficient.

The Technology Committee did a similar vetting of the PRAISE reports, and will use the PRAISE document to analyze District technology needs for all constituent groups.

It was noted also that the new TMC degrees may have a number of known and currently unknown impacts on course enrollments and course offerings, as the TMC majors will return to the era of more specific curriculum sets required for matriculation and this may will limit enrollment in courses that are not either TMC related or Gen Ed related. There were concerns regarding the readiness of the campus as to what these impacts will be and to anticipate which courses will be affected, either in needing more of same or less of same.

Also during this time slot, PLO/SLO breakout sessions by department (for those departments not in Track 'A' PR cycle) had rooms available for meetings and other work. The Math Department met in room 21-157 (Advanced Technology Center); department chair Stephen Toner led the meeting; Jeff Redona provided documentation. Thirteen Math faculty attended.

Due to the prerequisite change for students entering Math 50, there have been empty seats in Math 50 sections and a strong need for Math 12 sections. We will be re-arranging the spring 2014 schedule accordingly before part-time faculty get assigned to classes. This may include some early morning classes, as we are out of classroom space. It was suggested that we look into 21-171 for classroom space, as well as rooms at Excelsior. It was also suggested that we look into offering Math 228 in the spring semester as well as fall, based on the numbers we've had.

With the approach of the AMATYC conference, we need to figure out who wishes to go and how much it will cost. Please reply to Steve's email if you have not done so already.

Due to some COLA funds and extra monies coming down from the state, we will likely be increasing sections in the spring and next summer.

Dean of STEM, Rolando Regino (through Steve) had asked the department their thoughts on creating a streamlined (combination) class to help get students through Math 50 and Math 90. Pat Mauch pretty much summed up the department's attitude by stating "successful completion of Math 90 will drop without the Math 50 backup".

Those present spent the remainder of the time looking at the PLO results from last spring. We were generally pleased with the PLO results from last spring, except for PLO #5. Since the results of the SLO from Math 120 regarding hypothesis tests was also low in the fall and spring (SLO #4 – 72% and 70%, respectively), we made the recommendation to the Math 120 teachers to emphasize hypothesis testing. We also decided that we would like to look seriously into cutting the non-parametric statistics chapter from the end of Math 120 in order to make more time to emphasize hypothesis testing in the course. The remainder of the PLO's seemed to be successful enough. Even though PLO #7, based on an assignment from Math 231 had 69% success, we thought it to be a very challenging assessment.

The department then turned its attention to the SLO results from last spring and summer. Jarom Viehweg noted that in Math 104, SLO #1 didn't ask students to find the values of trig functions at the standard angles. As part of our discussion of students having difficulties with trigonometry in our calculus classes, it was decided to add a fourth SLO in Math 104 (to be effective next spring term): *Evaluate the six trigonometric functions at standard angles without the aid of a calculator*.

It was also noted that the results for Math 12's SLO #4 (Factor polynomials) has had consistently low results. We think that part of this is due to the "easy" start to Math 12; it was decided that we should look at the Math 12 curriculum again and see what changes we could make to strengthen the course.

In general, it was decided that we should spend some time each semester reviewing the topics covered by our SLOs, either as a review at the end of the course, or embedded within quizzes or assignments throughout the term.

The remainder of the meeting was spent discussing and brainstorming comments that faculty had made based upon their SLO results in the spring and summer terms: "Students are not doing their homework";"Students are not attending class after the drop date"; "Students seem too reliant upon notes on final exams"; "Students aren't prepared."

Another option for faculty in this section was a Curriculum workshop hosted by Curriculum Chair Debby Blanchard (Kinesiology), in room 21-171 (Advanced Technology Center/ATC). Leslie Huiner (Library/VVC Academic Senate Secretary) provided documentation. Eleven faculty attended this workshop.

Overview of Course Outline of Record – "Dotting Is and Crossing Ts: Creating Compliant and Effective Course Outlines". Topics covered: required elements of COR; optional elements of COR; course numbering system; course descriptions; units and hours; lecture and lab; requisites; advisories and recommended preparation.

Overview of Curricunet – Course Substantial Revision Process. Topics covered: cover sheet; units/hours; SLOs; methods of evaluation; instructional objectives; course content; lab content; methods of instruction; distance education, contact types; required texts; additional resources; library form; general ed.; assignments.

Discussion -- Topics covered: Q&A re: WebAdvisor; C-ID and TMC degrees; articulation.

For VVC Adjunct Faculty, space was provided in the Student Activity Center (SAC) Quiet Room for a presentation and discussion on Adjunct Faculty issues. Cheryl Elsmore (English) and Glenn Akers (Physical Sciences/Oceanography), the VVC Academic Senate Adjunct Representatives, facilitated this workshop. Trish Milhan (English) took notes.

Facts re: the AFT Union for Adjunct at VVC.

The Union is there for individual benefits, compensation, the bargaining process for a new contract, discounts, representation if discriminated against for race, sex, or religion, grievances/discipline(must act within 3 days of the incident), health care plans (not enough money to have own plan) and establishment of procedural policies.

The Union is not mandatory but all adjunct are represented by them. Dues are $30.00 for collective shop work; after that it is a choice whether to join or not.

The Union has established a Priority Hire list for adjunct; this list consists of an adjunct teaching six consecutive semesters with two acceptable student evaluations (one can be completed by a fulltime faculty)—adjunct must remind Dean's office when they need to be evaluated.

The Union contract provides for substitute teachers when an adjunct is absent from class and also ensures pay for sick days.

The Union makes stipends available for an adjunct on an academic senate committee and also will enable pay for release time for conferences if approved ahead of time.

The Union ensures adjuncts are paid for completing Student Learning Objectives according to their MOU.

The Union has an office with tools and equipment for adjunct in the Academic Commons behind the Math Lab; there is an office manager, Teri Reid, present from 9-1pm with copies of contracts adjunct may view, a bulletin board with the list of Union rights, and any news bulletins from our district representative.

Academic and Professional Matters: The Academic Senate needs more adjuncts to sit on college committees because the Senate sets curriculum policies, establishes prerequisites, degree and certification requirements for graduation, determines Student Learning Outcomes, the allocation of funds, equivalence and eminence, and shapes the VVC Course Catalogue. Furthermore, the Academic Senate has unlimited amount of faculty on committees and is open to all adjuncts who may apply for a position on a particular committee or just show up as a guest to a committee. First Academic Senate mtg. will be held in Bldg. 10-8 on Sept. 5th; all are welcome.

Shared Governance committees are made up of faculty, classified and administrators, but have a limited number allotted from each group. These committees are responsible for the educational program development, faculty roles and involvement in the accreditation process, grading policies (including waiver of course or grievances of students re: grade), petitions committee (which must follow the Calif. Ed Code), policies for faculty professional development activities, process for institutional planning and budget development, standards and policies re: student preparation and success (such as setting priority registration), processes for program review (see Theresa Shellcroft, Art History Adjunct), technology instruction, diversity, environmental health and safety, crisis assessment, distance education, and the VVC facilities. Adjunct are welcome to apply.

VVC Academic Senate 2012-14
Voluntary In-Service Day Report, August 30, 2013

Lynn Glickstein, AFT President, reports: Bargaining for new contract with a raise is at an impasse since last fall and waiting for a mediator. Every year the current contract is terminated so the process to bargain is ongoing.

Some adjunct' assignments have had 10-15 minutes added to their class time(due to holidays,etc.) without compensation; we have been told not to keep students unless college is willing to bear financial burden of paying us more proportionately.

The Union's yearly dinner will be held Oct. 16th at the Hilton Garden Inn in Victorville from 6-9pm. A full buffet dinner will be served, prizes will be raffled off, and important information will be disseminated. All adjunct and spouses are invited at no charge.

Comments from those in attendance: could business cards with Union names and phone numbers be distributed to all adjunct at the beginning of each semester; appreciation was expressed to the five officers present at meeting.

The last session of the Convocation had one structured workshop from 4:00-4:45 p.m. This final workshop was for faculty filling the discipline facilitator role, based on the Memorandum of Understanding ratified by faculty in Spring 2013. Duties and responsibilities outlined in this MOU were discussed. Lisa Ellis, Lead Negotiator/Past President, Victor Valley College Faculty Association facilitated this workshop; Carol Delong (Geography) took notes. Fifteen faculty attended.

Lisa Ellis described the sequence of events regarding the discipline facilitator MOU, and the e-mails sent to faculty regarding this MOU and the blocking of the implementation of the MOU by the CFO.

The VVC Board of Trustees has made this MOU an issue, and may try to put it on an agenda, although this is not an actionable item appropriate to the Board.

There was discussion of the grievance filed by VVCFA regarding the failure of implementation of the MOU by college administration.

The absence of disicipline facilitators in multi-discipline departments may impede completion of necessary ACCJC recommendations.

It was recommended by the group present that the 'original' departmental structure be re-enacted, as this structure enabled disciplines to complete necessary work (via the original department chairs).

As an alternative to this final workshop, Disciplines/Departments not included in the Facilitator MOU were provided this time to hold department meetings in the following spaces: 54-210; 54-212; 54-213 (this space includes small breakout rooms). Many departments and disciplines had meetings in alternative locations set up by department chairs closer to faculty offices. Some departments had already conducted their first department meeting by August 30, 2013; others had scheduled their first meeting for later in the semester. Jennifer Fowlie, Communications Center Facilitator, was on hand the entire afternoon so the center could remain open as needed.