Members Present: James Todd, Jennifer Hamilton, Deborah Laffrenchini, Bill Anelli, Mike Adams, Allan McKissick, Allen Boyer, Allen Luty (sub for Kevin Alavezos), Barbara Jensen, Bob Droual, David Boley, Michelle Christopherson (sub for Christopher Briggs), Deborah Gilbert, Elizabeth McInnes, Ellen Dambrosio, Eva Mo, Jim Howen, Lisa Riggs, Mike Morales, Paul Berger, Paul Cripe

Members Absent: Andrew Campbell (ASMJC President), Chad Redwing, Curtis Martin, Jim Stevens, Layla Spain, Travis Silvers

Guests Present: Barbara Adams, Brian Greene, Brian Sinclair (Faculty Liaison to the Board), Leticia Miller, Marianne Franco, Nita Gopal, Rob Stevenson, Ross McKenzie, Sarah Curl, Shelley Circle

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

M/S/C (J. Hamilton, A. Boyer) Move to approve the order of the agenda items.
21 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (Apr. 3, 2014)

J. Todd mentioned that due to the last meeting being robust, the minutes have not been completed and will be completed by the next meeting, Apr. 24, 2014.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

M/S/C (M. Adams, E. Dambrosio) Move to approve the Consent Agenda.
21 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Continuing Business:

1. Academic Senate Election Bylaws and Procedures

J. Todd mentioned there are different proposed revisions to the Senate bylaws. J. Todd mentioned opening up the ways the Elections are done, the ways the officer's positions (President and President-Elect) are done due to the long term commitment it is, and due to some that have stepped down rapidly out of this position.

Proposal 3, the purple packet is the current Presidential model.

Proposal 2, the blue packet would be moving terms to one year terms as President and President-Elect.

Proposal 1, the green packet has the change to a President/Vice President model. This is closer to what YFA is doing. The general idea would be a 2 year term. Most of the changes are in the rules. Nothing in the rules states that the person running for office has to have done something or have experience in a certain area in the past. It would need to be considered what kind of considerations the body would want a President or Vice President to have and those could be added to the rules.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Apr. 24, 2014, Library Basement, Room 55, East Campus
M/S (E. Dambrosio, B. Jensen) Move to approve the Academic Senate Election Bylaws and Procedures Models for a first reading.

Discussion took place.

M. Adams, as previous Academic Senate President, mentioned that he understands that there needs to be a change and that he likes that we currently have a longer commitment because compared to other Academic Senates in the state, our leadership seems to have more knowledge of what they are doing, but it is a huge barrier to the people doing it. He is leaning towards the green packet, the model with the President/Vice President, due to the idea of a longer commitment of two years and the flexibility of running again if desired or not.

J. Hamilton said there is not a presumption of change in putting these forward, but the Bylaws needed to be addressed because of the Engaging All Voices document and there were things that needed to be updated because of the leadership document change. When that situation occurred, it was at an Exec. Committee Meeting they realized they had not discussed models of leadership. These models were discussed and it was decided to put them out and see what the Senate wanted to do. It might be that just the Bylaws are updated and we come out looking the same. It’s the will of the body and how we want to move forward at this point.

M. Christopherson, as previous Academic Senate President, wanted to advocate for the President/Vice President model, where the President can run again, which is like the way YFA does it. Being Senate President is a difficult job, a complicated job, and a stressful job, but it can be fun and a fulfilling job as well. It’s complicated and takes a while to get the feel of the job.

R. Stevenson said the President/Vice President model was written with the intent that after J. Hamilton took the Presidency, if there was a change that is the point where the change would take effect. He mentioned there are two things you might want to be aware of that can be discussed:

1 – Are there a specific set of qualifications beyond what is written for an incoming President and Vice President? Are those qualifications different for the two jobs?

2 – R. Stevenson mentioned while working with the rules to create a model, he found the YFA special election cumbersome. As written in the green packet the President-Elect would assume the Presidency in case the President stepped down or became unavailable for the job. There would then be an election for a Vice President. It is a different model; he wanted to make it clear as it is being compared to the YFA model. It is up to the Academic Senate body how they would like to go about it.

J. Howen had an issue of the idea of a revolving door of a one year President and a one year Vice President. He suggested a possible compromise might be a prerequisite for running for President is either being a current president, served as a one year president in the past 5 years or a current Vice President.

J. Hamilton mentioned that J. Todd said if we discuss the President/Vice President model further, there are things that need to be stipulated about the candidacy because we wouldn’t have the presumption of the training of the President-elect.

J. Todd said that he spoke briefly with J. Sahlman prior to the meeting and J. Sahlman mentioned that if someone hasn’t been the Vice President they should have served on the Curriculum Committee at least for one year. J. Todd said it is important to have someone that knows the entire process, has worked through it, has looked at course outlines and understands all the kinds of conversations that take place. That could be something that could be added.

R. McKenzie said if the will of the campus was if the person is not eligible they would not vote for that person. In general, try to minimize the rules so you don’t have to make exceptions and trust if someone is unqualified faculty won’t vote for them. B. Sinclair agreed with R. McKenzie. There needs to be flexibility and we wouldn’t want to miss out a good candidate due to some technicality.
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Responding to R. McKenzie’s comments, S. Circle said she would be skeptical of hiring someone who is this great person who had training at another college but does not understand MJC. She thinks it would be an essential element for someone to be faculty here and to understand the faculty and the students.

J. Hamilton mentioned that the President/Vice President are two separate offices. If the will of the Senate body is to go with the President/Vice President model, it allows us to make use of some people that only want to do Vice President work and not President work.

A. McKissick said he would like to see a compromise. This is a situation where it is difficult to get good people to run due to it being such a long commitment; they are busy and have not made a commitment to the Senate. He would like to see a compromise of one or two semesters in Academic Senate first.

M. Christopherson likes refining the job description for the president. She doesn’t think that that person needs to be on the Curriculum Committee. It’s good training but not a necessity. She believes one year, at least, as a senator at MJC would be a good recommendation for a candidate. Part of the Senate President’s responsibility is to educate the Senate and the Faculty. The President should talk directly to the faculty and inform them of things. The wealth of education received at the conferences should be shared with the Senate.

L. Riggs mentioned there is no orientation for senators. With the technology out there, something could be done online so they could learn about 10+1 and Roberts Rules of Order for example. It’s very intimidating to know when to say something or how to say something. J. Todd has done a great job, but an Academic Senate President that had to learn about 10+1 on his own is very telling. She leans on the side of someone having some experience and exposure to the Senate prior to becoming President or Vice President.

J. Todd mentioned possibly at the first meeting of the year to have an orientation explaining what the responsibilities are.

J. Howen mentioned that he was convinced the President/Vice President model is needed. He mentioned a scenario of the President stepping down and the Vice President not wanting to take the President’s position, then we would have to find a president that may not have any experience. The individual running for Vice President should assume he will be President in the next term or terms down the road. If the President steps down midterm or is unable to complete his term, the Vice President should step into the President’s position and the Vice President’s name along with the President’s name will be on the next election. It should not be an option, because we will run into a problem.

J. Todd mentioned that this needs to be taken back to the constituent groups. If you have suggestions, please email him or J. Hamilton or the Exec Board to let us know what you are hearing. It’s not about us coming up with a solution but maybe there is a compromise, or if there is something you baseline want out of a president or vice president position it could be ironed out at the next meeting. If an email can be sent out it was planned to continue discussing at next week’s senate meeting.

It was mentioned due to the short timeframe and not meeting with their groups until next year, there would not be enough time for discussion this semester.

A. McKissick said due to contemplating this quickly he brought up the issue of the Green copy, the President/Vice President model. In his mind, page 1 contains a significant change. If he is reading it correctly the President might author resolutions. At one time the President could author a resolution; the body then decided they didn’t like the President authoring resolutions because of the President’s role. He felt that was a good idea. It put the body in a position to vote down something the President said we should do. It was awkward and problematic.
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P. Cripe said since it's taking us at Senate time to go through the models, the idea of emailing faculty and getting a response back in one week, he didn't see how one week would work. Second reading will be picked up in the fall.

**M/S/C (E. Dambrosio, B. Jensen) Move to approve the Academic Senate, Election, Bylaws and Procedures Models for a first reading:**
21 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

2. **Academic Senate Resolution SP014-A: Support of the City of Modesto’s Proposed Class 1 MJC Bike Path Between the East and West Campuses – 2nd Reading**

M/S (J. Howen, E. Dambrosio) Move to approve the Academic Senate Resolution SP014-A: Support of the City of Modesto’s Proposed Class 1 MJC Bike Path Between the East and West Campuses for a second reading.

J. Howen asked last time if there were any down sides or any liability and didn’t hear anything, so he thinks we should just approve it.

E. Dambrosio thinks it's a great idea and thanked B. Greene, being new to Modesto, for finding a need and working to resolve it. Welcome to MJC.

Brian Greene mentioned there won't be a change in traffic and there will be a barrier between traffic and the bike lane.

**M/S/C (J. Howen, E. Dambrosio) Move to approve the Academic Senate Resolution SP014-A: Support of the City of Modesto’s Proposed Class 1 MJC Bike Path Between the East and West Campuses for a second reading:**
21 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

3. **Unit Values Discussion**
   
a. **Academic Senate Resolution SP014-B: Senate Affirmation of the Curriculum Process – 2nd Reading**

M/S (M. Adams, B. Jensen) Move to approve Academic Senate Resolution SP014-B: Senate Affirmation of the Curriculum Process for a 2nd Reading.


M. Adams mentioned there were a few Whereas statements removed and replaced with something more general and the middle Therefore was revised also.

A. McKissick stated he is in favor of the amendment. Based on the conversation last time, there was controversy and concern and there has been substantial rewriting, and is greatly improved. It is a very important statement to make and is a better statement than previously.

The changes were pointed out and discussed.

J. Todd mentioned the amendment seems to remove most of the contentious The Whereas statements were discussed and removed the contentious out of the 2nd Therefore.

B. Anelli had a question about the Amendment in the 2nd Therefore. MJC Academic Senate directs its Executive Committee to work with the Administration and Curriculum Committee to prevent. Maybe it could be changed to help prevent or minimize disruption. Sounds like we are being told to prevent disruption, and that they are asking for something that can't be done.

*Next Academic Senate Meeting: Apr. 24, 2014, Library Basement, Room 55, East Campus*
J. Todd stated that the last meeting was tough for a lot of people. It was difficult listening to some criticisms and there was a lot of back and forth and misunderstanding; but over the last two weeks good things have happened. It is now understood by the Administration and the Curriculum Committee you can't necessarily and definitely block something from moving to the Curriculum Committee at the Dean's level. At yesterday's conversation, it was indicated that Curriculum was going to move forward with a faculty driven process to bring forward curriculum that are of any unit value and come up with a way of allowing disciplines to provide information when there are questions or concerns raised about units. He was encouraged with what B. Adams brought forward in talking about building that kind of process.

B. Adams mentioned upon looking at the research of what other colleges are doing many of them have a justification in place and not only for high units. Some colleges are attaching FTES reports like when they are proposing a new course. Upon looking at the processes of many other colleges, the last time our Curriculum Committee actually came up with a document for their review process and was approved by their committee was Sept. 23, 2008 and that was in response to the changes done in CurricuNet. In looking at this document, after not seeing it for a while, many of the things in this document were not being done so it needs to be addressed again.

In looking at the amended Resolution, in terms of talking about further disruption, B. Adams said in reality, step 5 of their approved process talks about submitting that course, updating it, sending it to the rep and then all the subsequent approvals. In the approval process it is very clear there is a Dean approval portion. She agrees with the aspect that it was a disruption of the curriculum review process based upon their document. The last Whereas of causing confusion, she doesn't think there was any confusion. There was a resolution that came through Curriculum Committee that was passed before it came forward here. Those are the two terms that are problematic to her. She likes how some things have been modified, but she believes those are two things that are still too vague or still inaccurate.

A. Boyer said in regards to B. Anelli's comment about the amended 2nd Therefore, it says "Committee to work with the MJC Administration and the Curriculum Committee to prevent any further disruption"; to him it means it is an ongoing thing. It doesn't mean they have to but will move toward that goal.

A. McKissick said A. Boyer's point is well taken regarding work with to prevent and we are all working to prevent certain things. Perhaps there wasn't so much confusion on the Curriculum Committee but there was confusion across campus among the typical faculty member. Sometimes members conversations were taking place about 5 unit classes going away, and that it's a done deal. When you stop the conversation to say there has to be the governance process, you get the reaction of So What, it's a governance process, and it won't go anywhere.

A. McKissick said as far as the Dean's signature, it has always been required, but he would disagree that it happened for this reason in the past. He mentioned briefly what happened previously when he was around for a number of Curriculum reviews where a division dean's role was to make sure due diligence was done in terms of state requirements and make sure that due process was followed in consideration. No one is saying take the division dean's signature line off and understands what B. Adams is saying but he would come at it from a different angle.

Point of Information. M. Morales asked at the last meeting if we could go back and have a history lesson so when we hear all the debates we don't catch it midstream - or 3/4ths of the way through. Let's go back to the beginning, how this all started at the legislature and work all the way through regarding anything in these classes that need to change or do something with. We would have the history so when we hear debates we know the whole playing field from the beginning to the end instead of coming in half way through.

J. Todd mentioned Curriculum Committee B. Adams did go over a small history and J. Hamilton briefly went over that history.
J. Hamilton also said we need to, as departments, pay closer attention to everyone’s degree plans because the decisions that a division makes could seriously affect and if they don’t have the big scope of awareness they could adversely impact another program unknowingly. That is the reason the Curriculum Committee has the job it has. You could go back and look at the discussion that the Curriculum Committee had about some of the Math courses that were impacting the Computer Science program, the ADT. None of us, as faculty, want to be in the position where they are dictating the success or failure of another department’s program by virtue of the class that is being taught.

Point of Information. P. Cripe said when you ask for the historical background of something it needs to be more than one person or one group stating that history because he has heard a lot of true things said and heard of a lot that’s true that wasn’t mentioned at all. The background of what’s been going on is broader than what you are hearing. He agrees about trying to find out all that’s been happening and hopes this group decides to find out and doesn’t feel one person is going to give the complete picture.

Barbara Adams said the problem is if you want historical background the brief history that was presented at Curriculum is just a small portion of what has been happening in the past. She is looking at it from the Curriculum lenses and other people are looking at it through other lens. As P. Cripe says there are some things they didn’t talk about at Curriculum because they are used to compliance and she feels that one of her major roles as co-chair is that they are in compliance, not only with Title V but also Accreditation, Standard D1, and Curriculum and Instruction.

Point of Parliamentary procedure was made by M. Adams. He thought they were at the point of talking about the amendment. He thinks that the amendment should be voted on and then continue discussing the resolution.

Parliamentary Party. Mike Morales said basically you are debating the merits of the amendment. In order to debate merits of the amendment you need to have the facts correct to be able to vote yea or nay. The amendment could be voted down based on the debates heard. Voting on the amendment right now is not a requirement because the amendment is still being debated.

J. Todd feels what is needed is a fair, collaborative, faculty-led process that can go thru Curriculum that addresses any kinds of course questions that might pertain to something like units. If he went in front of the board, and they asked questions, and they had a dissenting opinion, he would like to be able to turn to evidence: that the Curriculum Committee provided questions to that department or discipline; that department or discipline answered those questions; that it was discussed in Curriculum Committee through a process and it was still sent forward. If he was in front of the Board he could say this process was done, it is a faculty driven process inside of Curriculum. Curriculum Committee looked at all the information, answered all the questions that Administration had or faculty had and they said yes. There is no reason you are not primarily relying on Curriculum Committee for curriculum recommendations and that is really what we need. We need to make sure it is fair across the board that everyone understands what the questions are, we come up with those questions, and we approve those questions in Curriculum Committee and allow them to do that kind of work. Otherwise when he gets in front of the board and there is not that kind of process he feels there could be an acceptance of a different kind of opinion.

Barbara Jensen had a question about the Sept. 23, 2008 document, wondering where it came from and is it written in such a way that it can’t be changed?

Barbara Adams said the document came from the Curriculum Committee. It was drafted and revised and she was guessing it came forward to the Senate by the co-chair at that time saying this is a doc we came up with in Curriculum. We could all agree that you create a process and you think everything has been addressed until something comes up that wasn’t addressed in the document. Because we are not extremely specific with things, we still have the reference of it going thru all the appropriate approvals which is standard across the state and nation and yes, curriculum is a faculty driven process but also the dean, the administration and the Board of Trustees play an important role.
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Curriculum will be revising this because of issues coming up. B. Adams was debating that she didn’t believe that it was indicating further disruption of the reading process; there was a process and they were following that process. There is nothing that states that a Dean has got to move something forward; it talks about their approvals and then the approvals move things forward. She thought it was erroneous saying it was a disruption because it was part of a process that was in place.

E. Mo is not speaking for or against the resolution. She thinks the changes are good and it makes it a better resolution. She feels it doesn’t make much of a statement. She recalled something she learned from Bill Scroggins, he said, “Whenever you do anything like this be absolutely clear about what you want out of it” and she is not clear what we want out of this other than having an ongoing conversation with administration that will report back in a timely way. She is sympathetic and wants to see something more done and if this were to pass she doesn’t know if anything is really going to be solved to the satisfaction of what she is hearing and that hurt will continue to be a problem in faculty.

M. Adams mentioned several senators having voiced a desire to know the history. M. Adams spoke briefly about what happened so people could understand the context of this resolution and why it is important.

M. Adams is strongly in favor of the amendment. He thinks the amendment makes this resolution less contentious and more focused on no longer allowing disruption of the Curriculum review process.

A. McKissick said these are important questions. It supports very clearly the Curriculum Committee. There has been a disruption and we should work with the administration and the Curriculum Committee to make sure this doesn’t happen again. It left reasonable people feeling they were under duress. Where division deans will say to faculty this is what is expected and this is what you need to do, not all faculty realize it’s ok to speak up. He thinks it is an important step that we get on record and build a foundation saying that this is where we stand. Please remember that English curriculum, Math curriculum, whatever curriculum, those departments still may not get what they want in the Curriculum Committee. We are just supporting Curriculum Committee’s role and that’s necessary. He doesn’t see that senate is trying to disagree with what the Curriculum Committee wants to do. We are the stewards of the relationship between the faculty, the administration and governance. That’s our stewardship; it’s not just the Curriculum Committee’s. He doesn’t believe it happens this way. Where division deans withheld a signature, it was because of diligence or compliance. It wasn’t a division dean, it was someone above division deans who said they didn’t agree with the contact hours or number of units.

S. Curl was asked as YFA VP to deliver the following message to the senate. The YFA Executive Board supports shared governance in matters of curriculum, due process and following policies and procedures District wide.

S. Curl also spoke as math faculty regarding the issue of the specifics of this disruption. She gave her opinion of the events and said it was difficult for them to go through this and hopes that no other department or division ever has to deal with this again. If passing a resolution like this is going to prevent that from happening again then it should be passed.

Pt of information. E. Mo asked why would an administration want to do this? Is there a fiscal reason? Who would put themselves through this? What is the logic from the other side? There must be one. M. Adams said it is unknown and have asked repeatedly. They are guessing and speculating what it might be.

E. Dambrosio supports this resolution; she offered a suggestion in the 2nd Therefore. She suggested replacing the word further with future before disruption and not worry about whether it was or was not a disruption in the past but what we don’t want is a disruption in the future.

M. Adams asked for a Friendly Amendment changing the word further to future and it was taken positively with the other authors.
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L. Riggs asked when the VP of Instruction was asked why the holdup on all math courses, what was her reason.

P. Cripe said there was never a solid reason for the big shift in curriculum, but the thing that was told was that it was good for the students. When pressed on why was it good for the students the answer was there is a Math 70, 90 roadblock bottleneck and the opinion was if there is 4 units and 4 contact hours then the normal math professor that would teach those courses might be able to teach one more and that would produce less of a bottleneck. This curriculum decision would change at least their entire department, but he thinks it changes MJC. He has never been to a Curriculum Committee meeting, but nowhere in this process did he have a bad opinion about what the Curriculum Committee was doing. In his opinion, he thought the Curriculum Committee was being faced with a battle going on and they were just trying to figure out a way to deal with that battle, and follow their rules. He doesn’t believe they did anything wrong.

L. Riggs wanted to know if the V.P gave a reason because she felt like they knew the reason in their program. There is a tremendous amount of pressure coming from the state. It started with the CSUs and has filtered down to the community colleges. If a certain degree is desired, the units you should have were mentioned, and it had something to do with CI-Ds. All the departments were told where their unit cut offs were. Some people can’t do it because they are held up by courses that are prerequisites for their programs. She doesn’t know why all the Math courses were held up but it might be because of the pressure that is being discussed to cut down some of the other bad courses because they feed into other programs which cannot form their A.S.-T or a model curriculum without the help of science cutting down some units or math cutting down some units because they feed into it. Students can only transfer 70 units from a community college and anything over that they lose. When we have students that have taken 90 transferable units at a community college, they have paid for 20 units that will be dropped, not the actual course work but the units. When they go on to a CSU they are going to pay again to take courses. The state is saying they won’t do that anymore. They are saying you are a community college and you need to prepare students you have identified that are going to transfer. You need to line up your curriculum and units across the state because the state is helping subsidize all of our students. The state is not going to continue to do this for all the community colleges to determine what majors’ units are. The pressure is on the administrators and it is not a small group of people.

J. Todd said these courses are not being held anymore and will come thru Curriculum. Curriculum will develop a faculty driven, collaborative, fair process per a suggestion by B. Adams. We are getting lost in a conversation we’ve had for a year. The issues that have been brought forward are more than about a state law about CI-Ds. They are about the question of student load, student access and those are the issues in the Student Success Plan. This is our process that we can weigh in on to figure out how we want to answer the questions that are brought forward and we need to support Curriculum Committee in coming up with a plan that enables them to answer all these questions in a manner that is fair that has an entire body weighing in on. He doesn’t know what else we can do except support a faculty driven plan that allows people to present data on why they need the kinds of time, contact and units. It will then depend on a Curriculum Committee that is fully-informed about our campus and curriculum pathways: those faculty will need to make the decisions. Importantly, they will need to not only address CI-Ds, but student success, access, retention, what happens when students fail classes that are high units, and what is the opportunity cost for other classes on campus when students take a lot of units in one area and not in other areas.

This is a 2/3rds non-debatable vote.

AYES - Count was taken by raise of hands: J. Hamilton, D. Laffranchini, M. Adams, A. McKissick, A. Boyer, B. Jensen, D. Boley, E. McInnes, E. Dambrosio, E. Mo, J. Stevens, L. Riggs, P. Berger, M. Christopherson (sub for Christopher Briggs)

Bob Droual, Deborah Gilbert, Jim Howen, Allen Luty (sub for Kevin Alavezos), and Paul Cripe left prior to the Move the Question on the amendment vote.
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The amended resolution is open for discussion.

R. McKenzie explained a couple of things that happened during this academic year. Math had already put in place the curriculum of a course where the bottleneck issue was trying to be addressed at the beginning of the academic year. Toward the end this academic year, he was told by the division dean that administration had decided they would only approve a populous sequence if the course was 4 units with an optional lab. It wasn’t that their course was blocked, they were told the only circumstance that it would be approved. That was pointed out by the division dean to him and not to M. Adams, who is the curriculum rep. The chain of communication was broken. Administration shouldn’t be dictating how a course should be constructed, they can make suggestions, but to say it’s one way or nothing, it is not their place.

This is a 2/3rds non-debatable vote.

AYES- Count was taken by raise of hands: J. Hamilton, D. Laffranchini, Bill Anelli, M. Adams, A. McKissick, A. Boyer, B. Jensen, D. Boley, E. Mcinnes, E. Dambrosio, J. Stevens, L. Riggs, P. Berger, M. Christopherson (sub for Christopher Briggs)

AYES - Count was taken by raise of hands: J. Hamilton, Bill Anelli, M. Adams, A. McKissick, A. Boyer, B. Jensen, D. Boley, E. Mcinnes, E. Dambrosio, J. Stevens, L. Riggs, P. Berger, M. Christopherson (sub for Christopher Briggs)

Time for meeting was expiring. J. Todd requested that everyone to look at the Resolution for the Library. Talk about it with others and send it around; he would like it to be moved and approved in 1 reading at the next meeting on Apr. 24th. This needs to go to ACCJC by the end of the month and he would like us to support the Library in this initiative.

4. Facilities Council
5. Student Services Council
6. Instruction Council
7. Accreditation Council
8. Resource Allocation Council
9. College Council
10. FSA Discipline Specialists

B. New Business
1. Resolution SP014-C: Response to Draft ACCJC Accreditation Standards as They Relate to Libraries and Learning Support Services.

V. REPORTS
A. Student Senate – no report
B. Faculty Representative to the Board – Brian Sinclair – no report
C. Legislative Analyst - Chad Redwing – report following
D. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW)
E. Curriculum Committee - Jennifer Hamilton
F. Faculty Professional Development Committee and PDCC - Bill Anelli
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G. Distance Education Report – report following
H. Administration Report – Susan Kincade
I. President Report – James Todd

VI. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

VII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC - None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT adjourned at 5:50 pm.

"In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act and SB 751, minutes of the MJC Academic Senate records the votes of all committee members as follows. (1) Members recorded as absent are presumed not to have voted; (2) the names of members voting in the minority or abstaining are recorded; (3) all other members are presumed to have voted in the majority."
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Modesto Junior College
Academic Senate
Resolution: SP014-A
Support of the City of Modesto’s Proposed Class 1 MJC Bike Path
Between the East and West Campuses

Proposed by: Bill Anelli, Brian Greene, Noah Hughes, Elizabeth McInnes and Michael Smedshammer

Whereas: City of Modesto engineers have a detailed proposal for an MJC Bike Path that is feasible given existing infrastructure considerations <http://youtu.be/2lngAOlCFjE>;

Whereas: The proposed MJC Bike Path provides a safe, reliable, efficient transportation alternative to often-congested parking lots, facilitating access to classes;

Whereas: Bike paths are an example of modern public policy as discussed in various MJC courses (e.g. Philo 135: Environmental Ethics and POLSC 120: California Politics and Problems);

Whereas: The movement to improve bicycling options to and between MJC’s campuses is an example of civic engagement, collaboration and advocacy with both City of Modesto planning/engineering staff and citizen groups that we strive to foster in students;

Whereas: Safer, more appealing bicycle routes encourage bicycling and exercise in general, positively impacting MJC student and employee wellness;

Whereas: The MJC Mission statement includes “provid[ing] a dynamic, innovative educational environment,” and a bike path between campuses would contribute to such an environment, as has taken place at New York University, the University of California, Davis, and other bike-friendly campuses across the country;

Whereas: The MJC Values statement includes “innovation, professionalism, integrity, and responsible stewardship,” all values that readily align with the MJC Bike Path Project;

Whereas: The MJC Vision statement is to “enrich lives by challenging all students to become successful, lifelong learners who strengthen their community,” and the MJC Bike Path Project would be a source of pride as a model of
good environmental stewardship, as well as a connection between the college and the community; and

Whereas: The MJC Bike Path Project aligns with College Goal #6, which states “MJC will expand and enhance outreach to business, industry, and the community based on identified needs and opportunities,” because of the potential connection between the Virginia Corridor walking path and the proposed MJC Bike Path, as well as potential improvements to businesses and aesthetics on 9th Street;

Therefore: Be it resolved, that the MJC Academic Senate supports the City of Modesto in constructing the MJC Bike Path;

Therefore: Be it further resolved, that Associated Students of Modesto Junior College be included to gain student input and support for the MJC Bike Path and efforts to improve bicycling to and between campuses in a reliable and safe manner.
Modesto Junior College
Academic Senate
Resolution: SP014-B
SENATE AFFIRMATION OF THE CURRICULUM PROCESS

Proposed by: Paul Berger, Michelle Christopherson, Paul Cripe, Ellen Dambrosio, Barbara Jensen

Whereas: It is the right and responsibility of the Academic Senate to be involved in college decision-making in matters of curriculum, student success, and education program development; and

Whereas: The California State Education Code and Yosemite Community College District Board Policy 7-8049 requires that the YCCD shall rely primarily on the MJC Academic Senate in matters of curriculum; and

Whereas: The preeminent area in which the Academic Senate, in its role as the representative of faculty in academic and professional matters, must be considered to have primacy is the area of curriculum; and

Whereas: For a great many years the Curriculum Committee has been a model of participatory decision making, which includes MJC Administration representatives and has consistently welcomed discussion of any administrative concerns; and

Whereas: The implementation of Curricunet software had the unintended consequence of requiring the Division Dean's approval for curriculum changes, thereby significantly altering the decision making process for such changes, and doing so without consultation or agreement with the Academic Senate; and

Whereas: The unit value assigned to a course is directly related to its content and necessary contact time, and is thereby an issue of curriculum under faculty purview, and the requirement for Division Dean approval has contributed to confusion and controversy surrounding important issues relating to unit value; and

Whereas: Recent decision-making on a policy to enforce a limit on the unit values of courses has occurred without proper participatory decision-making from faculty; and

Whereas: The administration has decided to unilaterally block the normal curriculum approval process for a host of courses, ostensibly due to their unit values;

Therefore: Be it resolved, that the MJC Academic Senate asserts faculty primacy in matters of curriculum, and the role and operation of the Curriculum Committee; and
Therefore: Be it further resolved, that the MJC Academic Senate directs its Executive Committee to work with the MJC Administration to resolve any confusion concerning that committee’s operation caused by software changes, or by any Administration action that tends to obstruct the appropriate curriculum approval process; and

Therefore: Be if finally resolved, that the MJC Academic Senate President is directed to report back to the Academic Senate in a timely way regarding the resolution of these issues.

First Reading:

Final Action:

Disposition:
Modesto Junior College
Academic Senate
Resolution: SP014-B
SENATE AFFIRMATION OF THE CURRICULUM PROCESS

Proposed by: Paul Berger, Michelle Christopherson, Paul Cripe, Ellen Dambrosio, Barbara Jensen

Whereas: It is the right and responsibility of the Academic Senate to be involved in college decision-making in matters of curriculum, student success, and education program development; and

Whereas: The California State Education Code and Yosemite Community College District Board Policy 7-8049 requires that the YCCD shall rely primarily on the MJC Academic Senate in matters of curriculum; and

Whereas: The preeminent area in which the Academic Senate, in its role as the representative of faculty in academic and professional matters, must be considered to have primacy is the area of curriculum; and

Whereas: For a great many years the Curriculum Committee has been a model of participatory decision making, which includes MJC Administration representatives and has consistently welcomed discussion of any administrative concerns; and

Whereas: The Academic Senate is confident that the Curriculum Committee will continue to perform due diligence on any concern raised by faculty, administration, or staff in the process of curriculum review; and

Whereas: The unit value assigned to a course is directly related to its content and necessary contact time, and is thereby an issue of curriculum under faculty purview; and

Whereas: Recent actions by the administration that blocked Curriculum Committee consideration of certain courses caused confusion regarding all of the above; and

Therefore: Be it resolved, that the MJC Academic Senate asserts faculty primacy in matters of curriculum, and the role and operation of the Curriculum Committee; and

Therefore: Be it further resolved, that the MJC Academic Senate directs its Executive Committee to work with the MJC administration and the Curriculum Committee to prevent any further disruption of the curriculum review process; and

Therefore: Be if finally resolved, that the MJC Academic Senate President is directed to report back to the Academic Senate in a timely way regarding the resolution of these issues.

First Reading:

Final Action:

Disposition:
Proposed by: Ellen Dambrosio

Whereas: As of November 7, 2013, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) has drafted new Standards to replace the 2002 Standards without incorporating proposals given to the Commission from the Council of Chief Librarians (a group that represents librarians in the California community colleges), to strengthen the coordination of student learning among librarians, learning support staff, and discipline faculty; and

Whereas: The current Substandard II.C.2 entitled “Library and Learning Support Services” contains elements that have provided for constructive assessment of libraries and systematically improved them; and

Whereas: The ACCJC draft Standards weaken, to the detriment of student learning, the criteria used in the 2002 Standards with regard to information competency and access to library materials and services regardless of location or means of delivery; and

Whereas: The ACCJC draft Standards eliminates all reference to institutions “providing personnel responsible for student learning programs’ and eliminates the current Substandard II.C.2 entitled “Library and Learning Support Services” and places the standards now in that section under Standard II.B (Student Services);

Therefore: Be it resolved, that the MJC Academic Senate advocates for the concerns of library faculty and for reconsideration of the draft Standards by the accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) proposed at the January 2014 meeting of the ACCJC; and

Therefore: Be it further resolved, that the MJC Academic Senate advocates for the retention of the “Library and Learning Support Services” as a separate Substandard in the proposed new ACCJC Standards.
1) ACCJC Seeks Input on New Accreditation Standards

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC) seeks comments for its proposed revisions to Eligibility Requirements and Standards approved in January 2014. Comments are welcomed through April 30, 2014. According to ACCJC, “the revisions are based upon input received during the Review of Accreditation Standards and Practices that began November 2011.” To view a summary of the review process and the proposed changes, as well as to give input, visit the ACCJC website at: http://www.accjc.org/

2) The Transfer Challenge Continues: SB 1440 Update

Over five decades ago, California created a “Master Plan for Higher Education.” This plan, according to a recent Sacramento Bee article, “established public community colleges as a means to educate the state’s lower-division students and prepare them for transfer to a higher institution.” Yet, our transfer rates for students in the 112 community college system remains today at only around 40 percent. The article suggests that “the poor transfer rate stems in part from a conundrum of varying requirements and confusing pathways between schools that finally resulted in a 2010 bill, SB 1440, creating the Associate Degree for Transfer. The two-year degree guarantees admission into the California State University system as a junior and sets students up to complete their studies in four years – an increasing challenge at CSU campuses where high enrollment creates heavy demand for mandatory classes.” To read more about the complexities and challenges of the Associate Degree for Transfer outlined in SB 1440 see: http://www.sacbee.com/2014/04/14/6322011/california-public-colleges-collaborate.html#storylink=cpy

3) The Adjunct Crisis

According to a recent New York Times article, public colleges and universities “educate more than 70 percent of this country’s students” and when “burdened by rising costs and dwindling state revenues” public colleges and universities “reacted by raising tuition, slashing course offerings and, sometimes, by cutting enrollment.” However, they also “cut labor costs by replacing full-time professors who retired with part-time instructors, who typically have no health or pension benefits and are often abysmally paid, earning in the vicinity of $3,000 per course.” This article examines part-time, adjunct faculty as “invisible faculty,” because they are treated like transient workers and are given few reasons (or stipends) to engage in campus life and for this reason they “rarely participate in academic life and typically bolt from campus the moment class ends.” To accentuate the importance of “invisible faculty” issue, “a little more than half of all college faculty members are now part-timers, and they far outnumber full-time faculty members on most community college campuses.” Read more at: http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/14/opinion/the-college-faculty-crisis.html?_r=0

4) Nationwide Community College Full-Time Faculty Salaries Rise Two Percent

According to a recent Chronicle of Higher Education study, “the median base pay for full-time faculty members at community and technical colleges rose 2 percent in 2013-14. The data reflect the salaries of 26,341 faculty members at 213 institutions.” Read more at: http://chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/faculty-salaries-at-two-year-colleges-up-2-percent/75757
Curriculum Committee Report

17 April 2014
Prepared for Academic Senate by
Dr. Jennifer Hamilton, AS President-Elect, Curriculum Committee Co-Chair

Curriculum Year in Review

What CC Accomplished

- 345 courses
- 83 program awards
- 4 ADTs granted by the CCCCO
- 6 ADTs approved locally
- 53 C-IDs granted
- 132 C-IDs requested

Course Review

- 41 inactivations
- 3 “DE ONLY” requests
- 23 new courses proposed
- 272 course updates

Award Review

- 5 Skills Recognitions
- 25 Certificates
- 14 AA Degrees
- 23 AS Degrees
- 9 AA-T Degrees
- 2 AS-T Degrees
- 5 New Credit Awards Proposed
- 6 Substantially Changed Awards
- 25 Non-Substantially Changed Awards
- 5 Substantially Changed Awards
- 9 AA-T Degrees
- 2 AS-T Degrees

Legislation Causing Curricular Changes:

- SB 1415
- SB 1440
- SB 440
- SB 850
- AB 86
- SB 1070

New Discussion:

- There was discussion of attempting to recall or reconsider Resolution FL13-A “Curriculum Approval Stream”. In practice, this resolution did not offer the solution to the high unit values discussion that was initially hoped for; however, since the committee had used this resolution for a course of action, it could not be subject to a “move to reconsider” according to Roberts Rules. It was decided to just leave the Resolution on the books knowing that it probably would not be used again.

- Meeting dates and timelines for submission dates for academic year 2014-15 are posted on the Curriculum Committee Website.
Distance Education Report to Senate, April 2014

- Susan Kincade and several DE members met with an outside consultant to investigate a grant for distance education. The entire faculty was invited to this meeting. The actual grant has not been released yet so details are few at this point. The grant written by Jenni Abbott last year and our current DE plan will be being used to create this grant application.

- Peggy Fiske and Kristina Godinez from Financial Aid attended the April meeting to discuss the dropping of online students for non participation. Documenting that a student has logged into the class is not sufficient to demonstrate academic attendance. MJC must demonstrate that the student actually engaged in an academically-related activity. Last year MJC had to pay over $200,000 as our institutional share. (If students don’t succeed we have to pay part of the award these students received.) Mike will coordinate with Kristina to clarify this information for online instructors.

- Online tutoring in the Writing Center will piloted this summer.

- The Blackboard Help Desk is now open from 8:00am-8:00pm Monday through Friday.

- Mike reported that Susan agreed to a $500 Online Education Award. A subcommittee was formed to work out the details of eligibility and the nomination process.

- The Summer Online Instructors’ Institute will be held on Wednesday, June 25th from 8:30-3:30 in the Library Basement. All are welcome.

- Joshua Sigman reported that it is now possible to build forms in Omniupdate. These forms are fillable and can be emailed but do not have auto submit capability. Acrobat Pro is also another option. He will offer training in the near future.

- Work is continuing on a Student Online Diagnostic and a revised Start Here module.

- The California Community Colleges Online Education Initiative includes a plan to choose a common LMS and have a common registration system for open online courses between campuses. Until that occurs Blackboard will remain the Learning Management system at MJC.

- A discussion was started regarding the reality of craigslist and imposter cheating and methods of detection.

- The Summer 2014 Online Instruction Cohort will begin on April 28th. Applications are due April 16th. This is the last opportunity to earn the Title V stipend for these classes.

- Paying for VoiceThread with lottery money appears to be an option after all. Mike reports that we are in process of getting a Voice Thread license that can be used by up to ten users and that can integrate with Blackboard (you wouldn’t have to have students sign in, if all works correctly).