Members Present: Curtis Martin (President), Chad Redwing (Vice President), Shelley Circle (Secretary), Steve Amador (Parliamentarian), Deborah Laffranchini (Legislative Analyst), Allan McKissick, Annaliese Hausler-Akpovi, Ashley Yu, Belen Robinson, Bob Droual, Elizabeth David, Elizabeth Hondoy, Ellen Dambrosio, Eric Ivory, Hans Hauselmann, Holly Nash Rule, Jennifer Macias, Jim Howen, Jim Stevens, Kevin Alavezos, Kurt Olson, Lisa Riggs, Mike Adams, Paul Berger, Tristan Hassell

Members Absent: David Seymour, Nathan Bento, Theresa Stovall

Guests Present: Jenni Abbott, Jennifer Hamilton, John Zamora, Joseph Suratt (ASMJC – Senator of Tech. Education & Workforce Development), Kerri Stephens, Michelle Christopherson (Faculty Liaison to the Board), Nancy Sill, Nita Gopal, Pedro Mendez

Others Present: Kathy Haskin

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

No objections, the Order of Agenda Items were approved.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (December 1, 2016)

M/S/C (M. Adams, H. Nash-Rule) Move to approve the minutes of December 1, 2016.
22 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Board of Trustees Policies and Procedures: 3505, 3-8073, 3518, 3710, 3715, 3750, 3530, 3570, 3-8002, 3-8004, 3-8016, 3-8024, 3-8025, 3-8026, 3-8027, 3-8030, 3-8032, 3-8033, 3-8035, 3-8069, 3-8071, 2015, 3515, 4-8074, 5220, 6305

2. Appoint Barbara Adams as faculty representative to Instruction Office Specialist Hiring Committee.


4. Appoint Ben Riley and Claudia Puebla as faculty representative on the DSPS Counselor/Veterans Resource Center Coordinator Hiring Committee

Allan McKissick requested Item 1 of the Consent be pulled and moved to the end of the agenda.

No objections, the Consent Agenda was approved.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS - none

C. Martin mentioned due to having several visitors he wished to forego the Reports until after the presentation.

SENATE BUSINESS

B. Educational Master Plan Process and Timeline Presentation – EMP Workgroup
Members of the Educational Master Plan Workgroup (EMP) reviewed the process of creating the draft of the EMP. It included division charrettes, a faculty survey with input for the working draft with the workgroup taking that information and creating a draft which is to be presented to the college on January 23 for further review. Feedback and suggestions will be collected from faculty, staff and administrators through February 22 when the workgroup will adjust and revise the draft before a 1st reading on February 27 at College Council and a 2nd reading on March 13.

It was emphasized that this is a 5 year guided plan for measurable, institutional goals that meet the MJC mission. The priorities are tied to clear objectives and activities that will be carried out by workgroups, and giving full-time and part-time faculty, staff and administrators an opportunity to work on projects they care about and are invested in. All activities and workgroups are tied to ongoing campus initiatives.

The EMP Workgroup requested that faculty and staff take some time to review the draft between January 23rd and February 22nd. The final EMP product will govern the college and guide the direction the college takes and where the resources will be spent over the next 5 years.

V. REPORTS: Due to time constraints and the volume of work before the Senate, regular reports of the Legislative Analyst Report, Instruction Council, Facilities Council, Resource Allocation Council, College Council, Faculty Representative to the Board, Distance Education Committee, Students Services Council, Faculty Professional Development Coordinating Committee, and District Advisory Technology Committee will be provided electronically as an appendix to the minutes. Issues that arise from faculty participation in these committees need to be brought for disposition to the Academic Executive before the publication of the agenda.

a. Associated Students Senate Report – Joseph Suratt

J. Suratt reported that nominations are open for all student government positions for the 2017-2018 year through February 28, 2017.

On February 25th (east campus) and February 26th (west campus) ASMJC will be holding their annual RUSH event in the quad where all the campus clubs available will be highlighted. Taking place also on the 25th will be a FLOW event, which is the program that helps support students with a free lunch. To participate a student I.D. is required.

Pirate’s Promotion Day is planned for February 1 to help spread school spirit. To show school spirit faculty are encouraged to dress as pirates.

b. Faculty Liaison to Accreditation Council – Nancy Sill

N. Sill pointed out that the Accreditation Report draft is now available on the Accreditation website. Faculty and staff are encouraged to find the standard that applies most to their area/discipline, provide honest input and forward her or to Amanda Cannon who will be updating the draft on Thursdays at 5:00 p.m. N. Sill also encouraged anyone that has not done so to input their assessment information and encourage part time faculty to do so also. If changes are being made to online or live courses, drop a small paragraph explaining what was done to show as evidence of what faculty are doing.

c. Outcomes Assessment Workgroup Report – Nita Gopal, Chair OAW

N. Gopal reported that currently MJC is at 74% completion rate for fall 2016 but there are still many classes that need to be assessed. January 31, 2017 is the target date for fall 2016 assessments to be completed. Flex is available for those attending data entry workshops, and workshop on Friday, January 20. Regular eLumen trainings will begin in February and
the $200 stipend will continue for adjunct faculty throughout the spring semester. A document will be created that clarifies how to apply for the stipend. A booklet is being prepared that explains what this is all about and will be coming out soon.

d. President’s Report – Curtis Martin

C. Martin donated his time to M. Christopherson, for the Faculty Liaison to the Board report.

M. Christopherson reported that with three new board members things have changed and there is an openness and respect and they want to hear from all voices. The BOT have agreed to begin including in their minutes comments made in the constituent reports of a one to two sentence summary of their remarks.

During a study session on January 18th, the BOT said they want to hear things, which includes the good things taking place on campus and the problems also. Study sessions will take place on the third Wednesday of the month from 4:30 – 7:00 pm. Faculty and staff are encouraged to participate. Each study session will begin with a 15 minute presentation from faculty and staff. Interested parties should contact the Interim Chancellor, M. Christopherson or C. Martin. The topics of each study session will be posted in advance.

This is access to the board and faculty and staff need to take advantage of this opportunity.

VI. SENATE BUSINESS
A. Program Review and Assessment Cycle Proposal, 2nd Reading

M/S (H. Nash-Rule, D. Laffranchini) Motion to approve the Program Review and Assessment Cycle Proposal for a 2nd Reading.

Discussion ensued. Questions were asked: Why? How will the results be used? What will the decisions be based upon? What does it mean? What will be done with it? C. Martin stated that the document presented needed a minor correction stating that Program Review was due at the start of fall 2017 rather than the end of spring 2017.

Prior to this vote, K. Olson, E. Hondoy and J. Howen arrived, and P. Berger left.

Subsidiary Motion: M/S/C (K. Olson, E. Ivory) Move to have the Academic Senate direct the OAW Workgroup to write a proposal addressing how assessments will be used in Program Review and MJC’s planning process.

24 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

Main Motion: M/S/C (H. Nash-Rule, D. Laffranchini) Motion to approve the Program Review and Assessment Cycle Proposal for a 2nd Reading.

24 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

B. Educational Master Plan Process and Timeline Presentation – EMP Workgroup – moved up in the Agenda

C. Academic Senate Reading and Recommendations for Accreditation Standard II.A.1-7 No discussion due to meeting adjournment.

D. Resolution S17-A: Establishment of Best Practices for Online Waitlist Enrollment, 1st Reading No discussion due to meeting adjournment.

E. Implementation of Multiple Measure for Assessment Project using GPA. No discussion due to meeting adjournment.

VII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
a. ESL is the first discipline to complete ALL Fall 2016 assessments!

VIII. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS: Defining plagiarism; Use of Pre-Packaged Online Materials from Vendors; Pathways

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS – Next Senate meeting – February 2, 2017 – Library Basement, Room 55

X. OPEN COMMENTS FROM SENATORS

Comments were made about shredding. Shredding will no longer be picked up, and faculty are encouraged to purchase their own shredder and do their own shredding.

XI. ADJOURNMENT  5:45 pm

In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act and SB 751, minutes of the Modesto Junior College Academic Senate will record the votes of all 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.
Report to Senate: Distance Education Advisory Committee, December 12, 2016
From: Mary Silva
DE Senate Representatives: Iris Carroll, Leslie Collins, Mary Silva, Vacancy
Date: December 17, 2016

- June 30th will be the last day for Blackboard. A recommendation by this group to permit faculty to teach using it for early summer classes (Maymester) was declined.

- The E-Add card Workgroup recommends an end to the current system in favor of a consistent process of notification and communication with students as to how to add an online class. Feedback is encouraged and discussion will occur with Columbia before a resolution is brought to the Senate.

- Respondus may be funded. We need to hear if the faculty wants this to happen.

- There will be a $1200 stipend for those participating in the Spring Online Teaching Cohort. Mike will get this information to faculty as soon as possible.

- The portal and Hobson’s Starfish projects have started. The portal will provide a single login and password for the various online services on campus. Starfish is a kind of streamlined early alert program that also integrates with Canvas. Brian DeMoss will create a website in January to keep us up to date with ongoing developments.

- New business for Spring will include discussion of
  - Proctoring examinations on campus;
  - Replacing Turnitin with VeriCite as a more robust and less expensive plagiarism tool
All bills are at the First House (desk and policy stage) and most reported below target populations that have been identified for SSSP.

**AB 19** *(Santiago D)*  **Community colleges: enrollment fee waiver** *(Desk, First House)*  
This bill would lower the amount of unmet financial need a student needs to demonstrate to qualify for a fee waiver to at least $1. To the extent the bill would impose new duties on community college districts, it would constitute a state-mandated local program.

**AB 20** *(Kalra D)*  **Public employee retirement systems: divestment: Dakota Access Pipeline** *(Desk, First House)*  
This bill would prohibit the boards of administration of the Public Employees’ Retirement System and the State Teachers’ Retirement System, on and after January 1, 2018, from making additional investments or renewing investments in a company constructing, or funding the construction of, the Dakota Access Pipeline, as defined. This bill would require the boards, on or before July 1, 2018, to liquidate their investments in a company constructing, or funding the construction of, the Dakota Access Pipeline.

**AB 21** *(Kalra D)*  **Public postsecondary education: Access to Higher Education for Every Student** *(Desk, First House)*  
This bill would express findings and declarations of the Legislature relating to the possible impacts on public postsecondary educational institutions in this state of changes in federal immigration policies and enforcement.

**SB 6** *(Hueso D)*  **Immigrants: removal proceedings: legal services** *(Policy, First House)*  
This bill would require the department to either contract with qualified nonprofit legal services organizations, or contract with a nonprofit agency to administer funding to nonprofit legal services organization subcontractors, to provide legal services to detained individuals in removal proceedings who are not otherwise entitled to legal representation under an existing local, state, or federal program. The bill would also authorize the department to award contracts to provide legal services for nondetained individual in removal proceedings if sufficient funds are appropriated for that purpose. The bill would require the contracts awarded pursuant to this act meet certain conditions. The bill would also authorize the department to contract with organizations to provide legal training and technical assistance to qualified nonprofit legal services organizations, to provide postconviction relief services to immigrants, and to provide case coordination and placement services to ensure that all individuals in removal proceedings receive representation in a timely fashion. The bill would establish the California Universal Representation Trust Fund to accept donations from private foundations and other philanthropic entities for the purpose of expanding the number of individuals that may be provided legal services pursuant to these provisions. The bill would appropriate an unspecified sum from the General Fund to the department, and would require the department to adopt emergency regulations, for the purpose of implementing these provisions.
SB 12  (Beall D)  Foster youth: postsecondary education: financial aid assistance (Policy, First House)
This bill would require the Student Aid Commission to work cooperatively with the State Department of Social Services to develop an automated system to verify a student’s status as a foster youth to aid in the processing of applications for federal Pell Grants.

SB 15  (Leyva D)  Student financial aid: Cal Grant C awards (Policy, First House)
This bill set maximum amounts for annual Cal Grant C awards for tuition and fees, and for access costs, respectively. The bill would also provide that, notwithstanding the maximum amounts specified in the bill, the maximum amount of a Cal Grant C award could be adjusted in the annual Budget Act for that award year.

SB 25  (Portantino D)  Education: integrated K-14 system (Policy, First House)
The bill would require the Legislative Analyst to take specified actions, including recommending the expansion of concurrent enrollment programs and projects conducted pursuant to the California Academic Partnership Program and consulting with the UC, CSU, the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the Department of Education, and the Department of Finance to determine the cost of providing free access to the California Community Colleges and to create a plan for the complete integration of the state’s elementary schools, secondary schools, and the California Community Colleges, and submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the Legislature.

SB 68  (Lara D)  Public postsecondary education: exemption from nonresident tuition (Policy, First House)
This bill would exempt a student, other than a nonimmigrant alien, from nonresident tuition at the CSU and the California Community Colleges if the student has a total of 3 or more years of attendance at California elementary schools, California secondary schools, campuses of the California Community Colleges, or a combination of those schools, as specified, and the student graduates from a California high school or attains the equivalent, attains an associate degree from a campus of the California Community Colleges, or fulfills minimum transfer requirements established for the UC or the CSU for students transferring from campuses of the California Community Colleges.
At the Resource Allocation Council, Friday, January 13, the committee identified items to be funded by IELM money (2016-2017). The following process was used to identify and rank items which met the IELM criteria.

1. Program review was pulled for items to be funded (2013, 2016) and given to RAC to remove duplicates

2. Dialog occurred through the deans to establish division rankings

3. Equip, hardware, software was examined by CTC to clarify what could be funded through IELM (due to tech heavy requests). The CTC ranked items in the following ways;
   a. Rank 1: fund if resources
   b. Rank 2: not priority based on funding
   c. Rank 3: not fund

4. Discussion of institutional access and need was discussed in RAC; there was consensus to fund the following items; totalling roughly $1.2m of the $2.1 provided to MJC.
   a. Fund all items 1-4 priorities and institutional needs

- The departments whose items were identified must provide quotes and align with program review justification. Some departments will need to provide greater validation that these expenditures meet IELM criteria and ensure that expenditures do not require more money (for labor, maintenance, or software).
Outcomes-Assessment & Faculty Engagement: A Positive & Upward Movement

Being a Part of the Solution

Broadly speaking—

- We, as faculty, need to be aware of our own assessment plans/schedules.
- We, as faculty, need to “know” the nature of outcomes assessment and own it.
- We, as faculty, need to support each other and collaborate in regard to creating assessments, analyzing data, and making decisions at the course level, department level, and division level.

As faculty began to reflect on their SLO statements and test results toward the end of the fall 2016 semester, and as they began to input that information in eLumen, the engagement and completion rate went up as never seen before in such a short span of time (about ten days): We’re approximately up to 55% completion rate of the planned assessments for fall 2016.

Also, we still have time to enter fall 2016 information—our target date to complete entries for our planned assessments is Jan 31, 2017.

Faculty Questions

Q. Will there be more training in spring 2017?
A. Yes, that’s the plan—to have as many as is realistically possible without sacrificing other aspects of the OA project. Please watch for announcements.

Q. Will there be more data-entry sessions by Jan 31, 2017?
A. Yes, based on lab availability, a few data-entry sessions will be announced. Please watch for announcements.

Q. Will there be trainings for departments?
A. Yes, depending upon the request of each department, trainings can be scheduled.

Q. Will there be online training?
A. Yes, please watch for announcements.

Q. Will there be help with individual training or data entry?
A. Yes, please email your SLO coordinator

Q. When does the current cycle end?
A. In fall 2017

Q. What happens spring 2018 onward?
A. A new cycle will begin for which we’ll need to create a new assessment schedule—a new planner.

Q. If, as a department, we’ve finished assessing all our courses at least once in the current cycle, what’s the next step?
A. If your assessment calendar/schedule says “PLO/ILO Assessments,” then “mapping” will be your next step.

Q. Will there be training for mapping?
A. For mapping, it may be best for division or department reps to take the first step of checking off boxes inside of eLumen and then meet with their departments for approval.

Q. What happens after the spring semester’s data is in and mapping is completed?
A. Analyzing data that has been collected will be the next important step. This can be organized at the course level, department level, division level, or the college level.
As teachers, we **create** our SLO statements; we set our **expectations** of student learning; we **design** our curriculum; we **test** our students by trying to discover what they can actually do at the end of our course; we **enter** that information in a database; we **figure out** our SLO story; we **analyze and apply** our SLO story to further student learning.

The meaning we arrive at from such an outward journey cannot be handed to us. It’s **our journey**—internal & external. No one can walk that path for us; no one can make that meaning for us.

**What about Meaning?**

**Six Components of SLO Assessments**

- **SLO Statements**: The statements form the foundation of “backwards design.”
- **Assessment Plans**: “...specific approaches that convey how student learning will be assessed, the data collection tools and approaches that will be used, and the timeline for implementation” ([http://learningoutcomesassessment.org/TFcomponents.htm](http://learningoutcomesassessment.org/TFcomponents.htm)).
- **Assessment Resources**: “...information or training provided to faculty and staff to help them understand, develop, implement, communicate, and use evidence of student learning” ([http://learningoutcomesassessment.org/TFcomponents.htm](http://learningoutcomesassessment.org/TFcomponents.htm)).
- **Current Assessment Activities**: Projects and activities completed or currently underway
- **Evidence of Student Learning**: Results of assessment activities—examples: surveys, portfolios, institutional performance indicators.
- **Use of Student Learning Evidence**: “...the extent to which evidence of student learning is used to identify areas where changes in policies and practices may lead to improvement, inform institutional decision-making, problem identification, planning, goal setting, faculty development, course revision, program review, and accountability or accreditation self-study” ([http://learningoutcomesassessment.org/TFcomponents.htm](http://learningoutcomesassessment.org/TFcomponents.htm)).

Link for the video above (or click on the image to play): [https://vimeo.com/159024453](https://vimeo.com/159024453)

**Assignment Library for Various Disciplines to Measure Outcomes**

![Assignment Library](https://assignmentlibrary.org)