



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
SEPT. 19, 2013**

Members Present: Allan McKissick, Barbara Jensen, Bill Anelli, Catherine Greene, Chris Briggs, Curtis Martin, David Boley, Deborah Gilbert, Deborah Laffranchini, Ellen Dambrosio, Eva Mo, James Todd, Jennifer Hamilton, Jim Stevens, John Zamora, Kevin Alavezos, Layla Spain, Lisa Riggs, Mike Morales, Paul Berger, Paul Cripe, Travis Silvers

Members Absent: Andrew Campbell, Chad Redwing, Estella Nanez, Jim Howen, Tina Giron,

Guests Present: Brian Sinclair (Faculty Liaison to the Board), David Seymour, Derek Cowell, Lorena Dorn, Mark Anglin, Mike Adams, Ross McKenzie, Theresa Stovall

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS (3:45 pm)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Order of Agenda Items.

M/S/C (J. Hamilton, E. Dambrosio) Move to approve the order of the agenda items.

17 Ayes
0 Opposed
0 Abstentions

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (Aug. 29, Sept 5, 2013)

The minutes for Aug. 29 were amended to show that Bob Droual and Catherine Green are now senators as opposed to guests and added as members present. Brian Sinclair was in attendance and added as a guest and added David Boley as a member present. Derek Cowell and David Seymour reported they were in attendance and did not sign in, and were added as guests. Nancy Wonder was removed as absent as she is an alternate from Allied Health.

Allan McKissick wanted to amend page 3 after the statement at the top about the MOU. Add "The intention was to inform a discussion of Engaging All Voices."

The minutes for Sept. 5 were amended to show Catherine Greene, David Boley and Paul Berger as members as opposed to guests. Nancy Wonder was removed as absent as she is an alternate and Travis Silvers was removed as absent as he attended this meeting.

M/S/C (J. Hamilton, B. Jensen) to approve the minutes as amended.

17 Ayes
0 Opposed
0 Abstentions

III. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Appoint Robert Stevenson as an adjunct to the Executive committee, 2013-2014. (3:50 pm)
- B. Appoint Kathleen Ennis as the Senate representative from Library to the Instruction Council.

M/S/C (J. Hamilton, B. Jensen) to approve consent agenda.

17 Ayes
0 Opposed
0 Abstentions

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Oct. 3, 2013

IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Continuing Business

1. Elections (At Large, Adjunct At Large)

(3:55 pm)

J. Todd mentioned that for At-Large Senator, there were 2 nominations. Mike Adams and Theresa Stovall. For Adjunct At-Large Senator, there were 6 nominations. Paul Muncy, Duane Brooks, Allen Boyer, David Seymour, Derek Cowell and Stephanie Franks.

The Ballots will be going out tomorrow, and will be due Monday, Sept. 30, 2013 by 5:00 pm.

It was discussed that possibly in the future there could be electronic elections.

2. Course Unit Values

J. Todd mentioned that since Institute Day there has been a lot of discussion with groups about course unit values. They affect: our transfer model curriculum (we can't get specific ADTs approved with our current unit values); the amounts of electives and classes students can take (if students have to take higher units, TMCs/ADTs can't incorporate breadth), financial aid for students (they are running out faster, and there are major concerns), our efficiency in moving students through programs and "bottleneck" areas (students can't enroll or get through classes, and they are stuck here), our hiring and placements of faculty (we tend to prioritize areas that are bottlenecked/have high unit values, while we have lost incredible amounts of faculty in other areas), our ability to offer more variety of courses and programs (if unit values were trimmed, we could shift the labor of teaching elsewhere to offer a more comprehensive college course schedule to meet community needs), and our PTOL (a union issue for the most part, but this can affect compensation).

J. Todd talked with Jillian Daly and Barbara Adams about having a study session. People could be brought in from other areas like our college that are doing it differently, different unit values, they could show their syllabi, discuss pedagogical strategies, and how to move more students through the program. More discussion took place about courses that are bottlenecks, more students that need to be taking certain classes than there are instructors to teach them, hiring prioritization, students having problems with Financial Aid due to having so many units.

After further discussion J. Hamilton made a motion that the Academic Senate President invite relevant experts to facilitate the conversation amongst the Modesto Junior College faculty with regard to high unit value courses and alternate structures and pedagogies.

M/S/ (J. Hamilton, L. Riggs) move that the Academic Senate President invite relevant experts to facilitate the conversation amongst the Modesto Junior College faculty with regard to high unit value courses and alternate structures and pedagogies.

Discussion took place. P. Cripe liked the suggestion that B. Anelli brought up about trying to identify the main arguments in front of the discussion. It would be much more efficient.

M/S/C (J. Hamilton, L. Riggs) move that the Academic Senate President invite relevant experts to facilitate the conversation amongst the Modesto Junior College faculty with regard to high unit value courses and alternate structures and pedagogies.

17 Ayes

0 Opposed

0 Abstentions

3. Facilities Council – No Report

4. Student Services Council – No Report

5. Instruction Council

D. Laffranchini reported that Instruction Council passed the course review flow chart for Distance Education and the online course design rubric. They talked about the Program Review Party, the last one, Sept 27, from 8 am – 1 pm.

New Business: They talked about changing the Retirement announcement for replacement positions, for this year only, from Sept. 30. The date was left open, and when the decision is finalized, a 1 year date (Sunset) would be punched in and then it would go back to the original date of Sept. 30.

Education Master Plan: The Strategic Master Plan will be done in Fall 2013 and the Education Master Plan in Spring 2014.

Accreditation: Documents are being finalized, presented to the college and mailed out on Oct. 12. The goal is to keep things streamlined and providing lots of supportive evidence.

6. Accreditation Council

J. Todd mentioned there copies of the Accreditation Response available and have been printed for review. We have two weeks to look at. J. Todd would need authorization to sign the Accreditation Report. J. Todd was hoping to have for a first reading, but it was being written and just received today and was not able to put on the agenda. If problems are found contact J. Todd know by email, D. Laffranchini is available by email if you see issues or things you would like inside the Accreditation report. Other Accreditation Council faculty members are J. Todd, J. Hamilton, C. Redwing, D. Bolter and E. Dambrosio, and will be looking for one other person on the Accreditation Council to help with standards in the future. If a special meeting is needed, to postpone for another reading, we will have to do that on Oct. 10, otherwise if passed on Oct. 3 and things look well we can do that.

J. Todd will also make sure senators get an electronic copy as well.

It is very streamlined, lots of data, very short narratives, and there are a lot of positive things in the report.

7. Resource Allocation Council – No Report

8. College Council

J. Todd mentioned that College Council talked about Engaging All Voices.

College Council also passed the RAC recommendations done over the summer. When budgets are passed from RAC and get to College Council it's good to see the information attached and knowing where all the allocations went to. The College Council minutes will reflect where the allocations went to in regards to the \$150,000. J. Hamilton mentioned that it was the one time money given to divisions and departments that was based on 2011 Program Review. Not every division and department got some of that money. Their Program Review was addressed through other means.

J. Todd also mentioned that FTEs are "down"; we are not in decline, but we are short in terms of meeting our 3% growth target. The FTEs are 300-400 short and if Spring 2014 stays the same as last year it could be 1000 short of our growth. We have increased FTEs, but we have not totally met the 3% growth. Administrators are working on improving our schedule and offerings to meet our target.

9. Program Review and Assessment

J. Todd mentioned this is also New Business. Curtis Martin is Program Review Coordinator and also looking for people that would like to be a part of Program Review Party. It would be good to talk about how we feel about

Program Review. We need to go through what a Program Review looks like, what is in this proposal and any suggestions on data being used or what you need.

C. Martin made several remarks. The document "Instructional Program Review Principles and Process" is a revision of a resolution and process approved by Academic Senate, Nov. 2006, had a 1st and 2nd reading, and College Council and Board of Trustees approval. It has been around for 7 years and we have followed the process. We are updating the process including assessment. The Senate should look at this in 2 ways. 1. Philosophical; understanding of what Program Review is, why do we do Program Review, is this what we want; and 2. What information do we need to make this college work? Program Review is supposed to be the basis for all decision making on any constituencies. It should be a guide or an aid for decision makers across the campus as they go about their duties. It is the hope that the Senate can look at this and that it meets the needs of the faculty, as well as the needs of the administrators. Deans are the best place to make decisions, as it will be up to the Deans to write the executive summaries for many of these Program Reviews, which will be the basis for communicating with different committees.

J. Todd mentioned that you need to be aware of a couple of things with Program Reviews. 1. A 5 year process instead of once a year. 2. Every division has to update their participatory governance processes this semester. Part of those processes need to incorporate a way Program Review is going to be utilized, discussed, drawn upon, to put forward budget requests and hiring prioritization. It is much more integral at the division level.

J. Hamilton made a Point of Order.

M/S (J. Hamilton, D. Laffrachini) move to approve the Instructional Program Review Principles and Process for a 1st Reading.

Discussion.

C. Martin wanted to spend some time getting anecdotal impressions of Program Review from both the Deans and Faculty. What is your understanding of Program Review, what are the problems, what do you see as things you wish were different, at a very impressionistic level?

Several of the faculty made comments regarding their own personal history regarding Program Review, their own impressions of Program Review, their own disappointments with Program Review and what they would like to see.

C. Martin mentioned they were aware of some of these things and there was a lot of frustration. They knew this about the 1st Program Review. The first year when the Pilots were finished, there were 90 hard copies sitting on his desk. The Deans were the only ones that read them. We need to find a way to communicate. 1. Participatory governance for each division. There is going to be a suggestion that when there is going to be a faculty position, include in the division meetings, a discussion of Program Review. 2. Instruction Council. When your Program Review cycle comes up, you will present a document in a presentation in front of the Instruction Council, to talk about the Program Review and answer any questions. A Rubric will be done, so that the inconsistencies that happened the first Program Review, they will know what they're looking for, we know what we want. Everything is going to take a lot of cooperation and a lot of work to get institutionalized. C. Martin mentioned his perception sees things finally coming together.

J. Todd said that every semester only about 10% of the college will be getting in front of Instruction Council to share what has happened in their program and get feedback. If red flags for your program are raised, that will help you work on it. When we talk about Program Review, it will be your department and the programs offered in your department, degrees, certificates, skills recognition and awards.

J. Todd said that we can go through these to see what is mapped out and maybe have suggestions now or later of what was left out or what you would like in Program Review. Remember data problems you've had, what will help your Deans make a better argument for something your division needs. We want to make it more useful.

They proceeded reviewing the document.

J. Todd mentioned that we use to have a category that would be a response from the prior year but would now be a response every five years. It would be narrated by the Instruction Council that could now come from Deans and Instruction Council.

S. Kincade was asked about the status of Strategic Goals. She mentioned a meeting was set for Friday, Oct. 4 to discuss.

C. Martin said that from feedback this is the most useless part of Program Review. It asked you to tweak everything to make it link to one of 10 strategic goals. It led to confusion.

M. Morales said it was linked to whatever strategic goals were set for that year and many times they weren't Instructional in nature, and didn't apply but you were being asked to link it. Many times it made no sense.

S. Kincade said the reason the strategic goals linkages had to do with ACCJC and came out with the new 4 from the old 10 and were told and shown how to Program Review links to the strategic goals of the college. They wanted to see it imbedded in the Program Review. The mission of the Program that she believes she heard President Stearns say is the Mission is the college mission but relating to the strategic goals in one form or fashion making those linkages be important.

J. Todd said the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment process will be fairly streamlined in the fact that we will get hard data and aggregated percentages for each department. They will not be automatically generated; there will be some leg work necessary. Eileen Kerr will be the chair for OAW, looking at statements and assessment part, J. Todd will help coordinate with Curtis in terms of making maps and generating quantitative and qualitative assessment data for Program Review. Now that we have a standardized process, we will have more and more aggregated data for each CLO, PLOs, GELOs, and ILOs. There will also be a qualitative narrative summary that we discuss things like modifications made, goals you have, what is noticed in your assessments, what areas needs to be relooked at, and how the assessment info tells you about how your program is doing. Departments will continue to draw on assessment data later to make resource requests.

In terms of trend analysis, C. Martin talked a discussion with J. Todd about retention rates, success rates and what that meant. We have pressures to maintain students and make them successful. We're afraid we will lose one or the other. The way we measure success is after 1st census. Anyone that drops after that counts against the success. The success code should be measured after the 2nd census after the final exam. That measures more directly; those who completed the course who were successful. That doesn't mean we can't provide those numbers. He would like to see the number that took the final exam and how many succeeded.

The drop by 75% mark was discussed. J. Todd mentioned that the second Financial Aid deadline is 60%. Having numbers after 75%; how many actually passed the course. Is that a number we would want in our Program Review? Does that tell us something else? This is something to consider. If we had a policy and we knew that one of the numbers that went into our Program Review was if we dropped by the 75% mark, we could count the people that passed or didn't pass on our final roster, we could report this number in our Program Review. We would know how we did with the students left in the class.

We might want to pass something, that if we want to make it 75%; something that we proactively do as faculty that could make a difference in terms of everybody would know what the number is after the 75% drop date.

J. Todd asked L. Dorn for her comments in terms of Non Instructional Programs and Program Review. L. Dorn said that while they do have an Instruction Component in Counseling; they do have this data, but it is a very small piece of what they do overall. Theirs is a big narrative that has numbers in it of how many students are seen. What they don't have in terms of data is research. They don't have a researcher running reports showing correlations of students interacting with their services and their success. It doesn't mean their service caused their success, but correlations would be good to know. To obtain this a researcher would be needed and told these are things they want to see, or request data that they could be use proactively. If they had reports showing what students were majoring in or who was undeclared then they could use their services in a more proactive way. In their Program Review would be a plan of what they plan to do the interventions that we plan and how we did on those things.

J. Todd mentioned that we don't have demographics of courses in every section of our division. How would you feel about wanting to incorporate different kinds of data in our Program Review. Some is already broken down. J. Todd asked Susan if it was available. S. Kincade mentioned that if everyone asked for 10 more data sets, they would be overwhelmed. There are some things that are easy to do in DataMart, it would take some training.

J. Todd asked do we really want our success and retention versus the college, does it make sense to have versus a cohort of schools or versus the State? S. Kincade said that we would want to do it regional, statewide, looking at other institutions and how they do things. YFA established a cohort, maybe Academic Senate will want to establish a cohort that they look at. Important to do. The state is comparing us to other institutions.

P. Mendez said when you compare data some will be easy to access, some data won't be as easily to access from other schools. The other thing that will happen, you will have based on specific disciplines, you have different cohorts, you will want to compare to the best programs.

J. Todd mentioned that some may not get to their Program Review that are scheduled for this semester until late due to the restructuring needed in PRNet. C. Martin said whatever we put out we can modify. He wanted to hear from faculty and from the Deans: what do you find useful or don't find useful?

C. Martin said it was very important that information we use to make decisions will be in Program Review. E. Mo would like to see change over time from a historian's point of view from longer than five years. She would like to see data sets. If she is having a hard time teaching her students to write a proper sentence, is that than different than ten years ago? That would help her.

B. Jensen mentioned that could mean connecting to other divisions possibly.

L. Riggs wants to know if what we are doing is consistent across the state with what other colleges are doing, She would like to link CTE programs that have annual reports to a template that could be used in Program Review. C. Martin brought attention to page 4, the last paragraph. *Many programs at Modesto Junior College are assessed regularly by accrediting agencies. For programs that have a regular accreditation review, the program may utilize accreditation materials as long as the program review document follows the format described in Section II.C of this document.*

J. Stevens said that the lead writer for the Program Review each semester should meet with each department prior to producing information, to clarify and how to do it, a one on one. Just before turning it in, meet again and review again, make revisions, then turn it in. Then get a follow up on the previous.

A. McKissick would like to know more about page 4, #11, Commendations and Recommendations. J. Todd said we could clear up next time.

M/S/C (J. Hamilton, D. Laffrachini) move to approve the Instructional Program Review Principles and Process for a 1st Reading

17 Ayes

0 Opposed

0 Abstentions

The conversation about Program Review would continue next meeting for a second reading.

B. New Business

1. Instructional Program Review Principles and Process Document – included in previous conversation.

V. REPORTS

A. Student Senate – no report

(5:15 pm)

B. Distance Education Committee-Eva Mo

<http://www.mjc.edu/current/student-services/waystolearn/deplanfinal.pdf>

1. Congrats to Mike Smedshammer.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Oct. 3, 2013

2. DE didn't get the last Title 5 Grant, they will be applying for another one. If you have ideas send to Jenni Abbott.
3. If there is a new Dean for the Library, DE might be put under that.
4. Last year we focused on supporting faculty and pedagogy. This year we are looking in other areas we can focus on. Thinking about Student Success in Online Environment. Please look at the site above, that is the DE plan. If you have any ideas send to Eva or Mike. If you think we should be looking at a particular direction, she is asking Academic Senate for feedback.
5. Eva asked Susan Kincade where DE fits in Engaging All Voices, and Susan said that DE should be moved from College Council to Instruction Council. She is unsure how that would work.

C. Faculty Representative to the Board – Brian Sinclair

B. Sinclair is meeting with Board Members, specifically with Mike Riley, who asked if it would be okay for all board members to visit classrooms. Sam Pierstorff had done this with Board members, and John Leamy at Colu55mbia had received 25 volunteer faculty to have Board Members visit their classes. B. Sinclair intends to do the same thing and wanted to inform everyone that was going to happen. The whole idea is to have the board members be more familiar with faculty, disciplines and facilities. What he was clear with Mike is that it would not be evaluative in any way. No one seemed to have any problem with that.

D. Legislative Analyst-Chad Redwing

Legislative Analyst Report Sept. 19, 2013 Academic Senate Meeting Submitted by Chad Redwing

- 1) **Assembly Bill 955** is currently on the desk of Governor Jerry Brown after passing both the California State Senate and Assembly. The implications for community college students are vast, including the possibility that some high-demand classes could cost some students up to 300 percent more. A recent article states that "Assembly Bill 955, by Assemblyman Das Williams, D-Santa Barbara, would create pilot programs at six severely overcrowded community colleges to see if students are willing to pay higher fees to take over-enrolled courses during the inter-session summer or winter terms rather than languish on a wait list to take the course during the traditional fall or spring semester." Read the entire article at: <http://www.edsource.org/today/2013/ab-955-college-fees/38854#.UjtLezXn9es>

YFA President Jillian Daly sent out an excellent campus-wide email today about AB 955 that includes form letters you may use to contact Governor Brown and urge him to veto the bill.

- 2) **Senate Bill 97** passed both the California State Senate and Assembly and Governor Brown is expected to sign the bill which will cover a community college funding gap caused by the dissolution of California redevelopment agencies. According to *Capitol Weekly*, "the bill, authored by the Senate Budget Committee, had been rewritten in the Assembly to allow the Finance Department to allocate up to \$100 million to community colleges by Dec. 31, 2013." Read the complete article at: <http://www.capitolweekly.net/article.php?c=11q8ssmuc48xvka&xid=11q8sctehfj1q84&done=.11q8ssmuc497vka>

- 3) **Creative Commons Licensing at California Community Colleges** has been approved by the state board of California's 112 community colleges. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education, the community college system will now start "requiring that courses, research, and other work paid for by the system chancellor's office be made available free to all users under Creative Commons 'attribution' licenses. While the system will retain the copyright on the materials, other users will be able to take advantage of them as long as the originators are properly credited." The article goes on to say that "Board members adopted the new policy this month, saying they believed the move would save taxpayers money by making works the public has already paid for widely available and by avoiding duplication of effort and expense....Before the change, if a faculty member at a California community college wrote a textbook or created course materials for a class and the work was paid for by the chancellor's office, the system retained all rights to it." Read the entire article at: http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/californias-community-colleges-shift-to-creative-commons-licenses/46665?cid=wc&utm_source=wc&utm_medium=en

E. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW)-James Todd – no report

F. Curriculum Committee-Jennifer Hamilton – to postpone report until next meeting.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Oct. 3, 2013

G. Faculty Professional Development Committee and PDCC-Bill Anelli

Bill Anelli said he will discuss the following at the next Senate meeting:

1. He is chairing/co-chairing a Flex committee and he is approving everything and would like to revisit how that is done.
2. Institute Day – maybe of a two hour meeting instead of a 4 hour all campus format

H. Administration Report-Susan Kincade

S. Kincade responded to Eva Mo's questions about the Distance Education Committee and where it reports in the governance structure. S. Kincade stated that while the college can't make any changes to EAV right now, it is important to bring all ideas forward, and question what makes more sense and how we get the most traction out of our committees and workgroups. In the spring of 2014 the college will do a self- evaluation of EAV.

S. Kincade said we made national notoriety with a video posted on YouTube. Students who were handing out copies of the Constitution on campus (on Constitution Day) were approached by security and asked to follow our process. The claim is that we violated the students right to share the constitution. The officer involved is highly regarded at MJC and has been employed with us for 10-12 years, is an Army veteran, and serves in the National Guard. MJC continues to look into its policies and processes.

I. President's Report – James Todd – no report.

VI. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

Eileen Kerr will be on the Consent Agenda as chair of OAW

VII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – none

VIII. ADJOURNMENT Adjourned at 5:45 pm (5:30 pm)