



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING  
APPROVED MINUTES  
SEPTEMBER 18, 2014**

**Members Present:** James Todd, Deborah Laffranchini, Bill Anelli, Allan McKissick, Allen Boyer, Barbara Jensen, Belen Robinson, Christopher Briggs, Curtis Martin, David Chapman, Ellen Dambrosio, Eva Mo, Gail Brumley, James Dorn, Jim Howen, Jim Stevens, Layla Spain, Luis Rebolledo (ASMJC President), Mike Adams, Nancy Wonder, Barbara Adams (sub for Paul Berger)

**Members Absent:** Adrienne Peek, Bob Droual, Elizabeth McInnes, Kevin Alavezos, Rob Stevenson (sub for Chad Redwing), Travis Silvers, Susan Kincade, (VP of Instruction)

**Guests Present:** Brian Sinclair (Faculty Liaison to the Board), Elizabeth David, Jennifer Hamilton

J. Todd mentioned that there will be a different version of the Accreditation Midterm Report coming out and there is time to look at the final product in a couple of weeks and give feedback. You have a current copy and an electronic copy. Look it over and if you have comments, questions or suggestions send them to Jennifer and copy him also. He suggested that Senate representatives send it to their divisions for further review. The final copy will be reviewed at the next meeting and is not going for approval at this meeting.

**I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS**

**M/S/C (E. Dambrosio, J. Dorn) Move to approve the Order of Agenda Items.**

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (August 28, 2014)**

**M/S/C (M. Adams, L. Spain) Move to approve the August 28, 2014 minutes.**

18 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 1 Abstention (Barbara Adams, Sub for Paul Berger)

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Appoint Michael Girardi as Faculty Representative to the Student Services Council.
- B. Appoint John Zamora and Mike Smedshammer as Faculty Representatives to the District Technology Advisory Committee.
- C. Appoint Chad Redwing as Co-Chair to the Instruction Council.
- D. Appoint Cece Hudelson and Paul Brogan as Faculty Representatives to Resource Allocation Council.

J. Todd mentioned that the District Technology Advisory Committee is something that M. Gang would like to resurrect. C. Redwing is gone but will take his position on Instruction Council at least by Spring 2015. In the interim J. Todd will take that position during the Fall 2014 and R. Stevenson could sub as Co-chair in J. Todd's place as needed. The position that remains open is the Accreditation Co-chair and J. Todd is working to fill it.

**M/S/C (E. Dambrosio, B. Robinson) Move to approve the Consent Agenda.**

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

**IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**A. Continuing Business**

1. Accreditation Midterm Report – 2<sup>ND</sup> Reading

J. Hamilton mentioned the section that is being added, they were trying to keep it as brief as possible, on re-reading a little more detail in some areas would help to ensure that the report passes the

*Next Academic Senate Meeting: Oct. 2, 2014, Library Basement, Room 55, East Campus*

Commission the first time around. She briefly went over the items being added. Essentially, nothing new has been composed. It's just a reiteration.

## 2. Curriculum Technical Assistance Visit

J. Todd noted that the meeting was a philosophical discussion about curriculum, and there were many issues raised in the presentation by John Stanskas, the 2013-2014 ASCCC Curriculum Chair. First, there was the issue of ADTs and the 60 unit maximum: there are mandates we need to meet. Second, there was the philosophical issue of how units in General Education locally work, especially if you have higher units in some areas. How do our courses, especially in terms of units or the time students spend in them, affect GE breadth? Third, in terms of financial aid, while ESL does not have a cap, we do need to consider the ramifications of financial aid limits and the issues that arise when students fail courses and face academic probation and problems with academic progress. In this case, higher unit courses can very much have a large impact. Fourth, what constitutes proper lab time versus lecture time, and how do we best adhere to the Carnegie Unit? Fifth, there are issues of student access to courses or areas that may be heavily congested or impede student progress.

A broad message received from John Stanskas is that curriculum is faculty driven. They own the curriculum process through the Academic Senate and Curriculum Committee, but it becomes the property of administration after it is passed by the Board.

J. Todd said the end result was it seems we need further refinement from Curriculum, given what we are facing: we need a clear process on how to move forward with curriculum that we may have questions about in terms of the structure of units and contact. Curriculum Committee is hardworking, and hopefully we can affirm a policy they collaborate on and recommend. If curriculum was ever questioned by the Board, what James needs as Academic Senate president is something that shows there was a rigorous discussion that might cover questions that administrators, faculty and the Board might ask. It would be helpful if James could point towards a rigorous process that had taken place. It would then be up to the Board to tell us why they might not accept what is being proposed.

A. McKissick noted that there are some issues. First, the Curriculum Committee's place in the governance structure needs clarification and updating. J. Todd made note of that and agreed. Second, it is the culture of the institution that any policies adopted by the Curriculum Committee come to the Senate for the consent agenda. Curriculum Committee is a standing committee of the Academic Senate.

Discussion took place regarding what took place at San Bernardino Valley College and Bakersfield College concerning the Curriculum Committee and it being a local decision. Every institution is different.

It was mentioned that some senates delegate to their Curriculum Committee. That is where specific discussion takes place and the expertise is. The problem last year was there was Administration hold on Curriculum and Administration has changed their minds on that. Further discussion took place regarding the processes. The processes are being reviewed and updated. The feeling was to have Curriculum Committee come to the Senate with the processes and it could be reviewed and agreed upon as a faculty body.

## 3. Program Review and Assessment Day

Program Review and Assessment Day is tomorrow. This is for anyone doing Program Review and Assessments or just Assessments.

## 4. Distance Education – report following

E. Mo briefly went over the DE report and made some comments. There is going to be a subcommittee, so please encourage people to join from other areas because they won't meet until more people join.

*Next Academic Senate Meeting: Oct. 2, 2014, Library Basement, Room 55, East Campus*

5. Facilities Council – J. Howen was out of town, will get notes for the next meeting.
6. Student Services Council – report following
7. Instruction Council – report following
8. Accreditation Council – have discussed all along
9. Resource Allocation Council – report following
10. College Council

College Council met, discussed new faculty orientation, reviewed policies and procedures and discussed ways to bring in new faculty, a cohesive effort between YFA, Office of Instruction and Academic Senate.

**B. New Business**

1. Student Success and Equity Committee

This will be an advisory group to College Council that will be looking at drafts of the Student Success and Support Program Plan. The Student Equity Plan will be drafted within this group. It was mentioned what the Student Success and Equity Committee is looking to accomplish. It is operating as a workgroup right now and is acting as a discussion group to disseminate information.

A. McKissick had concerns about the committee charge, membership and place in the governance structure. There is a process for developing committees, having appropriate representation on them, and bringing proposals to the Academic Senate for ratification. J. Todd acknowledged this was an issue and would report back next meeting as to how the group would properly be established and develop its membership and charge in consultation with the Academic Senate.

2. Nomination and Election of Vice President

One person has been nominated for Vice President. Curtis Martin has been nominated and the Senate is open to other nominations.

**M/S/C (A. McKissick, M. Adams) Move that nominations be closed.**

17 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

It was noted that Nancy Wonder and Jim Stevens left prior to 5:19 pm. when the motion was made.

3. Equivalency

J. Todd mentioned that C. Martin would like to wait until the next meeting for Equivalency.

L. Spain mentioned a nomination for an At-Large senator. J. Todd mentioned that we will have to send it out to all faculty for an At-Large Senator for tenure-track faculty and there is one opening.

**V. REPORTS**

- A. Student Senate

L. Rebolledo mentioned that there will be a second meeting tomorrow. They are looking at possibly collaborating with the Veterans Department in installing a plaque in the memory of Ron Tingley and are putting it on the agenda for Facilities Council. They are working on the voter registration drive, and looking for volunteers for the International Heritage Festival on October 4.

Francisco Banuelos, Dean of Special Programs, is no longer ASMJC's Dean/Advisor. Martha Robles will be their Dean in addition to her regular responsibilities. At Monday's meeting, a redistribution of responsibilities was announced; F. Banuelos will now be the Student Conduct Officer.

- B. Faculty Representative to the Board

Brian Sinclair mentioned after the last Board meeting there were interesting comments from the Board members after the meeting. A lot of what he reports to the Board is sensitive but he did express some concern about the attitude of the Board towards the Math Department and there was some agreement. He wants to encourage anyone that has concerns to contact him about how they are feeling and has been asked by Board members for help in understanding campus climate and how people are feeling. Information obtained by the Board is by study sessions, Board meetings and Brian's own information.

Upon being asked if it was inappropriate to talk to the board the response was: there are processes and you need to go through proper channels. If the processes break down and you went to your leader and that didn't work and went to their leader and it didn't work, then the Board could be contacted. It might be better to talk to Brian first. It is his job to talk to the Board. This is technically his last semester of a two-year term.

- C. Legislative Analyst – no report
- D. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW) – no report
- E. Curriculum Committee - covered
- F. Faculty Professional Development Committee and PDCC

B. Anelli said they met and had a discussion where the office could be. They could be in the Library Basement. At the state level, he is having a hard time finding out about the new standards for flex. He is getting ready to start on Institute Day.

- G. Distance Education Report – covered
- H. Administration Report – no report
- I. President's Report

James Todd said we are mandated to have a Student Equity Committee and is looking forward to bringing back ideas how it is codified.

Today there was another meeting with CSU – GE Pathways about General Education. There are great possibilities of developing structured "pathways" for students in GE. Students would be asked to take 2-3 courses at MJC in GE, be part of a cohort that included interdisciplinary events such as talks or discussions, and would complete two courses at CSU Stanislaus and be eligible for a Minor in a GE area. This could help with student success, educational planning, and more. James, Rob Stevenson, Curtis Martin, Bill Anelli and Jennifer Hamilton will continue to foster this idea and meet with CSU faculty this year.

**VI. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**

**VII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC - None**

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT adjourned at 5:35 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."

## Report to Senate: Distance Education Advisory Committee, September 8, 2014

From: Iris B. Carroll

DE Senate Representatives: Iris Carroll, Mary Silva, Eva Mo

Date: September 17, 2014

### 1. Large Online Course Issue

Eva Mo brought the issue of large online courses from the Senate. There was a lengthy discussion regarding the concerns regarding implementation attempts during the summer and fall. The main questions were about process (how and why were there attempts to make single shells into doubles adding 25% more students to the shells)?; why was DE not part of this decision making process?; what are the implications regarding success rates, retention rates, and the pedagogical goals as expressed in the DE master plan, the certification process, and the general approach to online teaching that the DE committee has adhered to. DE committee members attempted to hammer out the various positions.

Question: Can administrators take two single online classes, and marry them into a single shell, turning it into a double, and add 25% more students, without instructor consent? What are the implications of this?

#### YES

Online classes should be treated like live courses. This is an issue of fairness.

Online instructors are getting away with less work when they marry two single shells into one, unlike live professors, they don't have to take on an extra 25% student load.

The College is trying to make our courses more efficient, and online classes that are married into one that do not take on an extra 25% student load is inefficient. Some other colleges have a higher online load than MJC.

When we use doubles, triples and quads, the division is compensated for it. This supports the division further.

This is not the purview of DE or Senate, because it is a load and contractual issue.

The DE does not advise the Senate, it advises directly to the Instruction Council.

#### NO

Online classes are evaluated, judged, and pedagogically different than f2f classes. They should not be treated exactly the same. It is a false analogy.

Online courses require more one on one interaction between professor and student. Marrying singles into one shell does save time (dealing with technological and digital environment) but it does so to deal with the increased individual contact hours required to be successful in an online format.

The DE advises all bodies regarding Distance Ed issues. And the Senate is and should be part of the discussion when it comes to academic and professional issues. The YFA has a representative on DE and therefore load is also an issue that DE can and should address.

Engaging all Voices map of council and committees shows DE committee linked to College Council with the Senate engaged with the committees.

There is a sense of urgency, as there is anticipation that we will have double online classes by Spring 2015 . Yet, there was overall agreement that this is a complex conversation. It was recommended that an appropriate role for this committee could be to identify the issues that need to be explored. For example, where does this touch on academic/professional matters; what is equal/equitable; etc. A sub-committee will be created to address this issue. It includes the following members so far: Eva Mo, Leslie Collins, Laura Monza, Susan Kincade. In addition, YFA has been in contact with the administration over this issue. Administration agreed that no faculty member would be forced to turn their classes into a double. However, there is a fear that once the schedule is created right of assignment may allow the dean to assign the class to someone else who is willing to teach it as a double. Also, Mike Smedshammer will ask for clarification regarding who the Distance Education Advisory Committee advises.

## 2. Online Education Initiative

We moved on to OEI Update: <http://ccconlineed.org/> - OEI is funded by the Governor with the aim of fixing our online programs in CA. There is a lot of money (\$16 million). Pat James is in the full-time leadership position of this initiative. The initiative has three branches: common assessment to place students in courses across all colleges, articulation will be centralized, and online courses will use a common Course Management System. The CMS will be decided this fall. There is a concern that we could see a net loss at MJC. OEI has a course design rubric that looks very much like ours. Mike Smedshammer was on the committee that worked to design the OEI course design rubric. Instructors will apply to have their courses in the consortium of statewide online courses. We pondered practical application issues such as wondering if we will need to standardize enrollment dates between colleges.

## 3. Accreditation Midterm Report

The rest of the meeting was spent updating the DE Plan and checking off accomplishments for the Mid-Term Accreditation Report. Many of the DE goals have been met, but there seem to be a consensus that DE is still suffering from lack of funding and support. Mike Smedshammer is updating the plan. There are several goals that we could not meet due to lack of staffing.

## 4. We were disappointed to learn that we did not receive the DE grant that we applied for last spring.

Sam Young has joined the council. Does anyone know what stakeholders he represents?

We discussed COLSK 100, the college skills class currently being taught under the auspices of the FYE program. There is hope that the class will be offered during the summer of 2015.

We discussed a new category of employee: Academic Success Coaches (name subject to change). These individuals would help students navigate through their educational experiences. This is something many counselors do, but they are overqualified for this, and their talents are best used elsewhere. We talked about the potential tasks of these employees, and what qualifications they would need.

We will review our charge and evaluate our effectiveness at our next meeting.

We will also be looking at policy changes regarding the student handbook.

Instruction Council Report  
Prepared by Debbie Laffranchini  
September 16, 2014 Meeting

- Instruction Council will look at the Faculty Hiring Prioritization rubric at 9/30 meeting
- 2014 Midterm Report will be available Monday, 9/22
- Enrollment Management Committee, a sub-committee of Instruction Council has suggested campus-wide representation:
  - o VP instruction
  - o VP Student Services
  - o VP College Administrative Services
  - o Deans (include CTE and Student Services)
  - o Research analyst
  - o Marketing
  - o CSEA (including someone who works in enrollment)
  - o Academic Senate
  - o YFA
  - o ASMJC
  - o ***The key element the Committee will address is communication***
    - *Do we understand our process?*
    - *When we are given targets, how do we address them?*
    - *Report back to Student Services Council and Instruction Council*
- Student Report spoke about success of Club Rush, upcoming Constitution Day activities.

*Next Academic Senate Meeting: Oct. 2, 2014, Library Basement, Room 55, East Campus*



In summary:

- Jennifer Hamilton presented the Accreditation Mid-Term Report for the first portion of the meeting.
- The remainder of the meeting was devoted to reviewing and clarifying the DRAFT Evaluation report that was conducted at the final RAC meeting in spring 2014.
  - o At the end of the spring 2014 semester, VP Albert Alt, conducted a year-end evaluation with RAC members. VP Alt then created a DRAFT evaluation report based on the final RAC meeting of spring 2014. RAC members reviewed the DRAFT evaluation and provided clarification to areas that were not clearly articulated in the DRAFT report.

NO actions were taken.

NO recommendations forwarded to the College Council.