



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
APR. 3, 2014**

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

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

Guests Present: Barbara Adams, Beverly Steichen, Brian Greene, Brian Sanders, Brian Sinclair (Faculty Liaison to the Board), Eileen Kerr, James Dorn, Jaymes Michelena, Jillian Daly, Kathleen Ennis, Leticia Miller, Michelle Christopherson, Nita Gopal, Rob Stevenson, Ross McKenzie, Ruth Cranley, Sarah Curl, Shelley Circle, Cheryl Mulder, Susan Kincade (VP of Instruction)

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

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

21 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES Mar. 6, 2014, Mar. 20, 2014

M/S/C (J. Hamilton, B. Jensen) Move to approve the minutes for Mar. 6, 2014 with minor change and Mar. 20, 2014.

20 AYES, 0 Opposed, 1 Abstention – Mike Adams

The minutes of Mar. 6, 2014, under New Business, 1. Substantive Change Report, first paragraph will be corrected to show The actual report is approximately the first 3 – 30 pages.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Continuing Business

1. **Facilities Council** – no report
2. **Student Services Council** – will be discussed at #7
3. **Instruction Council**

R. Stevenson talked about why and the reasons for cancellations of meetings over the last two semesters and they were based around setting up marathon Friday meetings. The schedule was moved around at the end of the semester from Tuesdays to Fridays. It looked like a lot of meetings were cancelled but only two or three were actually cancelled. There were meetings set up just in case during Finals week this semester and last semester, and they did cancel some of those meetings.

They are in the middle of starting a new process which is the annual self-evaluation. It is being broken down in two parts: 1. Evaluate how they think hiring prioritization went, to make alterations and possibly recommendations to Academic Senate and College Council if they see issues with policy, and 2. Figure out if the charge is being met, how much has been met, how to recommend to ourselves for

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Apr. 17, 2014, Library Basement, Room 55, East Campus

next year and how to keep on track. It is the first year, and are trying to figure out how it works on a schedule.

J. Todd mentioned there is a recommendation in Academic Senate that P. Cripe and K. Alavezos be part of the Hiring Prioritization evaluation process in Instruction Council as Senate representatives. It would be good if they could be incorporated in that conversation. They can bring forth historical context to the conversation.

J. Hamilton mentioned that the Sub Change Report was also approved by the Instruction Council at the last meeting.

J. Todd mentioned he spoke briefly with the president this week and it sounds like the president is still talking with PE and trying to figure out a solution. J. Todd brought forward concerns about that position and that PE is accommodated especially in terms of Bobby Boswell and the Athletic Trainer position. It sounds like the president would like to move forward with the next two positions that were on the rankings. J. Todd will bring the information forward when he hears anything. It would be the last position she is still trying to iron out with PE.

4. Accreditation Council

J. Hamilton mentioned the Accreditation Council approved the Sub Change Report with a last revision going through, a minor change about some data. A plan was made for the October report which should be less daunting than the past as there were no recommendations from the Commission to be addressed.

They need to address their own planning agendas and a plan made for the Senate's approval for the first meeting in the fall.

5. Resource Allocation Council

6. College Council

J. Todd talked about the Hiring Prioritization. They brought back the affirmation made of the 16 positions in order. The president noted some issues with providing a position to a division that is currently experiencing the difficulties of State initiatives in terms of repeatability while trying to balance some of the issues that the Sports Medicine program needs. J. Todd argued for a solution for PE that makes everyone feel comfortable. One of the issues is Bobby Boswell might retire in the middle of the year and that poses a greater issue for PE. We need to have someone in place for him. We could look at an additional Athletic Trainer whether be faculty or classified.

J. Todd said it was asked during the meeting if all 3 positions should be made 1-year appointments. J. Todd argued for tenure-track positions. The list of the 16 positions that the Instruction Council put forward was reaffirmed, the 3 positions were asked for, and asked if there needed to be a revision to the list or if the president felt there was a different priority of the college. The president is to provide a written rationale in terms of Collegial Consultation and following the Engaging All Voices document. We are leaving with 3 positions that we know are to be filled but are unknown exactly what they are.

7. Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Plan and Student Equity Plan

J. Todd thought the meeting on Friday, Mar. 28 was a good meeting. It was a conversation he and Brenda Thames as well as many others started last year. It is not an easy thing to accomplish because there are different groups involved. There are counseling faculty and instructional faculty, apart from counseling, that need to be a part of a larger comprehensive package that is delivered for students.

One of the issues is how will the initial and comprehensive educational plans be done for the students based on the number of counselors there are. Another issue is counselors would like to maintain the integrity of their focus on the comprehensive ed plan.

One of the things talked about in the meeting was a solution. J. Todd mentioned that a Student Equity Committee needs to be reestablished. It is a mandate; it is not a choice. There is an old Student Equity plan but it is rudimentary.

A Student Equity Committee would have to be people from all constituent groups over the campus that would be looking at a variety of issues from hiring to how students are doing in programs. An email was sent to the current College Committee for Diversity and Community and he hopes to meet with them to see if they would like to take on the charge of the Student Equity Committee. They are already representing multiple groups on campus. It would formalize some of the things they are doing and they would be more integrated into different structures at the college. That plan has to be in place by the fall.

J. Todd went over the options for the Student Success and Support plan that would entail interdisciplinary faculty teams to work with librarians and counselors. An additional option was for General Ed faculty to co-teach with a counselor. The counselor would come in for part of the time and do a comprehensive ed plan and the disciplinary faculty could teach the rest of the course. Students would get connected with faculty, counselors and be assigned a librarian so they could be acclimated to the campus. The number one thing that makes a difference for student success is connections with faculty and staff.

There will be a call out during the summer for faculty who want to be involved. He felt the general consensus of the group on Friday, Mar. 28th was to move forward. The drafting of a plan for approval seems at least there is a direction. He felt the counselors were satisfied with it.

There is a company, Comevo, that could do an online orientation. It is very affordable and we can have as many modules as desired. Students can be introduced to different disciplines and what is offered on campus. It could also be a great HR tool for folks that need training.

8. **FSA Discipline Specialists** – no report

B. New Business

1. **Academic Senate Election Bylaws and Procedures**

R. Stevenson said the Exec Committee wants to start a conversation in Academic Senate where we can review the makeup on how we deal with the President Elect and the President commission. They will think about ways to present them for discussion in this body, as it is the decision of the Senate on how to have the President Elect and President serve their term.

J. Todd said he was thinking of models and wanted to present them at the next meeting. It's just to open up the possibilities for other people to do this if they want to.

2. **Fall Institute Day** – Report following

3. **Upcoming ASCCC Plenary Resolutions**

As there were no inquiries about ASCCC Plenary Resolutions J. Todd just mentioned the Plenary is Mar. 10-12, 2014 and he, J. Hamilton and John Leamy will be in attendance. He had input from Lisa Riggs and there will be discussion about possible baccalaureate degrees in Nursing which might bring up interesting questions for community colleges. He is looking forward to the debate on that subject and doesn't think anything will be decided; there may be a resolution that needs to be voted on but he wants to hear about it first.

V. REPORTS

A. Student Senate – no report

B. Faculty Representative to the Board – Brian Sinclair – no report

C. Legislative Analyst - Chad Redwing – will make the report the next meeting

D. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW)

E. Kerr mentioned there will be a meeting tomorrow, Apr. 4, 2014.

E. Curriculum Committee - Jennifer Hamilton

Curriculum items will be discussed shortly. J. Hamilton will submit a report with some details about the number of courses done with C-ID and wanted to report that Ruth Cranley has kept us #1 of all community colleges in the state as far as courses approved with the C-ID process. We are doing well as far as staying on track for both C-ID approvals and our ADTs.

F. Faculty Professional Development Committee and PDCC - Bill Anelli – Report following

G. Distance Education Report – Eva Mo – no report

H. Administration Report – Susan Kincade – no report

I. President Report – James Todd

J. Todd felt there had been misunderstandings personally of what conversations he had been involved on the curriculum issues and where he stands. He addressed the comments made in the Public Comments section at a Curriculum Committee meeting. Comments made were his opinion. He will listen to the Senate and represent the faculty body.

There was a process that was followed in Curriculum. There was a resolution made, the Curriculum Committee followed through on the resolution, voted and we are still where we are. There is curriculum that has not moved forward into the committee. He spoke to several people at ASCCC at the state level and they sent him the Bakersfield document. Bakersfield has been wrestling with trying to get ADTs done, dealing with unit values and contact hours in their courses just like other colleges. What Bakersfield did was, they started with a base line of the C-ID units or normal minimal units and departments needed to argue for or justify units beyond that, and then a rigorous discussion would take place. What we are missing is a process that allows us to work with difficult questions and ask ourselves how we want the college curriculum to look like – college wide. We have a certain amount of resources, time and questions. How does student load affects their completion at this school? How do we do better with access? What about the opportunity cost for general education in the midst of high unit disciplines? These are difficult questions. This is also a Curriculum Committee issue. We should empower the Curriculum Committee to make those really difficult decisions.

VI. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)

B. New Business (continued)

4. Academic Senate Resolution: Bike Path Proposal

M/S (E. Dambrosio, J. Hamilton) 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 1st Reading.

Discussion: E. Dambrosio referred to B. Greene. B. Greene mentioned that after working with several people on campus, the city, throughout the regional area and bicycle advocates on different ways to improve bicycling, there was a meeting last week with some city engineers, they are moving forward with the project and are looking for support from the college; maybe because it is intended to benefit the college. The city is asking individuals, organizations and especially the college to voice their support for the bike path. Since then the Modesto City Council has approved a three million dollar road resurfacing project which will pay the majority of it. Most of it should happen this summer and should be completed in September all the way from East Campus to the West Campus property.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Apr. 17, 2014, Library Basement, Room 55, East Campus

It was mentioned that if MJC doesn't have the funds to cover our portion on the college property, the city has some ideas on how to potentially cover that cost also.

B. Greene said the bulk of the path is on 9th St. The city intends to take away the right hand southbound lane of 9th Street and it will become a dedicated bike lane separated from the roadway, which is what the city approved. The bike path will be strictly on city property and the idea is to tie it into the college. There would be no maintenance fees due to the majority of it being on city property. The city would like to go out and get some grants to help make it more safe and make it more permanent between the road and the bike path.

B. Greene mentioned that he spoke to the city engineer today and the city is completely liable if something happens.

M/S/C (E. Dambrosio, J. Hamilton) 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 1st Reading.

21 AYES, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions.

5. Academic Senate Resolution: Curriculum Process and Unit Values

M/S/ (J. Hamilton, D. Laffrachini) Move to approve the Modesto Junior College, Academic Senate, Resolution: SP014-B, Senate Affirmation of the Curriculum Process for a 1st Reading.

For informational purposes the Modesto Junior College, Academic Senate, Resolution: SP014-B, Senate Affirmation of the Curriculum Process is the same document that is referred to in the Academic Senate Agenda as Academic Senate Resolution: Curriculum Process and Unit Values.

J. Todd mentioned that the Resolution that was passed in Curriculum is included in the Agenda packet. There was a discussion and a process that went through.

M. Christopherson said this is very important to her division as they have several 5 unit courses in 3 different areas. They are very concerned about curriculum. She has a lot of respect for the colleagues on the Curriculum Committee and Math Department and she believes that open discussion is always healthy and is looking forward to the 2nd reading, open issues and concerns about this resolution.

Upon being asked for clarification in the 2nd from the last Whereas regarding Recent decision-making, J. Todd referred this question to the writers of this Resolution as he was confused about the last 3 Whereas' and asked for clarification of the 1st Whereas also.

P. Cripe mentioned speaking from the standpoint of the Math Department, from his perspective, it seems the real goal is to have a maximum of 4 units for any Math course offered and a maximum of 4 contact hours. He believes this is more than just a discussion on Math 171, 172, C-ID values and pressures from the State on those programs, but is across the board. He believes there has been no proper participatory decision-making and thinks that the Senate has the responsibility to weigh in. There has been a lot of discussion but there hasn't been a discussion with the Math Department about this plan, this idea, this concept that all courses need to be limited to 4 units and 4 contact hours. He feels that it is probably the whole college, not just the Math Departments, that all 5 unit courses will have to be 4 units and 4 contact hours.

B. Anelli – Point of Information. He wanted to clarify and have a clear picture of P. Cripe's definition of proper decision-making. 1. For the Math Department, a meeting needs to be scheduled with Administration for a discussion about pros/cons and whys and 2. ask that it also be discussed in Academic Senate. He asked if having 2 different kinds of meetings is his definition of proper decision-making?

P. Cripe said he meant the 2nd one, as the 1st has been tried by both parties and it wasn't particularly effective. He believes if this concept takes place the college will have changed in a very real way, thinks

we should weigh in on that possibility, and would like these ideas to be talked about. He wants people to be aware of what's happening versus thinking they know what has been happening.

J. Todd said every administrator has curriculum under its job description in terms of Deans, Vice Presidents, and President. There are Title V regulations with Curriculum, and Senate has it under 10 + 1. The content of curriculum and the kinds of content put in curriculum is faculty driven. Right of assignment and responsibilities for resources are not necessarily only the Curriculum Committee, or Senate purview. Faculty are not the only group who get to say how we will run resources at the college. Deans have a right of assignment and the responsibilities of higher administration is crafting and dealing with resource allocation. In some ways we are talking about units, but really talking about contact time with students during the course. Contact is the resource question and the time allocated to students is what FTES are based on. If contact hours are cut it means we are cutting FTES. If there is less contact time in your classes, the way the contract is structured it would affect how many classes you teach. If you reduce a class from 5 to 4 units, you shouldn't be taking that 5 unit class and forcing it into a 4 unit class; you should be streamlining that course which means you wouldn't have as much work in a 4 unit. It is a resource question that has to do with Administration and it is a unit question that has a lot to do with faculty. Curriculum Committee does a lot of work that balances both of those things.

M. Adams, as one of the authors, wanted to make sure that the context for Resolution FL-13-A was clear. The administration's action to block the approval of courses had already occurred when the resolution was written in response. M. Adams mentioned that J. Todd brought up the concept that the contact hours are the main issue. It seems a large stretch because it is a resource of an abstract time not only does this take it so far out of faculty purview it does not need faculty input. It can be done unilaterally by administration.

B. Jensen wanted to echo M. Christopherson and agree with P. Cripe. She wants clarification and transparency. Where is this coming from, who is telling us we have to change our 5 unit classes? In regards to English, they only have two 5 unit classes, and Merced and Delta each has 3. We have fewer basic skills classes than other colleges and when our students take the writing proficiency test at Stan. State, our students are scoring higher. She does not want to lower the standards.

C. Redwing feels implicated in this resolution; it says the Senate would direct the Executive Committee to work with the MJC Administration to resolve any confusion. He is confused and finds it difficult to be one of the people assigned the task of resolving the confusion. He is hearing there is an issue that we as a faculty senate need to be more proactive on and that is the entire 5 unit debate. He mentioned P. Cripe said it is giant issue that needs to be talked about in a big way. He doesn't understand how he can help solve confusion with a software issue and a charge of obstruction. He agrees more conversation is needed about 5 units, what it means, why we would have 5, what other colleges are doing and where the push is coming from. This is more a reactive response to a specific concern. There was a specific concern about Math courses and it was blocked in Curriculum Committee. As a response the senate passed a resolution that a 2/3rds vote would override the dean's disapproval and then the courses would go on anyway. He doesn't understand why that 2/3rd majority didn't appear in Curriculum Committee and if it didn't, what is he supposed to do to make it better? He is being asked to enter into a conversation he doesn't understand.

c. Redwing is asking as a member of Exec what is he supposed to do with Curriculum Committee to solve the problem when the spirit of our body is to respect and affirm the decision making processes of the councils and committees we have established. Last meeting we affirmed the Instruction Council's decision. Now is it a Curriculum Committee's decision that he is not affirming? He is supposed to agree that it didn't pass with a 2/3^{rds} so they need to do a certain thing? He understands the big issue; he loves the idea to have a cordial collegial debate on another large issue at the state level, college level, and the student level about 5 unit courses, but he is asked not to do that but to override a vote on the Curriculum Committee.

A. McKissick said there is nothing stating that Academic Senate will override the Curriculum Committee, but it states that Academic Senate supports the role of the Curriculum Committee; he thinks the concern of the role of Curriculum Committee will somehow be undermined or not respected. There is no

reference of the 2/3rds rule and is concerned how it all came about. When CurricUnet occurred, there is a box that stops the curriculum change if the box is not checked off. There was a situation where a conscience decision was made not to check the box. As a response, there ended up with a resolution brought to the Curriculum Committee about how to deal with that. Previously there was a paper form, and it had a place for a division dean but what he experienced is that the division dean signature functioned as the administrator overseeing that the process was correct. The administrators have the role to make sure we are in compliance and overseeing the changes. You might argue there was a place for division dean's approval, there was a signature line, but he doesn't think it ever functioned this way, but it does now, a disagreement on Curriculum.

A. McKissick doesn't agree that contact hours per course is a resource allocation issue, but is a curriculum issue. There is a provision for overriding. He quoted from the policy: It has to be exceptional circumstances for compelling reasons and only then would recommendations not be accepted. This resolution supports the role of the Curriculum Committee. He thinks there might be concerns that it might not work that way. As far of the 2/3rds, he asked why 2/3rds? Why not a simple majority? He knows the recommendation came from some Senate leaders/officers at the time, who were trying to do their best with the situation. It shouldn't take any more than a simple majority for Curriculum Committee to do their business. At the time Curriculum members were deferring what the senate wanted and senate was deferring what Curriculum wanted. If the Curriculum Committee chooses not to move on with this and wants more conversation between departments, administration and senate, that is their right and he supports that.

J. Todd mentioned that he heard from other people there were errors of fact inside this and asked B. Adams to say something to the way in which the relationship with Curriculum, and what's in this resolution and that it is clear if it was a software issue or not.

B. Adams said the fifth Whereas is inaccurate saying it had unintended consequence of requiring the Division Dean's approval for curriculum changes. It is saying it was never that way before when in reality the old paper outlines did have a spot for a Division Dean to sign before it moved on. In reality, what happened today is that she recognized it had the unintended consequence of allowing faculty authors to circumvent division deans. She went over an instance that happened and it was returned for approval without going through the Dean. That had never happened before. Again, in reality, it has the unintended consequence of bypassing some important steps along the way.

S. Kincade said faculty, through the Curriculum Committee, can always submit curriculum to the Curriculum Committee. What was missing was the opportunity for the dean to have a conversation with the faculty and say we have to talk about this. For instance, if the Dean decides not to forward it, there is no reason why faculty can't send it directly to the Curriculum Committee, it goes on the agenda and it might get passed. What would happen then, as she explained to the Curriculum Committee if this process that didn't exist, she would have to go to the Board of Trustees and provide them with the information, if there was a dissenting report, as to why she had to do that; why it didn't go through the regular process that included the administrator taking a look at it and having a conversation with the faculty. The only extenuating and exceptional compelling reasons for not having 5 unit courses come through without a conversation is because we have a lot of courses and programs who really would like to have 5 unit courses; how do we maintain equity in that? It was previously mentioned that it is not a part of cost, or a fiscal issue, it actually is. There is some point where we can't say to everyone, let's all do 5, 6 or 7 or whatever, that's where the fiscal part comes in but that's where the conversation takes place on a college wide level which is the charge of the committee.

M. Adams – Point of Information. He just wanted clarification. He heard the statement if a dean refused to approve a course the faculty can put on the Curriculum Committee agenda. He was not aware of that.

S. Kincade said she was talking about past practice at a previous institution. There is a process now; the resolution was passed through Curriculum.

B. Jensen – Point of Information. If a dean is holding up a course, who is directing them to hold up the courses?

S. Kincade said she was the one directing them to hold up courses, so that we could have a process which was created in the Curriculum Committee, whereby we could be able to say we don't agree. The administration and faculty need to work together collegially to get this done. If there is a point where a dean has pulled something or has consulted with her and mentions this is going to be difficult, if it just goes through, she doesn't go on curriculum. There is no way to have a process until now where we can say the dean did not endorse this particular piece of information. The deans always consult with her prior to saying they don't endorse it.

K. Ennis wanted to say there has been talk about a process in place, and talk about the deans. Being on the Curriculum Committee it was clear to her the Math courses were held not by the dean but by S. Kincade holding them back. There was a process. It is called the Curriculum Stream and it was subverted. She is unsure about 5 unit courses but she was not unsure about the process. There was a process and it was subverted so that the new thing that had to be done in Curriculum Committee, the 2/3rds vote, was because the original process was subverted by S. Kincade.

E. Mo reported that like C. Redwing she is also confused. She explained the reasons for her confusion and why at the moment she is not for the resolution. She would like the language in the resolution to be clarified and cleaned up. She went over items in the resolution that she didn't agree with and things that she felt needed to be done to fix it. She thinks talking about different issues should be done in a manner where rules are set up and have a true collegial conversation about these courses and what we can or can't do across disciplines. She doesn't think the resolution does that or gives us that dialogue.

M. Morales – Point of information – He would like to know what changes are happening and are coming down from the State. There are reasons why things are being changed. It would be nice to hear what is happening that is causing us to have to make changes in how we do our normal routine to make sure our students succeed or reach their goal. He would like Susan to elaborate the changes that are coming down on us that we have to evolve with so our students can be successful.

M. Morales said we only have bits and pieces of the information. We need the whole picture. Let's start from the beginning and get the whole process. We need it from the beginning so we can see the transition of all the steps and nuances that happened before we make decisions based on we don't know all the facts behind it. As a Curriculum Committee member when he read the resolution he was offended. As C. Redwing said Curriculum Committee did the whole process. They followed the resolution; it was followed exactly. There needs to be something added to that resolution and add a third part because of that impasse. The deans have always been able to hold up a course. He had a course held up. It was returned to him and he was allowed to make changes. They worked together, came up with a solution and moved forward. From his tenure here those things have always happened. Quick decisions don't need to be made.

B. Anelli said he agrees more dialog is needed in the Senate. In terms of this resolution, it sounds like the issue is the Curriculum process is still unclear and that's why there is no consensus about the last Whereas discussed. It sounds like there is an easy way for all parties to agree how faculty can completely control the curriculum process at Curriculum Committee and if administration doesn't agree there is a way they can state their disagreement and bring it to the Board. He agrees with C. Redwing, he is unclear what he is being asked to do on the Exec. Committee.

S. Circle mentioned that she liked what M. Morales had to say and has spoken to S. Kincade about her concerns. S. Kincade expressed some of the constraints she is under and asked what she could do to make it better or to explain it. What faculty needs is to understand all the different things that are happening. There are so many parts to it. We need to have a big picture so we can understand. She thinks it is valuable to look at our classes and unit values. What concerns her is she feels like there is an arbitrary number that it can't come over 4 across the board no matter what class it is and that bothers her.

P. Cripe mentioned that J. Todd spoke awhile and in his opinion the discussion was phrased the way J. Todd wanted and he didn't hear the word curriculum used until Curriculum Committee was mentioned. The discussion was all about the other variables of which there are many. The truth is in handling a Math

171 & 172 issue from the state there was a point of view that came about which says not only are we going to talk about that or fix that which was a unit issue, not necessarily a contact hour issue, and it's a real issue. All of a sudden all courses had a 4 unit cap and 4 contact hour cap and nothing was going through until all were addressed. S. Kincade more or less said she held it up, not that she alone did it, but she used the word curriculum and she said there has to be a way, if there are concerns about curriculum, to address it and is holding this up. He wanted to make it clear and he is concerned. If you take Math 70, for instance, and take it down to 4 units and 4 contact hours, that is a Curriculum decision and it has not involved any of the Math department. He doesn't blame the Curriculum Committee. They followed the rules. There is something wrong. The question is what do we want our college to become? We have a reputation that is pretty hard earned in this community. It is a good reputation and a good reputation can go really fast. It is not appropriate for us as professionals to lie down and accept an idea that our college has to move in a direction that hurts our developmental students. It increases their chances of failure or reduces what they are going to learn. He is discouraged about the format of this discussion because it is not leading the conversation of the real issues, it is doing something else.

6A. McKissick – Point of Information – He is still curious as to why, given the rules and traditions of the Curriculum Committee, there hasn't been every opportunity for a conversation in the Curriculum Committee where a dean or VP had concerns. Did we used to have the opportunity? There has always been an opportunity for a conversation.

B. Jensen said one of the biggest problems that she has with this is that she is feeling directed by an Administration that doesn't know her students. If our administration really knew our students that are in our 5 unit classes that administration could never ask us to give our students less time.

It was mentioned, due to some in attendance having left, that quorum might not be available. J. Todd asked for voting members to raise their hands. 17 members were counted as still in attendance. Those that left early were: Debbie Laffrachini, Bob Droal, Jim Howen, and Greg Hausmann (sub for Kevin Alavezos).

A. McKissick made a Call to Question, J. Hamilton seconded. Non-debatable, 2/3rds vote. The vote is for the Call to Question.

15 hands were raised for the Call to Question. 2 Opposed the Call to Question – Mike Morales, Lisa Riggs

M/S/C (J. Hamilton, D. Laffrachini) Move to approve the Modesto Junior College, Academic Senate, Resolution: SP014-B, Senate Affirmation of the Curriculum Process for a 1st Reading.

15 AYES, 0 Opposed, 3 Abstentions – Eva Mo, Mike Morales, Lisa Riggs

VII. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS - None

VIII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC - None

IX. ADJOURNMENT adjourned at 6:15 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."

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Apr. 17, 2014, Library Basement, Room 55, East Campus

**DRAFT REPORT ON THE STATUS OF CURRENT FLEX AND
COMING CHANGES TO FLEX AT MJC
by Bill Anelli, March 16, 2014**

1. Which bodies are directly involved in flex at MJC?

a. Currently 3 or 4 bodies are directly involved in determining/approving Flex at MJC:

- i. YFA (per contract),
- ii. the **Senate** (Professional Development/Flex committee tasked with approving flex),
- iii. the **VP of Instruction office** (administers recording of flex (Melissa Beach) and also approves individual flex (via Deans).

b. Generally there are two ways to have a flex activity approved:

- i. Approved by the **flex committee** (for activities involving 5 or more? Needs to be clarified)
 1. Currently both staff-proposed/led and faculty proposed/led activities involving 5 or more are approved by a senate faculty flex committee composed of faculty only.
- ii. Approved by a **dean** (for activities of 1 to 3? Needs to be clarified)
- iii. Thus far I am unable to find specific documents that formally establish the above.

c. YFA contract and flex: for both instructional and non-instructional faculty

i. Total hours – how much flex?

1. The fall and spring semester each consists of two days of flex = four annual flex days in addition to instructional weeks (Article 3: Academic Calendar and Work Year, 3.1)
2. Each flex day is 7 hours for a total of 28 hours/year if non-overload. If overload then additional flex hours per each overload course are required. (Article 4: Workload, 4.1 Professional Week, 4.1.2 Instructional Faculty Accountable Time)

ii. Content – specific types of flex stipulated in the YFA contract:

1. Student advising *may* be counted towards one's flex or institutional day responsibilities (4.1.2 Faculty Advising, p. 10-11)
2. Online related flex
 - a. Completion of online course training per college DE plan may be applied towards flex obligation in lieu of column advancement credit, money, or professional hours obligation (37.4 Training and Incentives, p. 84)
 - b. Peer mentors for new online courses (37.5 Initial Online Assignment and Review/Mentorship Incentives, p. 84)

2. Flex criteria for both staff and faculty – what exactly counts as flex?

- a. Thus far I cannot find a jointly-approved document (per 10+1, signed by both YCCD and the Senate and consistent with YFA contract) regarding flex criteria. The closest I could find is the reporting document we submit to the state that is posted on the mjc flex website. Flex approval processes appear to be based on “past practice” as relayed verbally. However our flex criteria (ie, on the “flex” website) appear to be “cut and pastes” from the Chancellor 2007 guidelines and/or the ACCCJC/CCCCO. are taken directly from sources as well as the form we use to report flex to the state:
 - i. ACCCJC/CCCCO – see Appendix F
 - ii. The Chancellor’s office, Ie - Guidelines For The Implementation Adopted April 3, 1993 Of The Flexible Calendar Program Revised April 2007 – see Appendix D
 - iii. The California Community Colleges 2013-2014 Flexible Calendar Activity Submission Form. We must submit this form each year.
 - b. What counts as FLEX is *very broad* – almost anything having to do with committee work, division meetings, campus events, etc.
3. **Proposed changes by the CA/SSI Professional Development Task Force** for replacement of present FLEX with PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – see Appendix B
 4. **Estimate timeline for these new changes:** The **earliest** that the law, AB2558 by Assemblyman Das Williams (Dem) *and the* Budget Change Proposal to the Governor for 2014-2015 will *both* be in effect is **January 1, 2015**. (See Appendix A)

FALL INSTITUTE DAY a tentative plan for the Fall of 2014
per meeting with Mike Sundquist, Judy Wagner, Bill Anelli

FRIDAY

1. 8:30 to 10:30 - college wide presentations, awards, president, Chancellor, etc.
2. 10:45 – Noon - breakout session – 3 OR 4 PRIORITY SIMULTANEOUS COLLEGE SESSIONS
3. Noon to 1:30 – Lunch (Mike will look into free lunch)
4. Division meetings – 1:30 to 3:30

THURSDAY

1. four breakout sessions: a max of four concurrent sessions?
 - a. Breakout session #1 : 9 am -10:20am
 - b. breakout session #2: 10:30 am to Noon
2. Noon to 1 pm Lunch – brown bag
 - a. breakout session #3: 1 pm to 2:20 pm
 - b. breakout session #4: 2:30 pm to 4 pm
3. NO HOST GATHERING – 4 TO 6 PM.

To do:

1. send out all campus email inviting staff, faculty, administrators to suggest Institute day breakout session ideas. This will be sent out no later than Monday, April 7.
2. Based on suggestions, college needs, etc., send out a survey to everyone in order to estimate attendance at various breakout sessions. This should be sent out no later than the third week of April.
3. Using survey results, create schedule for the Thursday breakouts.
4. Question: is there money is available to bring in a speaker who could speak to learning theory/pedagogy related to instruction in teaching?

**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/21ngAOICfJE>>;
- 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;

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Apr. 17, 2014, Library Basement, Room 55, East Campus

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

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Apr. 17, 2014, Library Basement, Room 55, East Campus

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 it 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: