



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING  
APPROVED MINUTES  
APRIL 2, 2015**

**Members Present:** James Todd (President), Curtis Martin (Vice President), Steve Amador, Chad Redwing, Deborah Laffranchini, Adrienne Peek, Allan McKissick, Belen Robinson, Bob Droual, David Chapman, Elizabeth David, Eva Mo, James Dorn, Jim Howen, Kevin Alavezos, Layla Spain, Luis Rebolledo (ASMJC President), Mike Adams, Catherine Rasmussen (sub for Nancy Wonder), Paul Berger, Shelley Circle

**Members Absent:** Allen Boyer, Ellen Dambrosio, Jim Stevens

**Guests Present:** Ross McKenzie

- I. **MINI-LESSON** - none
- II. **APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS**

**M/S/C (A. McKissick, J. Howen) Motion to move B1 of Continuing Business to before A1 of New Business.**

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

- III. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (March 19, 2015)**
- IV. **CONSENT AGENDA**

M/ (M. Adams ) Move to pull the Curriculum Committee Review Process from the Consent Agenda.

J. Todd authorized the discussion to take place.

M. Adams began the discussion on the Curriculum Committee Review Process. He briefly went over what has taken place with the Review Process and with Curriculum Committee. He feels the process seems to be saying a proper model for our curriculum is a specific 4 year college. There are good models in the 2 year college system that could be used other than CSU Stanislaus. He stated what has been happening with their Math courses. The procedure from Curriculum committee comes to Senate because it is the Senate's job to be the next player up. The Senate is like an Appeals Court, and if the Curriculum Committee does something that is objectionable, the Senate sometimes has to say "no" and he believes it needs to be said.

Discussion took place regarding how the motion allows Curriculum Committee to override the discipline faculty, who are the experts in their field. There have been no other alternatives offered, Senate is not the experts and is not like a higher court. It is either the process or the personnel that is the problem. There was a suggestion of hearing from members of the Curriculum Committee about what is happening. The main disagreement is about what is to take place. If no agreement is made then it would either match C-ID or what CSU Stanislaus does. If there is no agreement and a course has already been C-ID approved, would it not already meet that provision or would the C-ID be looked at and have pieces picked out of the C-ID to be applied to the situation? There was some agreement that other community colleges needed to be looked at and compared rather than with a CSU. One member mentioned being a C-ID Reviewer for the state Academic Senate and has been through the training and in the documents that she was trained on stated the minimum unit value is just that. It can be more than minimum unit value, it just cannot be less. There tends to be a policy in Curriculum Committee that anything over 4 units, unless the C-ID descriptor states it can be more than 5 units, is not being approved. There are issues with the wording. C-ID sets a minimum and this would come into play if a course was being proposed with other than minimum. C-ID sets a minimum, it is not a maximum. If it is passed the way it is, clarification is needed. It should state that minimum is the standard and a rationale is needed.

A member asked if the courses were out of compliance and was told the courses will go out of compliance in the summer and brought it up at the beginning of the academic year that it was coming up in the future and was told that it was not a big deal; courses are offered on a regular basis that are not technically in compliance. There was a comment that the only issues for courses being out of compliance is that you cannot ask for new C-ID approval or new articulation but the courses can still be offered.

A member stated that Senate needs a clear discussion with the head of the Curriculum Committee to provide the context on this issue. Her opinion is it is the Curriculum Committee's job to judge our outlines. There should be a compromise; it is not just the faculty of the discipline experts who get to say everything because there are institutional considerations. They should be held accountable to the process and the standards but they do have the greater say than just the discipline faculty. She keeps hearing about the issues outside the Senate about the C-ID standards but she is not hearing about it in the Senate. We need to hear it from the Chancellor's Office here in Senate. Remember why we have C-ID in the first place. They will not allow more than 60 units to transfer to a 4 year college. They are trying to limit and move our students out of here faster and that is why the State legislature got involved. There are all those moving parts that are not heard on the Senate floor. CSU Stanislaus is a major transfer institution and we are held accountable to be equal for those students that transfer to that institution. MJC should be in line with our major transfer institutions. She is open to what the approved motion says, but not the way it is written. It is not clear enough.

C. Martin said we are not the Curriculum Committee; we approve or disapprove policy but we should not be at a place to make changes. We can say we are not happy with this or turn it down or turn it up and send it back with recommendations. Because you don't like a decision it does not mean you have to be happy with it. When you take positions here and there is a close vote we ascribe by it. We see a lot of motivations being ascribed to Curriculum members. He takes the Curriculum Committee to be the final authority of these things.

C. Martin has seen nothing that mentions the process has been denied. Ed Code and Title 5 states nothing about discipline faculty; it talks about the Curriculum Committee, and discipline faculty play no role. He has heard it mentioned of rubberstamping. If discipline faculty writes something, should it be taken into consideration or should it be rubberstamped because it is discipline faculty? There was a vote here at Senate that the Curriculum Committee is the final authority when we turned down one of the proposals.

A member requested proof that Senate cannot modify a procedure, in the Rules or other relevant authority rule anywhere. C. Martin requested proof that Senate can modify a procedure.

More discussion took place regarding the wording of the motion. The ADTs were brought up and how they changed things and how this has been considered for a year in two separate bodies. There have been several conversations with the Curriculum Committee and they have been very responsive as a committee and both sides have been heard.

S. Amador pointed out in the Academic Senate Bylaws, Article VII, Committees and Appointments, Section 1. Committees and read *Formal actions of standing committees must be ratified by the full Senate to take effect, with the exception of issues clearly specified in committees' charges on which the committee may act without ratification. Any such designation may be revoked by a vote of the full Senate.* S. Amador interprets it as the Curriculum Committee has been charged with curriculum issues and that they are responsible for their charges. S. Amador said voting against it would constitute Senate in revoking it.

It was suggested possibly requesting B. Adams to come and explain the meaning of following the C-ID or CSU Stanislaus. J. Todd will ask B. Adams to come to the next meeting.

M/S (A. McKissick, A. Peek) Move to postpone this discussion to the next meeting.

**Move to the Previous Question was made by S. Amador.**

Non-debatable, to stop debate and vote on the postponement.

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

**M/S/C (A. McKissick, A. Peek) Move to postpone this discussion to the next meeting.**

Motion was passed with majority vote.

**V. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

A. Faculty Marshals for Graduation Day, May 1, 2015

L. Spain, being a member of the Graduation Committee, mentioned that six faculty marshals need to volunteer for Graduation Day. Four to read off names and two faculty marshals to escort faculty onto the stage. One person has volunteered, so a total of five are needed. The deadline is Wednesday, April 8.

B. eLumen

J. Todd mentioned eLumen has been purchased. eLumen is a new program that will help track assessments beginning next Fall. The data and assessments will be entered beginning Fall 2015. All the CLOs and PLOs will be uploaded in the summer. J. Todd briefly went over what eLumen will be able to do.

C. BSI Coordinator Position

J. Todd mentioned that the BSI Coordinator Position has been pulled due to it being out of process. It will probably be relisted as a management position.

D. Faculty Hiring

J. Todd mentioned we were able to get the top 20 people on the Faculty Hiring list plus replacements.

**VI. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

A. New Business

1. Resolution SP15-A, Collegiality in Design for Success

M/S (A. McKissick, J. Howen) Move to approve Resolution SP15-A, Collegiality in Design for Success for a 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

M/S (A. McKissick, A. Peek) Move to approve the amendment to Resolution SP15-A, Collegiality in Design for Success, that was proposed.

Discussion took place and it was decided on a Friendly Amendment to revise the last Therefore.

**M/S/C (A. McKissick, A. Peek) Move to approve the amendment to Resolution SP15-A, Collegiality in Design for Success, to read Therefore be it finally resolved that any plan for academic and institutional reorganization that affects Academic and Professional matters should be subjected to due process through the existing, agreed upon participatory governance structure, including all relevant councils and committees, and the Modesto Junior College Academic Senate.**

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions.

**M/S/C (A. McKissick, J. Howen) Move to approve Resolution SP15-A, Collegiality in Design for Success for a 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.**

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

2. Faculty Retreat at Asilomar: August 16 – 19, 2015

J. Todd mentioned a faculty retreat at Asilomar, which would involve taking a bus to Asilomar on Sunday August 16 and returning on Wednesday August 19. There is a committee that would include members of the Executive Committee of the Senate, people from SSEC and a couple of other faculty. The idea is to think about how we can have more effective practices that address Equity and to learn about processes from major professional development groups, like 3CSN.

Someone from the Center for Urban Education, which is written in our Student Equity Plan, would also come to talk to us. There would also be time to address issues with incoming faculty.

The contract has been arranged for 100 single occupancy rooms. It will probably be on a first come, first served basis. There will be a way of working through the divisions first in terms of putting your names forward. J. Todd will announce this soon, will send out an email and then figure how to get people on board. J. Todd said he believes there are more areas in Equity where more representation is needed than others.

### 3. Institution Set Standards

This subject is something that has not been discussed as an institution very well across all the governance bodies. When our reports are given to ACCJC, an annual report form is requested which went through College Council and on to ACCJC. J. Todd briefly went over what the report asks for and we have next year to put ourselves in a place where we can get through our major self-study before the Accreditation people come in 2017. The idea is for the college to do better, not just to meet, the standards. Our information needs to be made public so our rates can be easily seen on how we are doing in terms of achievement. There need to be measurements of how we as a college are doing, not only in completion but in different groups. This is a conversation that will need to take place in the future.

4. Institutional Effectiveness Performance Indicators – postpone until the next meeting.

### 5. Engaging All Voices Periodic Review

J. Todd believes there are those that have suggestions for making changes to the Engaging All Voices document. He believes it is the DE Committee and the Tech Committee that would like to make changes. If there is any other changes please email J. Todd.

E. Mo mentioned for the DE Committee they are asking them to have eight people in this committee and you can only get those eight Senate votes if all eight people show up. They need fewer people who are better advised and more responsive to the Senate body itself to have those eight votes count but not all eight people. They would like less people but with the same amount of voting ratio.

A. McKissick mentioned that possibly we could attempt to clarify the relationship between the Academic Senate and the Councils/Committees and maybe the Administration would be amenable to it.

### B. Continuing Business

1. Resolution SP15-A, Collegiality in Design for Success – moved to #1 of New Business

### 2. YCCD Core Values

The Core Values and Guiding Principles were reduced in District Council and they requested J. Todd's input. They took everything and narrowed the categories; nothing was thrown out, just narrowed down. There was nothing following Student Success under YCCD Guiding Principles and they may be rewriting this. J. Todd will check on the status of that area. The President still wants Academic Senate to vote on this document. J. Todd would like it reviewed before the next meeting.

### 3. Program Review

## VII. REPORTS

### A. ASMJC Senate – Luis E. Rebolledo

L. Rebolledo reported that Cram Night is on Thursday, April 23, 2015. Elections should be finalized soon.

B. President's Report – James Todd – report made above at 3:50 pm

J. Todd mentioned that the Library is not happy about the reorganization. They would like to be their own division and to have a full time Dean.

J. Todd brought up there is a Student Conduct hearing on April 15 and needs to appoint someone to be on that committee. If the time is after 1:00 pm A. Peek is interested.

J. Todd requested that everyone be prepared to come on April 30 for an Academic Senate meeting.

C. Legislative Analyst Report – Deborah Laffranchini

D. Accreditation Council – Brian Greene

E. Instruction Council – Deborah Laffranchini

F. Facilities Council – Jim Howen

The student bench program has been approved for a first reading. J. Howen mentioned if there is a project, come prepared with site plans, details and pictures. They will not approve the student benches until they see that detail. The Ag Department wanted to put a new sign and was approved because they had the details and pictures. They wanted to approve the second half of a full barn and they held off on that. They have now poled that for consideration.

G. Resource Allocation Council – Kevin Alavezos

H. College Council – Curtis Martin

I. Faculty Representative to the Board – Bill Anelli

J. Curriculum Committee – Curtis Martin or Barbara Adams – Moved to the top of reports

K. Distance Education Committee – Eva Mo

L. Student Services Council – Ross McKenzie

M. Faculty Professional Development Coordinating Committee and PDCC

N. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW) – Eileen Kerr

O. District Advisory Technology Committee – John Zamora

**A. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**

**B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

C. Martin said since the college is hiring over 30 faculty, and in College Council the President mentioned she would like to bring back new faculty orientations. C. Martin is trying to sell the President on a two day new faculty orientation and so far she is sold on one day. C. Martin has told her it is difficult to try to do it in one day. J. Todd is concerned if there is the Faculty Retreat, and then three days of Faculty Orientation, it would be too much for new faculty. If it is limited to one day, please send your suggestions as to what you feel would be most valuable for new faculty.

**C. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

**D. OPEN COMMENTS FROM SENATORS**

**E. ADJOURNMENT      Adjourned at 5:44 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."

Legislative Analyst Report  
Academic Senate Legislative Analyst Debbie Laffranchini  
April 2, 2015

Current topics:

- Restructuring California's Adult Education System
  
- Implementation Update: Reforming Transfer from CCC to CSU dated February 2, 2015
  - o Both CCC and CSU have made substantial progress, with recommendations to the Legislature to set specific reporting and data requirements to ensure the segments stay on track toward achieving the goals of transfer reform.
  
- March 24, 2015: 2015-2016 Budget: Adult Education Block Grant
  - o Proposes \$500 million in dedicated funding for adult education
    - 70 consortia of school districts, county offices of education, and community college districts to support instruction in five core areas
    - Existing adult schools would receive 2012-2013 funding
  - o Creates decision-making triad
  - o Concerns:
    - Doesn't include all adult education funding
    - Allocation proposal lacks significant details
    - Allocation boards
    - Lack of clear goals and accountability
    - Allocation not necessarily proportionate to regional need
  
- March 24, 2015: 2015-2016 Budget: CTE Pathways Initiative and Apprenticeship Programs
  - o Aims to improve career pathways
  - o Reauthorizes 2005 program set to sunset at the end of 2014-2015
  - o Governor proposes extending \$48 million grant program for an additional year that would fund 19 CCC programs
  - o Justification for extending CTE Pathways Program is unclear, LAO recommends rejecting the CTE Pathways Program Extension
  - o Apprenticeship Program provides on-the-job training in a specific trade and have classroom component
    - 50,000 apprenticeships in various trades, majority in construction Trades followed by public safety jobs
    - Governor proposes \$29 million to augment apprenticeship programs which would allow CCC to use these funds for purposes other than reimbursing providers for RSI, such as developing aligned coursework, marketing and piloting new programs, and conducting studies to determine regional needs for apprentices in emerging industries
    - Concerns: Apprenticeship Categorical Program inconsistent with coordinated workforce approach

Accreditation Council  
March 26, 2015  
By Ellen Dambrosio

- ☐ Jennifer Hamilton, who, with James Todd, is co-chairing the council in Susan Kincade's absence, reported that MJC's 2015 Annual Report has been submitted to ACCJC electronically. This is a lengthy form where we reported lots of statistics on student achievement data and student learning outcomes and assessment. These data will be further analyzed and described in our full accreditation report to be submitted in 2017.
- ☐ One area of this Annual Report included institution-set standards for successful student course completion and student completion of degrees and certificates. MJC is presently meeting its goals and must now have a conversation about adjusting them upward.
- ☐ This council still needs additional members from across the campus.
- ☐ Brian Greene presented a draft timeline for getting the report written in time for the fall 2017 accreditation visit.
- ☐ Our next meeting will be Tuesday, April 7, from 8-10 am, in Sierra 235. This will be a study session to discuss each of the new standards and develop a list of what steps should be taken next.

Instruction Council  
March 24, 2015

Prepared by Debbie Laffranchini, AS Representative

- Quorum was not met so official business was not conducted
- Conversation and input for non-action item “Hiring Prioritization Instruction Council Process – Growth Positions” document
  - Instructional Outlook Report prepared by VPI and Senate looking at community needs and budget that should inform ranking and proposals
  - Three areas for ranking should be on the score sheet in some way:
    - Potential for student demand to be met by alleviating enrollment bottlenecks
    - Establishing or maintaining an innovative program driven by community needs
    - Potential for improving the overall student success at the college
  - Discussed universal data elements to be considered for presentations and scoring



Report to Senate: Distance Education Advisory Committee, March 2, 2015

From: Mary Silva

DE Senate Representatives: Iris Carroll, Leslie Collins, Eva Mo, Mary Silva.

Date: March 4, 2015

---

### **AREA I: Student Support**

1. **Student Equity Plan Update:** Brenda explained that the committee received an extension to 12/30/15 for the spending of funds. The committee is submitting an application to *Achieving the Dream* and hopes for a positive response in April. Brenda also clarified the instructional designer position that was mentioned at the college wide meeting last Friday. It is really a position for an expert in pedagogy. She also agreed to explore and share available data regarding success rates in online classes for subpopulations of our students.

### **AREA II: Faculty Support**

2. **Online Instruction Cohorts Update** – The cohort will be starting the third class soon. Mike is working on a one month Blackboard refresher course to be offered in May.
3. The third annual **DE Summer Academy** is tentatively planned for May 20<sup>th</sup>. Canvas will be a topic and Mike continued to encourage members to consider how we might contribute.
4. Mike encouraged attendance at the first **Online Ed Regional Meeting** hosted by the State Academic Senate on March 20<sup>th</sup> at the College of San Mateo
5. Faculty are encouraged to attend @ONE's **Online Teaching Conference** on June 18/19.

### **AREA III: Technology and Infrastructure**

6. **Blackboard Updates** – We will renew our contract for at least one and possibly three years. Classes older than two years will be archived in May.
7. **OEI Update:** - Mike shared his class in Canvas from the pilot at MJC in 2012. Blackboard costs us \$140,000 per year and Canvas may charge as little as \$20,000 per college. The changeover will not occur quickly and there will be training and support from Canvas. MJC will continue to use Blackboard for one to three years.

### **AREA IV: Governance, Guidelines and Budget**

8. **DE Program Review** - We need to do PR. There are issues with CurriCunet not working for non-instructional programs.
9. **Large class provisions online subcommittee update** – Eva reported that data is being gathered on state wide success rates in online classes. A survey regarding faculty experiences in online courses, load and class sizes will be distributed to community colleges.
10. **College Council** (Mike) - Mike reported on David White's "Creative Class" and the issue of minimum qualifications for faculty.
11. **Committee Membership Review** – We revised the online version to reflect current membership. Milan Motroni was welcomed as our newest At-Large member.
12. **Scheduling Future Meetings.** Mike will send out a Doodle poll to see what day and time works best for committee members.

Student Services Council

Mar. 27, 2015

By Ross McKenzie

1. We briefly discussed the proposed updates to the Student ID cards (adding either a bar code or a magnetic strip)
2. We discussed noncredit classes, and some of the problems basic skills classes would have if they moved to a noncredit modality.
3. We discussed what minor organizational changes could be made to the student services areas as part of the re-org.