



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
MARCH 19, 2015**

Members Present: James Todd (President) by phone, Curtis Martin (Vice President), Steve Amador, Chad Redwing, Deborah Laffranchini, Adrienne Peek, Allan McKissick, Allen Boyer, Bob Droual, David Chapman, Ellen Dambrosio, Eva Mo, James Dorn, Jim Howen, Kevin Alavezos, Layla Spain, Mike Adams, Nancy Wonder, Paul Berger

Members Absent: Belen Robinson, Elizabeth David, Jim Stevens, Luis Rebolledo (ASMJC President),

Guests Present: Ross McKenzie, Eileen Kerr

I. MINI-LESSON - none

II. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

S. Amador made a motion to move the President's Report to 3:50 pm, as J. Todd will call in to make the President's Report at a predetermined time. There were no objections. Motion Carried.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (March 5, 2015)

There being no changes or objections to the minutes for March 5, 2015 the minutes were approved.

Presidents Report – moved up from VII. REPORTS

J. Todd mentioned at the College Council Meeting on Monday, March 16, 2015 the President pulled the idea for Design for Success due to us not being ready for transformational change. There were not a lot of people that wanted to move and be reorganized and that was conveyed to the President. One of the issues is that Accreditation is scheduled for two years and going into next year making changes seems not to be the best move in getting the Accreditation work done.

J. Todd said there are Core Values on the agenda and the President would like Academic Senate to rank them and give feedback in the ordering of them or which ones Senate liked best. If possible please look at them so they can be discussed at the next meeting.

There was some tension in the Curriculum Committee over the policy that needs to be brought to Senate on April 2. Curriculum Committee came up with a policy on how to deal with unapproved courses.

The Math Department Position on Unit Values will be discussed today. There seemed to be some misunderstandings at the Curriculum Committee and needs to be discussed to make sure there are no misunderstandings.

J. Todd mentioned they are looking to compile committees for the BBSS Dean, the Ag Dean, and the Equity Dean and would include two faculty from the division and at least two faculty outside the division for the BBSS Dean and the Ag Dean positions. It is unknown how the committees are being structured. It indicates they are going forward with those hires. The struggle has been now that Ag does not have a division what happens; will we see something else in there. He would bring that forward before the President made changes or conferred with us. The President is aware also that the Library would like to have a home. People could state they were open to moving to different areas and that could be brought up to the President.

There was not a way to fix Technical Education and that was a large complaint; and the issues with the English/Math combo were brought up.

J. Todd said it was brought to his attention that the Basic Skills Faculty Coordinator which was posted not long ago had not gone through the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process. They thought that position had been approved through the Equity Plan and SSSP, but it had unfortunately not gone through the Hiring Prioritization Process. J. Todd brought it up to the President and the Vice President and said there is an issue with that because it can affect our hiring rankings. That position is posted but may get pulled. His argument was for the prioritized list. He will find out by the next meeting what the ETA is for the FON. The Basic Skills Coordinator position will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

E. Dambrosio asked if hiring an Equity Dean, what would that person do, and would that include the Library and Learning Center or is that off the table. Before it is posted, is there a chance of knowing ahead so there could be input or is that not part of the process? J. Todd said it was mainly dealing with equity, and he believed it had already been written and sent to HR. He believed the description was based on other equity deans across the different districts and did not recall if it mentioned the Library and Learning Center.

After the question was asked about keeping even small changes from occurring regarding the reorganization, J. Todd said that the President mentioned there might be some small changes but is unaware of what those were.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Appoint Laura Maki, Mary Roslaniec and Mary Silva to the Instructor of Chemistry – Full Time Tenure Track 2015-2016 Hiring Committee.
2. Appoint Demitrius Snaer, Paul Brogan, Steve Aristotelous, Bill Newell and Tina Giron to the Instructor of Physical Education/Head Football Coach – Tenure Track Hiring Committee.
3. Appoint Dan Alcantra, Paul Cripe, David Boley and Adrienne Peek to the Instructor of Mathematics – Tenure Track (2 positions) Hiring Committee.
4. Appoint David Dow, Michael Lynch, Lynnette Borelli, Anne Shanto and Jenni Abbott to the Instructor of Dance – Full Time Tenure Track 2015-2016 Hiring Committee.
5. Appoint Curtis Martin, Chad Redwing, Flora Carter and Robert Stevenson to the Instructor of Humanities – Full Time Tenure Track 2015-2016 Hiring Committee.

M/S/C (A. McKissick, J. Howen) Move to approve the Consent Agenda.

18 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

V. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. Math Department Position on Course Unit Values

M. Adams believes the Senate needs to take actions relative to this issue. M. Adams said their position needs to be clarified and valued and acted upon because he believes the college is going in a bad direction.

Discussion took place regarding the issues with Course Unit Values and the Curriculum Committee. There is opposition to allow the Math Department to create its own curriculum, to the point things are happening in the Curriculum Committee that is unexpected. At the Curriculum Committee meeting there was a discussion about a 4-unit class and a 1-unit optional discussion. B. Adams wanted to create a process to have courses unstuck if there was a conflict. A proposal was made and rejected. The option for faculty at that point was discussed.

M. Adams comments will continue at the time of the Curriculum Committee Report.

It was mentioned that Senate did pass an authorized ratified Curriculum Committee proposal, with further investigation of a course rationale behind the proposal when the Curriculum Committee so desired. Senate has not passed a two semester clock or having a default be the C-ID descriptor or C-ID minimum for Stanislaus State. There needs to be discussion if the default or standard is the C-ID minimum. This is a local decision and a decision needs to be made.

Math gave the reasoning why Math 171 and 172 proposed 4 units, which was to help Computer Science. After further discussion it was mentioned that Curriculum Committee should get a procedure and handle the facts, hours etc. because we are not the experts.

VI. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. New Business

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

M/S (A. McKissick, K. Alavezos) Move to approve Resolution SP15-A, Collegiality in Design for Success.

A. McKissick mentioned that at the last meeting due to some controversy about Brown Act and to put concern aside passed the Therefores as a motion. The President's Report mentioned the Design for Success plan was off the table; A. McKissick wanted to continue the discussion if anyone wanted to speak to it they had the opportunity to do so and to understand that the Literature and Language Arts had a position paper that needed to be brought forth to be sure it was incorporated into the minutes. The motion at the last meeting and the Therefores reference that, along with the Senate gathering the Committees position statements. One of the reasons to get this resolution into the minutes is to say the resolution is something we did not vote down, and the actual wording of the resolution shows that we are willing to discuss it and that we want a procedure in this body that thoroughly involves faculty, not the forum, not the confusion of a couple of plans and a short time frame and having it discussed in a College Council meeting and suddenly withdrawn. A. McKissick believes that the Senate needs to proceed with this and those concerned that it is a moot issue because the Design for Success per se is currently off the table. We are also going on record so if something else is introduced about redesigning our divisions with a different name our attitudes are known.

Support for the resolution was heard and a lengthy discussion took place regarding changing the wording, postponing the resolution indefinitely or definitely to the next meeting and parliamentary procedures were reviewed. A. McKissick withdrew the motion on the table.

M/S/C (A. McKissick, M. Adams) Move to postpone this discussion definitely to the next Academic Senate meeting.

18 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

2. YCCD Core Values

C. Martin asked if anyone brought any corrections or suggestions. He requested that all review and bring back corrections or suggestions to the next meeting. When these were done at an Annual Strategic Meeting in December, he and Chad were at the same table and were trying to convince the institution that education and teaching is our primary goal and should be reflected. Everything that drives this institution is the education of our students.

Bring suggestions or make up your own so that we can send meaningful suggestions or possibly agree on a set.

3. Program Discontinuance

C. Martin said this document (Modesto Junior College Program Initiation, Revitalization, Reduction, and Discontinuance Guiding Principles and Procedures) is one of the most important documents this body will ever have to work on. It needs to be as tight as possible because given the fiscal realities of California we never know when things will happen. The Science faculty have been pushing for the initiation again of the Engineering Program and we need to have a way of initiating that through the Curriculum Committee. This document needs to be scrutinized and it needs to be a practical document. This should be a document that will strengthen our ability and narrow the discussion when we talk about discontinuance and initiation and how we issue programs. There is a problem with the first statement, Definition of a Program. It defines a program as the state defines a program; as a series of courses leading to a degree, certificate, diploma, license or transfer to another institution of higher learning. That is not the way Curriculum Committee looks at programs. They look at disciplines, math, history, English.

Whatever this document says he does not want them to say they will be discontinuing history, for example, because it is not a program. Language or anything that can be brought up that will strengthen how we define a program at this institution would be well done. C. Redwing put this document together in two weeks from scratch and the guiding principles are well written. It captures the spirit this document needs. Suggestions are welcome.

C. Redwing wanted to bring this in as a discussion item and not ready for a 1st reading. Debi Bolter has already reviewed and when it is past the 1st reading it will be reviewed by our lawyers because it has not only fiscal but union ramifications. The program definition is strange; this is what Title 5 code says. We could get away with define objectives, and otherwise if you have SLOs you are a program, and if you don't have SLOs are you a program? D. Bolter said fiscal exigency according to our YFA contract is six months of FTES decline in a program. We have five years in this document. There is a difference of opinion between six months and five years. C. Redwing said D. Bolter is also worried about potential language that says two semesters where full time faculty member sections go unfilled or at a reduced fill rate would also trigger fiscal exigency. The language in the contract and what the ideals are in the document, which are five years, are worlds apart. It will come down to definition of terms. We need to be careful as a Senate how the terms are defined. Initiation and revitalization were included in this document which was not included in the original document. C. Redwing incorporated a lot of prior documents and also documents from other schools. Please put a lot of eyes and thought into this.

A. McKissick said we are overdue in accomplishing this and that it is important to fix this before anything happens and that there are reasons to have completed this semester.

C. Martin said to give this document to the rest of the faculty and weigh in and give suggestions or revisions to C. Redwing. The reason for the rush is that we want to negotiate with the administration and have the Board of Trustees on board before anything happens.

B. Continuing Business
1. Equivalency Update

C. Martin said this body wrote a new document for Equivalency and the Senate approved. We were given the impression and the promise that it would not be a problem for Columbia and that it would be a district-wide process. Their Executive Committee unanimously voted for the document and their rep council voted it down. They were afraid that the signature there for the president meant we would interfere. They link what is happening in the district of looking backwards through each division to see if people meet minimum qualifications which is happening right now. They are going division by division and pulling tenured faculty and adjuncts and if they do not have it they are asking for equivalency which is not the reason we wrote that process. Columbia wanted their process back. C. Martin needs to discuss with HR and find out how we redo the process. The only thing that would be eliminated should be the Columbia College President's signature and YCCD would be changed to MJC. He is hoping Columbia will reconsider.

C. Martin confirmed that we could change the order of the reports. He wanted to go ahead with the Curriculum Report, where there is a written report, where M. Adams could continue his comments.

VII. REPORTS

Curriculum Committee Report

M. Adams mentioned there was talk about the new policy that the Curriculum Committee had come up with and needed to come back on April 2, 2015 to Senate for discussion. He wanted the Senate to know ahead of time what this procedure says and how it was introduced to the Committee. M. Adams informed Senate what had taken place in Curriculum Committee on Feb. 17, 2015 regarding a procedure to handle situations if Curriculum Committee and a department had reached an impasse how a course should be designed and progress was stopped. The procedure was rejected by the committee. A new procedure was immediately presented by some members of the committee and M. Adams attempted to have it delayed. The procedure included a

two semester clock running for when the curriculum is scheduled to go before the committee and at the end of the clock if an agreement had not been reached then the faculty must follow either the exact C-ID descriptor at the state level or make their course an exact copy of what is at CSU Stanislaus. There was the danger in that meeting to having that policy applied immediately to the Math Department where their courses had been blocked for more than two semesters and therefore the clock had already run out and they would have to do it right now. C. Martin came to their defense and said it was not fair to apply a policy ex post facto.

This is the policy that is being discussed.

At the last meeting on March 17, 2015, Math had been working on trying to justify and explain in better detail, the lab for Math 171 and 172 courses and brought it before the committee. A motion was made that they were out of order, because this new policy said it did not match the C-ID descriptor or CSU Stanislaus. The Chair of the Curriculum Committee was asked to rule on this and the Chair said that was correct. M. Adams appealed the decision of the Chair was told it was not up for discussion and was not allowed to speak. Their courses were not discussed in a way that prevented Math from voicing objection to not discussing them. He left at that point. R. McKenzie was the only Math faculty that remained and he found out later the courses were discussed at the end of the meeting after they were told they could not talk and the courses could not be discussed.

M. Adams believes Senate has a supervisory role when things get awful at Curriculum Committee and Senate should take some action; if things at Curriculum Committee are not stopped no matter how bad they get, we are not doing our role as a Senate.

Steve Amador said he knew nothing or very little the reason why the courses were denied or the reason why the new motion was made at the previous meeting and will not claim to know. He answered some questions about the parliamentary procedure that were used and takes responsibility for that. He briefly went over Robert's Rules of Order regarding Rules of Indecorum. He gave his interpretation of indecorum and said everything that has happened and taken place in the Curriculum Committee have been moved forward by a vote of majority. With that said, Robert's Rule of Order protects the rights of minority, and carries out the will of majority.

More comments were made from the floor with their own opinions and perspectives of what took place. S. Amador made further comments about Parliamentary procedure.

- A. ASMJC Senate – Luis E. Rebolledo
- B. President's Report – James Todd – report made above at 3:50 pm
- C. Legislative Analyst Report – Deborah Laffranchini
- D. Accreditation Council – Brian Greene
- E. Instruction Council – Deborah Laffranchini
- F. Facilities Council – Jim Howen
- 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. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

It was brought up that Literature and Language Arts prepared a position statement and will be included in the minutes.

D. OPEN COMMENTS FROM SENATORS

E. ADJOURNMENT Adjourned at 5:40 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."

Why Should Literature & Language Arts Stay Together: A Division's Perspective on the Proposed Reorganization

16 March 2015

Reading, ESL, English, Foreign languages, and American Sign Language are the branches of Language and Literature—akin to the branches of math or the physical sciences or life sciences.



Background

Last Thursday, March 12, President Stearns sent out a college-wide email with a second proposal of division organization. See below:

Second Proposed Division Map
Reflecting feedback from college conversation on 2.27.15

March 9, 2015

Antigua	Barbados	Tahiti	Jamaica	Aruba	Bahamas
Math 15	Logistics 1	Ag Animal	Psychology 5	Geology 1	Music 6
English 25	Contract Ed	Ag Plant	Child Dev 5	Physics 2	Humanities 2
	Fire Sci	Ag Mech	Human Ser 1	Biology 6	Art 6
	Workforce	Ag Bus	Geography 1	Earth Science 1	History 5
	Comm Ed	Env Sci & Env Hort	Political Science 1	Anatomy	Dramatic Arts 3
	Career Center	Welding 1	Economics 1	Physiology 4	Photography 1
	Auto Body 1	Machine Tool 1	Office Tech 2	Chemistry 4	Philosophy 2
	Auto Tech 2	Indust Elec (prev EITec)3	Anthropology 3	Micro Bio 1	Spch Com 7
			Accounting 3	Graphic Art 2	Spanish 3
			Sociology 1	Comp Sci 5	
			AOJ 2	Computer EI (prev EITec) 1	

Hawaii	Support & Student Learning	Access & Student Learning	Equity & Student Learning	Campus Life & Student Learning
PE 15	EOPS 1	K – 12	Success	Int'l Std
Athletics	DSPS 2	AB 86 (Adult Education)	BSI 1	Std Dev
Health Ed 4	Counseling 16	A & R	Inst Design 1	Std Conduct
Medical Assisting 2	Transfer	Pre-College	Library 5	Grievance
Resp Care 2	TRIO 1	Financial Aid	Learn Ctr	Campus Life
RN 12	Veterans		Distance Ed 1	
	Evaluation		ESL	
			Reading	

As you see in the picture, English, ESL, Spanish, and Reading have been separated from each other, and there's no mention of German, Italian, French, and American Sign Language.

Our Resolve:

As a division and a team, Lit & Lang is passionate about student success and understands that reorganization and rejuvenation may add to this goal; however, we also believe that separating the various branches of Literature & Language Arts will actively destroy the success and progress we have achieved so far, and the separation will impede future success of our students in the fields of languages and Reading.

Our Rationale: The various branches of literature and language arts are intricately connected to one another.

ESL and English: In the new ESL program redesign (on which ESL is currently working this 2014-2015 academic year), ESL will lead directly into English 101. While the final level in the Reading/Writing sequence will be a prerequisite to English 101, thus ensuring that the ESL Department will need to work more closely with English faculty, in addition, the two (and possibly) three highest levels in the grammar, Reading/Writing, and listening/speaking strand will be transfer level courses and count as foreign language credit. ESL and Foreign Language need to be in the same division as English because English is a foreign language for our ESL students. Also, at the upper level of ESL, we use the same common assessment as developmental English. ESL and English are in constant communication with one another about standards and curriculum. English students are frequently referred into ESL.

Reading and English: Reading and composition are reciprocal, almost mirror processes. In order for students to write well, they need to read well (Sullivan, P. and Graff, G.).

Students go from reading to English and take reading and English courses concurrently. Splitting these two departments will make scheduling more difficult to ensure that students are able to take both. These departments frequently organize learning communities as well.

One study by the Reading department compared the success rate of English 50 students who had taken Reading 40 vs. English 50 students from the general population. The pass rate for those students who had Reading 40 was 12 percentage points higher (75% pass rate vs. 63% pass rate). There is not a week that goes by where Reading students don't ask questions about organizing a paper they are writing for English 49 or English 50. During the analysis and deconstruction of paragraphs in a Reading class, virtually all our Reading instructors also emphasize the idea that the patterns and structures we are analyzing can be incorporated into students' own writing. Countless students over the years have said that Reading 40 has helped them understand paragraph/essay structure as it applies to their own writing.

Also, our composition courses are defined as "Reading & Composition." In English 49, 50, 101, and 103 (not excluding all other English classes), reading is a critical component of the course. English teachers emphasize reading techniques as they guide students through the writing process.

ESL and Foreign Language: We essentially have the same discipline. What we do in ESL is very much akin to foreign language. There is a steady stream of students that move back and forth between these two disciplines within our division.

Reading and ESL: These are not basic-skills disciplines and should not be marginalized and relegated to a non-academic division. Reading and ESL are academic disciplines in their own right and not an extension of student support. In reality, ESL for students is essentially the academic study of a foreign language at very high levels. Likewise, reading is not a learning process that stops when students complete developmental courses. Students in college still need development in their reading skills just like they do in writing.

ESL, Reading, and English: We share many of the same students, and indeed, many students advance from their ESL courses to Reading and 49 & 50 to ultimately college composition and literature courses. Reading courses function as a logical transition between the ESL sequence and the English sequence. Non-native speakers constantly use Reading courses as added practice before tackling English 49. Reading has participated in a decades-long dialog with ESL as to how to best serve this population. We need to be under the same roof physically and metaphorically in order to work together for our students.

Reading, English, foreign language, and ESL: All of these branches are related philosophically and pedagogically. We ALL do language instruction in various forms.

Foreign Languages & English: FL courses often support and enhance English classes in that English grammar has to be regularly reviewed or even taught before the grammar of the target language is tackled. Many students report that they have learned more about English in FL classes than any time prior to their college education. Also, the Puente Program is in the process of being brought back. Splitting the division will just put one more barrier in that process which is supposed to foster student success for a marginalized student group.

Student Inequity: While good intentions may be involved in trying to place ESL and reading in a student support division with basic skills, doing so will stigmatize these programs as well as the students and result in less student equity versus more. This is supported in the research of Flippo, R.F., Caverly, D., Cummins, J., and recent research out of CSU, Northridge, and more. Findings prove that this kind of separation results in less persistence of students

from developmental courses into transfer-level programs, and there is less desire on the part of students who need this instruction to actually matriculate into disciplines like reading and ESL. Best practices note that ESL and reading departments are ideally placed in academic divisions, not in Basic Skills or Student Services/Support Divisions. The Reading Department receives many of its students from Student Services programs such as EOP&S, CalWorks, CARE, and Disability Services due to the fact that Reading 40 is a logical point-of-entry for many non-traditional students. Once again, marginalizing these students in a non-academic division does nothing but further stigmatize them. Best practices indicate that non-traditional students do best when mainstreamed.

Collaboration for Student Success: As a division, we work collaboratively, and most departments are in constant discussion about student success; we often collaborate on grammar exercises and grading; for example, ESL and foreign language instructors often take part in composition norming, and Reading instructors offer ideas in incorporating better techniques in composition classes. Once again, as mentioned above, we need to be under the same roof physically and metaphorically in order to work together for our students. As a division, we meet on a continuous basis to help with division-related and department-related issues. We have inter-departmental committees that work together on a variety of tasks.

Only Two Basic Skill Classes: English has only two basic skills classes, and the ***only reason we manage this despite the demographic challenges is because of the support we get from our fellow branches. English cannot function without the support of Reading, Foreign Languages, and ESL.*** We thrive on that support by being collaborative and interactive as part of the same division.

Besides ENGL 49 & ENGL 50, English has many higher level classes (transfer-level composition & Literature), so the argument that English and Math are mainly basic skills and hence should be together holds no truth, no basis.

Literature & Language Arts is one subject area. This discipline as a whole with its branches is akin to the branches in Math or the physical sciences or the natural sciences. Just the way there is a difficulty in finding rationale to separate Geometry, Algebra, Statistics, and Arithmetic and distribute them to three or four separate divisions, or to split Human Biology, Zoology, and Botany and spread them into various divisions, so is there a difficulty in rationalizing the breaking up of the language arts.

Conclusion:

Though we have nothing against other disciplines joining us as a division, grouping disciplines that are closely-related in pedagogy is simply logical and strengthened by research. Essentially, English, Reading, ESL, Spanish, French, German, Italian, and American Sign Language make up one subject area. We work together and depend on one another to help solve learning issues and move our students toward empowerment. Even if we are supposedly different departments, we have never drawn boundaries between us. ESL instructors work closely with English, English instructors work closely with Reading and ESL, and Foreign-language instructors work closely with ESL, Reading, and English. As a group, Literature & Language Arts is ***against*** being cut up and separated.

Accreditation Council
News to report
By Brian Greene

The March 12 meeting was canceled because several members were unable to attend and several vacancies on the Council remain. Ellen Dambrosio and Theresa Stovall are both on the committee (the latter has a class/meeting conflict but will resume attending in the fall), and James Todd continues to serve as Council Co-Chair, leaving two faculty vacancies. These positions are critical to fill as we begin working on writing our self-evaluation ahead of our comprehensive site visit. Planning for this effort has been complicated by Susan Kincade's absence but needs to get underway immediately. The next Accreditation Council meeting is Thursday, March 26 at 2:30.

In other news, a team from MJC attended the state academic senate's Accreditation Institute in late February. Participants included: James Todd, Brenda Thames, Patrick Bettencourt, Heather Townsend, Debi Bolter, Barbara Adams, Jennifer Hamilton and Brian Greene. In addition, Brian Greene served on an ACCJC evaluation team that visited Butte College in early March.

Report from Facilities Council Meeting
Monday, March 16, 2015
Respectfully submitted by John Zamora, Co-Chair of Facilities Council

Piloting of Campus Facilities Project Request Process

The Facilities Council is currently finalizing its Facilities Request Process along with an appropriate form. Several projects are piloting these procedures to inform the Facilities Council to best proceed. The projects piloting the draft process are the student benches and additional electrical outlets in Founders Hall, the signage replacement for the Beckwith ranch, the second phase of the pole barn at the Beckwith ranch (project approved four years ago), and consideration of bicycle parking and safety at MJC.

Action taken on the following:

- Request to place benches and electrical outlets in Founders Hall: This proposal After approval of motion to suspend the rules, request was approved for a 1st Reading. This proposal is up for a 2nd reading in April.
- Request to consider importance of bike parking and safety: Motion approved to forward this request to the Traffic and Safety sub-committee to consider further.
- Request to approve replacement signage for Beckwith Ranch: After approval of motion to suspend the rules, signage was approved.
- Request to complete second half of pole barn on Beckwith Ranch: After approval of motion to suspend the rules, the request was approved for a 1st reading. This proposal is up for a 2nd reading in April.

Evaluation for Facilities Council Goal Setting

The Facilities Council reviewed its evaluation questionnaire from last year for its evaluation process this year. The Facilities Council moved and approved to use last year's evaluation this year and include an Additional Comments field. The Council will evaluate itself before the April meeting using Survey Monkey. Based on these results, the Facilities Council will develop its goals for the 2015-16 academic year at its April meeting.

Measure E Projects

Measure E Projects are moving forward. The Center for Advanced Technologies (formerly North Hall) is nearly finished its construction phase, which is to be done in March 2015. As of the March 2015 Facilities Council meeting, it was reported there is approximately \$385,000 left from FF&E for "computer equipment". Clarification is needed what needs are still left in the building. Repairs to North Way, South Way, and the walkway/drive between the Student Center and the tennis courts will occur starting in May (in phases). Work continues on the roads and pathways on West Campus. Media Services and Technology Services are working on punch lists for the Center for Advanced Technologies.

MJC Facilities Projects

The heating system has been repaired and is providing heat to Founders Hall. The large metal plating that is between the Student Center and the tennis courts will remain for several months as there is a leak that needs to be addressed and should

Resource Allocation Council
March 6, 2015
By Kevin Alavezos

The following occurred:

1. Reviewed IELM expenditures to date.
2. Created an evaluation that will be sent via Survey Monkey to RAC members. Completion date is for the survey is set as March 13, so the results can be shared and discussed at the March 30 meeting.
3. Agreed to use the evaluation results from the survey to help set RAC goals for next year.
4. Decided that meeting minutes not already approved will be moved for approval at the March 20, 2015 meeting by consensus if quorum is not met.

No actions were taken and no recommendations were forwarded to College Council.

Academic Senate

Curriculum Committee Report

Submitted March 19, 2015

The Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee met on Tuesday, March 17, 2015 at 2:40 PM for their regularly scheduled meeting.

- Committee Actions:
 - Reviewed and approved 4 course proposals (revisions and adoptions)
 - Reviewed and approved 4 requisites requests (maintaining, requesting new)
 - Reviewed and approved 1 local requirement request (requesting)
 - Reviewed and approved 11 GE requests (maintaining)
 - Reviewed and approved 14 programs (modifications)

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Adams, Curriculum Co-Chair (Elected by Curriculum Committee)

Student Services Council
March 13, 2015
By Ross McKenzie

We had a presentation from Financial Aid re: the need to drop non-attending students in a timely manner. Basically, if students are enrolled but not participating, they are given financial aid they don't deserve, and MJC has to pay for that.

We talked about the enrollment priority request form, and decided that it needed to be sent out to constituent groups. (Document Attached)

We talked briefly about having Lloyd Jackson give a presentation on de-escalating conflicts with students. We also talked briefly about the re(re)-org. The student representatives hadn't heard about this at all, and we felt that not including them was doing our students a great disservice.

MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE

Priority Enrollment Request

Procedure for Requesting Priority Registration for “Groups as designated by the College,” as outlined in Level 2 of YCCD Board Policy 5505.

Submission and Review Guidelines

1. Proposals are due October 15th for implementation the following fall and are submitted to the Student Success & Equity Committee (SS&EC).
2. A written proposal addressing the criteria established by the college is to be completed. The proposal must include supporting evidence and appropriate data.
3. The SS&EC will conduct a technical review to determine if criteria are met.
4. Authors who have submitted proposals that meet the established criteria will be asked to provide a presentation to the SS&EC describing in more detail the eligibility requirements, benefits, and procedures outlined in their written proposals.
5. The SS&EC will forward their recommendation to Student Services Council.
6. Student Services Council will forward their recommendation to College Council.

Note – Two non-mandated groups, TRIO and Student Athletes, currently provide priority registration for their students. Approval for continuation of this priority is extended through Summer 2016. Both groups need to complete the attached form and submit their request to the SS&EC by October 15, 2015, for priority registration to be continued beyond Fall 2016. As existing programs, both groups must conduct a review of the effectiveness of priority registration for their students and attach that to their requests.

MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE

Priority Enrollment Request

Request for Level 2 Priority Registration for “Groups as designated by the College” per BP 5505.

Priority registration is awarded to participants in groups that actively promote student engagement and success by providing services and requiring students to: 1) enroll in appropriate courses to meet identified educational goals, 2) succeed in their courses, and 3) complete certificates, degrees, and/or transfer requirements in a timely manner.

Student learning theory indicates that student engagement is a critical aspect of student success. Therefore, groups should include eligibility and ongoing participation criteria regarding active engagement, adequate academic performance, and measurable progress towards identified goals.

Group Name: _____ **Submitted by:** _____ **Title:** _____
Name

Description of the Group:

Who has responsibility to identify the students who qualify for this group each term?

Name: _____ Title: _____

Number of terms priority is being requested for the individual students in the group?

Is the request related to a grant? No Yes If yes, when will the grant be submitted?

Designated administrator of the grant: _____ Start & End Dates:

Justification for Priority Request: Address issues such as program objective, time constraints, high unit majors, and impact of the program on student success, etc.

MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE

Priority Enrollment Request

List the data reports that will be used to track eligibility and attach samples (remove student identifiers).

Review of Priority Status for Group: Initial approval is granted for a period of three years. After two years, the group must conduct a review and resubmit for continuation of priority registration.

What criteria will be used to measure the effectiveness of providing priority registration to these students?

Outline the process that will be used in conducting the review of this priority group. Include who will be conducting the review, specific dates on which the review will begin and conclude, and the expected findings that will lead the group to either propose continuation or termination of priority registration for participants.