



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
OCT. 3, 2013**

Members Present: Allan McKissick, Allen Boyer, Barbara Jensen, Bill Anelli, Bob Droual, Catherine Greene, Chad Redwing, Chris Briggs, Curtis Martin, David Boley, Deborah Gilbert, Deborah Laffranchini, Ellen Dambrosio, Eva Mo, James Todd, Jennifer Hamilton, Jim Howen, Jim Stevens, Kevin Alavezos, Mike Adams, Mike Morales, Nancy Wonder (Sub for Lisa Riggs), Paul Berger, Paul Cripe

Members Absent: Andrew Campbell, Estella Nanez, Layla Spain, Tina Giron, Travis Silvers

Guests Present: Brian Sinclair (Faculty Liaison to the Board), David Seymour

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

(3:45 pm)

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

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

23 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (Sept 19, 2013)

J. Todd mentioned there were changes in the Administration Report and proceeded to read items from Susan Kincade.

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

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

Allan McKissick mentioned that in the last paragraph about the security guard, it might be good to add a comment, the whole point of mentioning his background is that he was in very good standing with MJC, if anyone was wondering why it was mentioned that he was a veteran. It was decided to reword slightly the last sentence “The officer is highly regarded at MJC, has been employed with us for 10-12 years,” is an Army veteran, and serves in the National Guard. MJC continues to look into its policies and processes.

B. Sinclair wanted to make clear on the Faculty Report to the Board, that “board members” were being asked to visit classrooms, not just Mike Riley.

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

23 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

III. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Resolution FL13-A (Wes Page)

This is only a notification of a change in date. J. Todd received an email message from Mike Sundquist that he thought we should make Wes Page Day October 29, as there is an event for Wes Page on Oct. 30.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Oct. 17, 2013

B. Eileen Kerr as Chair of Outcomes Assessment Workgroup. She will begin work Oct. 4, 2013.

M/S/C (E. Dambrosio, C. Redwing) move to approve the Consent Agenda.

23 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Continuing Business

1. Elections (At Large, Adjunct At Large)

Votes were tallied this week. Mike Adams will become our At-Large Senator and Allen Boyer will become our Adjunct At-Large Senator. Welcome Mike and Alan.

2. Instructional Program Review Principles and Process Document (2nd Reading)

J. Todd mentioned that A. McKissick asked a question at the last meeting. How there was going to be a weigh in from the Instruction Counsel? An entire answer has not been received, as it needs to be discussed.

J. Todd requested A. McKissick to rephrase the issue. A. McKissick mentioned the issue is: What kind of recommendations would the Instruction Counsel make? How does it relate to the Senate's role?

M/S (C. Martin, P. Berger) Motion was made to approve the Instructional Program Review Principles and Process Document for a 2nd reading.

Discussion

There was discussion about the Instructional Program Review Principles and Process Document. The majority of the discussion was regarding page 4, C-11, Commendations and Recommendations.

A. McKissick mentioned at C - Criteria for Review of Academic Programs, # 11, it includes recommendations by Instruction Counsel. He thought the recommendations should come from the Senate. He suggested that the Instruction Counsel could forward the recommendations for consideration to the Senate.

J. Todd said he was glad the point was brought up regarding Recommendations by Instruction Council. He thought it might be Commendations and Recommendations for analysis. According to what C. Martin is saying, it's more about recommendation to analyze things. J. Todd asked A. McKissick if he thinks it covers that or would he rather have something tabled that said this is something that would be the idea of the area of what recommendations are would be further discussed.

A. McKissick said that the latter would be a good idea if still not sure.

C. Martin said the Commendations and Recommendations are not for hiring. The Commendations and Recommendations are for once the document is finished, reviewed by immediate supervisor and depending on the shared governance process, what J. Todd is proposing, these decisions about recommendations for your division go back to the division meeting and those recommendations go from there but then they go to Instruction Council or wherever decided. The idea is the Instruction Council does the evaluation of programs. They will read the Program Review, make recommendations and have a chance for a presentation.

J. Howen brought up an issue on Page 3, 7. Trend Analysis, A. Enrollment Trends, it says Success Rate Date, (should be Data). In a Tech. Ed. area, individuals come in not wanting a degree, not wanting a certificate; they just want to take 2 welding classes and leave, 1 machine class and leave. What shows on Success Rate Data is that they are in failure because students are taking 2 classes and not completing.

J. Todd said that success is per course. We might want to add 1 category which is, as Academic Senate we can add in the 75%, and really stick to this as an institution as faculty that we drop students at 75%, and then we have a number of who did what after that. That would give us an idea of what is the success rate with students that made it through 75% of the class. That's different than the first 2 weeks.

C. Martin said one of the proposals from last week's meeting was that a grade completion be published. People would look at this. The State defines success as anyone who gets an A, B or C. It is unfair for small programs as we don't have that data. Some programs don't have certificates. How do you put that you successfully completed a program where there is none?

A. McKissick made a motion. At Page 4, Item C, #11 – Move to replace Sub Point B, instead of Commendations and Recommendations by: Instruction Council, it will say by: b. Academic Senate as informed by Instruction Council. There was a second by Allen Boyer.

J. Todd said A. McKissick would like whatever Instruction Council recommends to come back to the Senate for approval for all Program Review and whatever recommendations and commendations are on there. The idea is that these would go to Instruction Counsel at some point and would probably end up on College Council consent agenda. He thinks A. McKissick is trying to make sure that whatever commendations are written in Instruction Counsel that there is a place the faculty body can make sure that it is appropriate and balanced.

A. McKissick said "point of information" for just recommendations. When a recommendation is made to your department it becomes the criteria by which you have been evaluated by which your Department is reviewed next time. That is a criteria for review. Whatever the recommendation is, as to the scope of this recommendation, it will then become the criteria for the next time around when your department is reviewed for Program Review. That's a Senate for purview. It's not so technical, until you know what it is, run it by the Senate. It will not be the division. This goes straight into the Program Review rubric.

J. Todd said sometimes we get so locked into making sure that we are cementing this in for the next 25 years, that we lose sight of the fact that these can always be re-reviewed by Senate if we don't like what's happening.

E. Mo is hearing Allan's concern about safeguard for certain programs that are vulnerable, in one of two situations; vulnerable in the position or vulnerable under the eye of Instruction Council, and that may be what he wants is a possibility for that program to have the option of coming to the Senate and getting a 2nd voice in clearing up their situation.

M/S/C (J. Hamilton, B. Droual) Call to Question on motion on the floor. Need 2/3rd vote on Call to Question.
Vote by Show of Hands. Show of hands revealed 2/3rds, passed.

M/S/NC (A. McKissick, A. Boyer) Move to replace Sub Point B, instead of Commendations and Recommendations by: Instruction Council, it will say by: b. Academic Senate as informed by Instruction Council.
3 – Ayes, Opposed – 20, Motion not carried

Next is to vote on the main motion as first read without amendments.

A. McKissick requested a waiver of the rules. He doesn't think people realize the implications, as is and no more discussion on any sentencing or it's over, unless reintroduced for a 1st reading.

M/ (A. McKissick) moved for a waiver of the rules, to not have just those two choices. There was no second.

M/S/C (C. Martin, P. Berger) Move to approve the Instructional Program Review Principles and Process Document.

21 – Ayes, 1 Opposed – Allan McKissick, 1 Abstention – Kevin Alavezos

J. Todd said this document will go to the Instruction Council next.

3. Course Unit Values Senate Study Session

J. Todd said there was a meeting on Oct. 1. He found it very productive in terms of some of the issues we have facing all that have 5 unit courses and above. The discussion; one reiterated the inextricable links of how course unit values affect student success, financial aid, student choices of classes in an era of unit caps, resources and hiring prioritization, and course offerings. It is no longer as easy as a department merely decides on its curriculum and offerings.

The first issue is there some TMCs that are not able to go through. This is larger than that. The conversation was not just ADTs, it was a catalyst for discussion about how high unit values effect other areas of the institution. Higher unit values affect student financial aid use. The larger unit values we have inside of ADTs or TMCs affects the kinds of electives that students might be able to have: it depends on where they are taking their classes and what the breadth of their education is going to be; how many units can they have and how does that affect what they are doing across the institution. It also affects some of the ways in which we are doing Hiring Prioritization; if there are bottleneck areas where students aren't able to get into classes, or not making it through classes, how can we have more comprehensive offerings across the college as well? It hurts students if they have to retake classes, in terms of units or financial aid.

The Senate Study Session will continue over the course of the fall and perhaps the spring.

J. Todd wanted to make a comment about Council reports. What might make it more efficient is that we have written reports from people that are doing them and if there is something of importance from councils it can be mentioned publicly, otherwise we will have reports that we can put at the end of the agenda that people can read.

Kathy will email the ones responsible for Facilities Council, Student Services Council, Instruction Council, Accreditation Council, Resource Allocation Council and College Council to remind them of written reports.

4. Facilities Council – Jim Howen

There is a traffic problem on Collegiate Way. People are turning left into the college right in front of the pen, where they are turning left onto Brink Ave. going northbound in the southbound lane to turn into the college. We (Tim Nesmith) are contacting the county to see if they could put a line or potstops which defines how to turn in a proper lane going northbound.

5. Student Services Council – No report

6. Instruction Council – Deb Laffranchini

The Hiring Prioritization document was reviewed and it is going forth. There was a discussion about two situations that could occur; what happens when someone dies beyond the deadline of needing to announce so it becomes a replacement instead of a growth position and what happens when someone becomes seriously ill? It's not going to change now, but will be considered and discussed later on. What will happen in either of those situations is that there will be a 1 year temp replacement and then will go to a growth position.

If you know you are sick, you can't wait until after the Sept 30 deadline and let them know you are going to retire in the next year because you're being replaced.

They didn't feel they could come up with a single rubric because we have a diverse nature of our programs, Counseling, Basic Skills and CTE.

M. Morales mentioned that we missed something in the Hiring Prioritization when it went through. If there is a death and they missed the deadline of Sept 21 and they passed in Oct. Since they missed the deadline, that position will be a 1 year temp position, and then it is lost to a growth position and will be ranked with the entire college's growth positions. They will come back at the beginning of the next fiscal school year to change that.

7. Accreditation Council – Discussed in New Business B.1.
8. Resource Allocation Council – meets Oct. 4
9. College Council –
Talked about the report of Accreditation below

B. New Business

1. Accreditation Report

There have been several presentations with the Accreditation Report. Their approach was to be succinct and they were. There is a lot of evidence that goes along with this. It was mainly Susan Kincade and Debra Bolter who wrote the report. They feel very confident about it.

M/S (B. Jensen, P. Berger) Move to accept the Accreditation Report

Discussion

A. McKissick had a question. In terms of what the Senate has already seen, you are talking about some editorial effort to make it more succinct and he has read parts of what most interested him, so this is essentially no change from we have already seen?

J. Todd would like to engage how there might be more faculty involvement and feedback between faculty and the Accreditation Council. Going forward, they have organized the Accreditation Council so people have started to move into standards, so that may facilitate more involvement and conversation among faculty. Bill Anelli has graciously stepped up to join the Accreditation Council. The big thing is we will be showing evidence and explaining processes.

M/S (B. Jensen, P. Berger) Move to accept the Accreditation Report

23 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

2. FSAs

J. Todd said FSAs are due in two weeks, mid to late October. He will talk to Debra Bolter and Gene Womble about the FSA process. They will be sharing the responsibilities for YFA while Jillian Daly transfers into her new job. There have been some issues with the FSAs in terms of what people think they are doing when they apply for them. The equivalency process is different than applying for an FSA. You need to make sure you have your minimum qualifications, that they go through the right place, and you are providing your discipline specialist all the paperwork that allows them to forward it to this FSA committee. J. Todd will be calling some of the people that did not get their FSA approved.

Regarding FSAs, you can get an initial one if you taught two courses in that discipline where you have minimum qualifications, or a secondary one that is good for seven years as long as you are continuing your education or have recency in terms of work experience.

3. Flex Reform/ Institute Day

Bill Anelli said if you are thinking of applying for a Title V grant, there is another \$20,000 available for the Spring 2014 and another \$20,000 for the summer. No date has been given yet for Spring. There will be an email about it.

There is an issue with a Title V grant, when there is a faculty position required in the grant. When the grant goes away, the requirements of the grant are that the faculty position has to stay. That is the case with the Title V grant. It looks like it overrides Hiring Prioritization. It fell through the loops in terms of when someone is applying

for a Title V grant and that require a faculty position as part of the grant. When the grant goes away, the district has to pick up the position. Is that clued into Hiring Prioritization?

He created a handout based on the State of California as recommendations to the Chancellors office to completely change flex. The change that we would be interested in is: a minimum of 5 days of flex per year, which would be about 40 hours versus 25 hours required now. There will be \$25 million will be allotted to all the 107 college campuses for personal development for staff, administrators and faculty. We might be getting about \$100,000 from the state. This would be passed in 2014. That is an issue for the Senate; in deciding how we want to weigh in if we are receiving \$100,000 to spend on faculty development.

Another issue is best practices for flex. What is acceptable, what is not? If you have feelings and comments, email him.

Institute Day. There is an interest and proposal in shortening Institute Day from 4 hours to 2 hours with the campus community for Spring 2014; then you go to division meetings, or whatever they do after that.

A. McKissick recommended that we try the model of 2 hours community focus on Institute Day in 2014.

A. McKissick made a Call to Question. It was seconded by B. Jensen.

M/S/C (A. McKissick, B. Jensen) Call to Question on motion on the floor.

23 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

M/S/C (A. McKissick, B. Jensen) Senate recommended that we cut down to 2 hours with the campus community on Institute Day 2014.

22 Ayes, 1 Opposed – Debbie Laffrachini, 0 Abstentions

V. REPORTS

- A. Student Senate – no report (5:15 pm)
- B. Distance Education Committee-Eva Mo
- C. Faculty Representative to the Board – Brian Sinclair
- D. Legislative Analyst-Chad Redwing

Update on AB 955 – Assembly Bill 955 remains on Gov. Brown’s desk. He has until Oct. 13 to sign the bill of the six pilot schools for the two – tier fee program. It seems support or participation in the pilot program is in danger of crumbling.

1. Solano can no longer participate because it does not meet enrollment targets.
2. College of the Canyons can no longer participate because it does not meet enrollment targets.
3. Oxnard and Pasadena seem to be uncertain about their participation. If the Governor signs the bill this leaves only the certain participation of Crafton Hills and Long Beach.

E. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW)-James Todd

They will be meeting tomorrow, Oct. 4.

Some will have changes in their schedules; we will be working on it tomorrow. We now have an excel file of everybody’s current CLOs. He has a stack being working on getting reconciled between CurricUnit and PiratesNet. Within the next couple of weeks all will be updated in terms of changes.

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

G. Faculty Professional Development Committee and PDCC-Bill Anelli

Discussion same as IV. B. New Business 3. Flex Reform/ Institute Day

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Oct. 17, 2013

H. Administration Report - Susan Kincade – no report

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

VI. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS - none

VII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – none

VIII. ADJOURNMENT Adjourned at 5:37 pm

(5:30 pm)