



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2016**

Members Present: Curtis Martin (President), Steve Amador (Vice President/Parliamentarian), Bill Anelli (Secretary), Debbie Laffranchini (Legislative Analyst), Allan McKissick, Annaliese Hausler-Akpovi, Ashley Yu, Belen Robinson, Bob Droual, David Chapman, David Seymour, Elizabeth David, Ellen Dambrosio, Eva Mo, Hans Hauselmann, Jim Stevens, Kevin Alavezos, Lisa Riggs, Mike Adams, Mike Morales, Paul Berger, Shelley Circle, Theresa Stovall

Members Absent: Duane Brooks, Eric Ivory, Jim Howen, Lonita Cordova, Teri Curtis

Guests Present: Brad Machado (VP/ASMJC), Brian Greene, Gabe Tovar, Michelle Christopherson (Faculty Liaison to the Board), Nita Gopal, William Holly

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

S. Amador made the request to Postpone Item #3 Resolution S16-A: Revision of YCCD Contract Faculty Hiring Procedures, 1st Reading and Item #8 Program Discontinuance Proposal Review to the next Senate meeting.

Seeing no objections – the Order of Agenda Items was approved as amended.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (January 21, 2016, February 4, 2016, February 18, 2016)

Seeing no objections – the minutes for January 21, February 4 and February 18, were approved

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Board of Trustees Policies and Procedures: 3435, 3560, 6800, 6700, 6620, 6530, 6400, 6330, 5500, 5020, 5015, 5013, 5010, 4225, 4222, 4105, 4102, 4070, 4021

M. Adams briefly went over the Policies and Procedures Committee Report on #1 of the Consent Agenda. After a short discussion it was decided to leave Policies and Procedures 6620, 6530 and 6400 and pull the remainder. BP 6620, 6530, and 6400 were approved.

Policies and Procedures 3435, 3560, 6800, 6700, 6330, 5500, 5020, 5015, 5013, 5010, 4225, 4222, 4105, 4102, 4070, and 4021 were pulled from the Consent Agenda and will be presented for review at the next Senate meeting.

2. Appoint Curtis Martin to the Selection Committee for the College Research Analyst position.
3. Appoint Michael Adams, Paul Cripe and David Boley to the *ad hoc* equivalency pre-screening committee for Math
4. Appoint Kurt Olson, J. Penn, and Melanie Berru to the *ad hoc* equivalency pre-screening committee for Sociology
5. Appoint Theresa Stovall as accreditation tri-chair to Standard 1 of the Accreditation Council
6. Appoint Elizabeth David as Academic Senate representative to College Council
7. Appoint Bobby Hutchison as faculty lead to the MJC Institutional Review Board (IRB)
8. Appoint Brian Greene as faculty co-chair of Accreditation Council
9. Appoint Curtis Martin, and Pam Crittenden to the Vice President of Student Services Search Committee
10. Appoint Adrienne Peek, Annaliese Hausler-Akpovi, Theron Westrope and Debbie Gilbert to the English Full-Time Tenure Track Search Committee.

Seeing no objections – The Consent Agenda was approved as amended.

IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. New and Continuing Business

1. Resolution F15-E: Assessment Exemption Proposal, (Early Placement in High School), 2nd Reading

M/S/C (S. Circle, A. Hausler-Akpovi) Move to approve Resolution F15-E: Assessment Exemption Proposal (Early Placement in High School) for a 2nd Reading

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

2. E-Lumen Presentation – Nita Gopal – Prepared for presentation – see below
3. Resolution S16-A: Revision of YCCD Contract Faculty Hiring Procedures, 1st Reading (Postponed)
 - a. Robinson, D. Laffranchini and E. David arrived before Resolution S16-B was discussed.
4. Resolution S16-B: Assessment Data and Faculty Evaluation, 1st Reading

M/S (S. Circle, E. Mo) Move to approve Resolution S16-B: Assessment Data and Faculty Evaluation for a 1st Reading.

Curtis Martin gave a brief background of the reason for Resolution S16-B.

M/S/C (S. Circle, E. Mo) Move to approve Resolution S16-B: Assessment Data and Faculty Evaluation for a 1st Reading

22 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

2. E-Lumen Presentation – Nita Gopal

N. Gopal gave an eLumen Presentation, questions and discussion followed.

B. Robinson left prior to the Resolution S16-C discussion.

5. Resolution S16-C: Cycle of SLO Assessment and Program Review, 1st Reading

M/S (S. Circle, H. Hauselmann) Move to approve Resolution S16-C: Cycle of SLO Assessment and Program Review for a 1st Reading.

Curtis Martin gave a brief background of the reason for Resolution S16-C and would like to possibly form a Program Review Workgroup to discuss what our Program Review is.

Discussion took place both for and against the resolution.

M/S (M. Adams, D. Chapman) Motion to remove the first “Therefore” from Resolution

S16-C.

Discussion ensued.

M/S/C (M. Adams, D. Chapman) Motion to remove the first “Therefore” from Resolution S16-C

19 Ayes, 2 Opposed (S. Circle, A. Hausler-Akpovi), 0 Abstentions

M/S (A. McKissick, heard but unknown) Motion to strike out the top “Proposed by the Outcomes Assessment Workgroup” and in the last Whereas remove “leading to an Outcomes Assessment Workgroup recommendation of a more standardized system and schedule across each academic year for all programs;”

Discussion took place and the following amendment was proposed.

M/S/C (A. McKissick, heard but unknown) Motion to strike out the top "Proposed by the Outcomes Assessment Workgroup" and in the last Whereas remove "leading to an Outcomes Assessment Workgroup recommendation of a more standardized system and schedule across each academic year for all programs;"

17 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstention

It was noted that P. Berger, D. Seymour, D. Laffranchini and T. Stovall left prior to the vote.

M/S/C (S. Circle, H. Hauselmann) Move to approve Resolution S16-C: Cycle of SLO Assessment and Program Review as amended for a 1st Reading.

15 Ayes, 1 Opposed (B. Droual), 1 Abstention (heard but unknown)

Due to Quorum being lost, Academic Senate was excused.

6. Resolution S16-D: Adoption of *eLumen*, 1st Reading
7. Resolution S16-E: Online Educational Resources, 1st Reading
8. Program Discontinuance Proposal Review – Continued (Postponed)

V. REPORTS

- A. ASMJC Senate – Bradley Machado
- B. President's Report – Curtis Martin
- C. Accreditation Council – Brian Greene
- D. Legislative Analyst Report – Deborah Laffranchini
- E. Instruction Council – Deborah Laffranchini
- F. Facilities Council – Jim Howen
- G. Resource Allocation Council – Kevin Alavezos
- H. College Council – Bill Anelli
- I. Faculty Representative to the Board – Michelle Christopherson
- J. Curriculum Committee – Steve Amador
- K. Distance Education Committee – Eva Mo
- L. Student Services Council – Ross McKenzie
- M. Faculty Professional Development Coordinating Committee and PDCC – Bill Anelli
- N. Outcomes Assessment Work Group – Nita Gopal (OAW)
- O. District Advisory Technology Committee – John Zamora

VI. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- A. Program Review is due March 20th
- B. Fall and spring assessments due by end of Spring 2016 for courses scheduled in the cycle.

VIII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

IX. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

1. Engaging All Voices: Survey Results of Governance Councils

X. ANNOUNCEMENTS – Next Senate meeting – March 17, 2016

XI. OPEN COMMENTS FROM SENATORS

XII. ADJOURNMENT

"In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act and SB 751, minutes of the MJC Academic Senate records the votes of all committee member 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."

Accreditation Report

Feb. 25, 2016

By Brian Greene

Brian Greene, Curtis Martin and VP Brenda Thames attended the Accreditation Institute on February 19th and 20th in San Diego. Hosted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and including presentations from faculty, college CEOs and ACCJC administrators, the event focused on techniques for addressing the 2014 accreditation standards. Takeaways from the conference are being shared with the Accreditation Council and Standards Committees.

Other items:

- Brian Greene, Faculty Accreditation Chair, was asked to serve as a last minute replacement on an ACCJC site visit in early March.
- The Distance Education Substantive Change Proposal is being revised and a draft will be available in early March.
- The next Accreditation Council meeting is March 10th, 2:30-3:30 in CAT 262.

Academic Senate

Curriculum Committee Report

Submitted February 29, 2016

The Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee met on Tuesday, February 23, 2016 at 2:40 PM for their regularly scheduled meeting.

- Committee Actions:
 - Reviewed and approved 14 course proposals (revisions, adoptions, inactivation)
 - 5 courses pulled, discussed at meeting, and approved
 - Reviewed and approved 10 requisites requests (maintaining, removing, requesting new)
 - Reviewed and approved 2 GE requests (maintaining)
 - Reviewed and approved 7 DE proposals (maintaining, requesting new)
 - Reviewed and approved 1 program proposal (modification)

Respectfully submitted,

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

INSIGHT

MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT NEWSLETTER FEB 2016

By Nita Gopal

Keeping it Simple

“Keep it simple” is perhaps a practical mantra to adopt in order to reach our assessment plus transition goals and achieve them with the least amount of stress. Here are a few tips:

- 1) If you were scheduled to assess this past fall 2015, and you have your data, do attend the eLumen workshops scheduled for the semester. If you can't attend any of the workshops, simply contact the Outcomes Assessment Workgroup and ask for help.
- 2) If you're scheduled to assess this spring 2016, then assessing after the last drop date and before the semester ends might be the best time to do so.
- 3) In general, even if your class is not scheduled for assessment, attending one eLumen workshop will give you an idea of what data entry entails, and you'll get a chance to meet other faculty whom you might not meet otherwise.

Deadlines: Flexible or Rigid?

Outcomes Assessment is a faculty-run process. Traditionally, our school has followed two general dead-lines for data entry: End of January for previous fall's data and end of May for the spring data.

These deadlines were mainly advised because reflecting on the most recent semester is much easier than ruminating over classes from two semesters ago, so yes, the deadlines are flexible. If you did not get a chance to enter your fall information by the end of January, you could do it now. Once again, attending the eLumen workshops might help you tremendously.

Waiting until the end of the spring semester to input fall data might cause additional stress if you also have spring data to enter.

Assessment Activities/Tools/Measurements: Flexible or Rigid?

As instructors, we know best what tools or activities or measurements to use when assessing our students' learning.

The activities we use to assess are based on our best judgment as qualified and experienced teachers. The goal behind outcomes assessment is to discover what our students have learned and to provide evidence about that knowledge or discovery. Every instructor might have a unique assessment situation. One of the best ways to find answers to your questions and move forward with assessment is to talk to OAW reps or the faculty coordinator. Also, attending an eLumen workshop will help you in learning the software, discoursing with colleagues, and inputting data.

Just sharing assessment-related issues with friends and colleagues could help reduce some stress.

Assessment Strategies/Activities/Tools

The following list is not limited to the items within it:

- Final exam at the course level
- Course portfolio
- A research paper evaluated toward the end of a course
- A common essay across all sections of a course
- Quiz
- Test
- Field test
- Project
- Competence interviews
- Case study

- Problem Solving
- Oral Speech
- Debate
- Product Creation
- Multiple-Choice Exam

Question to ask oneself: ***Will my test/quiz/exam/portfolio/project etc. be a direct evidence of my expected student outcomes?***

Assessing Outcomes Versus Traditional Grading: A Few Points

Outcomes Assessment

Focuses on a specific outcome or set of outcomes

Provides the teacher with deeper and more specific information regarding her/his students' learning.

Reflects the specific learning/skill/knowledge that was expected of the student

CLO expectations across sections of the same course are identical.

Traditional Grading

Reflects overall performance of the student

Grades could represent participation points, late assignments, missing assignments, extra credit etc.—all of which might not clearly *show* student learning.

The overall grade reflects the extent to which a student has met the requirements of a course.

Course content across sections of the same course could vary widely depending—for example—on an instructor's selection of readings and assignments.

Assessment Process in eLumen

Faculty Members in eLumen:

- 1) We sign up and sign in
- 2) We see our classes and rosters
- 3) We "add" an assessment or access an assessment (if it has been distributed per schedule).
- 4) We decide if we want to assess all our CLOs in one move, or if we want to assess one CLO at a time.
- 5) We either click "Student meets CLO" or "Student doesn't meet CLO."
- 6) We save and move on to the reflection template. We write an action plan *if* it has been requested.

Department Coordinators in eLumen:

Faculty members volunteer as their department's coordinator(s) to map, run aggregated reports on how the department overall appears (eg. How many courses got assessed), collect action Plans and reports for department meetings, and remind their colleagues about any assessments that are due.

Division Coordinators in eLumen:

OAW reps act as division coordinators to view the overall fulfillment of that division's assessments.

In the end, what does assessment data inform?

The purpose of data analysis is to support the continuous improvement processes of a program and of the institution as a whole for student success.

***National Institute for Learning Outcomes
Assessment:***

<http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/index.html>