



**ACADEMIC SENATE
APPROVED MINUTES
JUNE 21, 2012**

Senators Present: Kevin Alavezos, Bruce Anders, David Boley, Ellen Dambrosio, Bob Droual, Jennifer Hamilton, Allan McKissick, Eva Mo, Adrienne Peek, Chad Redwing, Lisa Riggs, Dorothy Scully, Burt Shook, Brian Sinclair, Rob Stevenson, Theresa Stovall, James Todd, Layla Yousif, John Zamora

Senators Absent: Paul Cripe, Catherine Greene, Jim Howen, Debbie Laffranchini, Mike Morales, Estella Nanez, Mark Smith, Jim Stevens

Guests Present: James Varble, ASMJC

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

The order of the agenda items was approved without objection.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Allan McKissick noted that the motion for approval of the “Description of the Academic Senate for the MJC Participatory Decision-Making Handbook” should be corrected to say M/S/U. Burt Shook added that his comments from the last meeting regarding the status of the faculty hiring progress should be reflected in the Open Comments section.

M/S/C (Allan, McKissick, Burt Shook) to approve the June 7, 2012 meeting minutes as amended.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Approval of Faculty Liaison to the Board Job Description
- b. Structure of Assessment Work Group

The Consent Agenda was approved without objection.

IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Continuing Business

- A. Allan McKissick mentioned that a motion was approved at the last Senate meeting to direct the Senate Executive Board to meet with Administration and clarify their intent regarding the development of a new program viability process. Allan also mentioned that a motion was approved to create a task force that will study program viability, study relevant data, and possibly make recommendations for program reduction.

Allan noted that several Executive Board members have met with Administration as directed to do so. A draft of a proposal was presented to Dr. Retterer and discussed. The Academic Senate reviewed and discussed the proposal. The MJC Program Analysis Task Force proposal is as follows:

Membership:

1. Members will be appointed by the constituent groups, MJC Academic Senate, MJC Student Senate, and MJC Administration.
2. The task force will be comprised of 5 faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate, 5 members appointed by the MJC President (including the MJC President and Vice-President of Instruction or designees) and two student representatives appointed by the MJC Student Senate.

Charge: The task force is charged with considering cost savings at MJC, including any necessary and appropriate program reduction, and make recommendations to the Academic Senate, the Student Senate, and the MJC President. The task force will:

1. Analyze all relevant data, including data generated from the already ordered viability study of the entire MJC curriculum.
2. Prioritize other possible savings over cuts in academic programs.
3. Use the four-level tiering already completed in each academic program as a starting point in considering prioritization of course offerings at MJC.
4. Give high priority to retaining permanent faculty, particularly tenured faculty.
5. Prioritize PTOL and Summer Sessions related savings over cuts in academic programs.
6. Generate a ranking of programs/courses to be maintained should program cuts become necessary, based on the criteria listed in the MJC Program Viability Assessment procedure.

The task force will facilitate a consensus between the Academic Senate and the MJC President on recommendations to be presented to the YCCD Chancellor and Board of Trustees.

Allan commented that Administration also shared a draft of criteria that they are in the process of developing. Mr. McKissick noted that there is a lot of overlap with Administration's criteria compared to the Program Viability Process created by Senate, but you will also see a lot of differences. Allan said that it was discussed with Administration that if there is to be any more criteria developed, there should be every attempt made to get the Senate on board. Allan stated that he was very pleased with the general atmosphere of the meeting with the Administration.

Allan said that Dr. Retterer has stated the word suspend instead of eliminate in previous conversations regarding program viability. Allan said that he hopes that the institution can get to a point of looking at the budget crisis this way. Allan said that looking at program viability is something we should be doing. If in the future we are not experiencing budget issues, maybe

we could use program viability to look at programs that actually need more funding. Program viability can also be used to fund programs.

Burt Shook said that he doesn't think the program viability process that is currently being discussed based on budget cuts should be set apart from the current program viability process. Burt said, "I think the current viability process is a good check against instant and sudden decisions regarding elimination of programs. That is exactly why it is in place. Regardless of what the reason would be for an attempt to end a program, it's my understanding that once financial exigency is officially declared by a college board, then all bets are off. I think it should take that to make an exception to a current policy that's in place. I would hate to see a separate budget related program viability process be developed outside the current program viability process that is in place, unless that official determination of financial exigency is made."

James Todd said that compared to a year ago, it is amazing that we have an invitation to be a part of this process. James Todd stated, "If we have five people present, then that is really positive. I am looking at this as an opportunity."

Allan stated that he would like to meet with Burt and others who have expressed comments regarding the current viability process. Allan said he wants to maintain the current process as much as possible. John Zamora informed the group that this is an ongoing process right now, and the group will continue working on language for the Program Analysis Task Force.

- B. John Zamora updated the Academic Senate on the Participatory Decision-Making Handbook progress. John said the first draft will be available on July 9, 2012. Allan commented that it was very important that the Senate description was passed unanimously. This shows that the Senate is standing firm on the concepts within the description.

New Business

- A. Eva Mo stated that she has two different integrity topics to discuss with Senate members which are the following:
1. Authenticity task force to start the research process for distance education (DE) to address accreditation concerns.
 2. Integrity initiative conversation to address:
 - Who do we want to be?
 - What do we want to accomplish?
 - Where would we like to see ourselves?
 - What is our mission here at this institution?

James Todd said that we need a task force to tackle DE authenticity sooner rather than later. Rob Stevenson stated that a call should also go out to all faculty that use online instruction to request their membership on the task force. James Todd made the following motion:

To support the Distance Education Committee's formation of a task force that will look into the authenticity issues surrounding DE, and to also formally request that members of the Senate be members of the task force.

M/S/C (James Todd, Eva Mo) to approve the motion.

- B. James Todd announced that the College Committee for Diversity and Community (CCDC) has set up a delegation to people that want to be part of the Strategic Planning process. James said that the committee has opened this up to as many people that want to be part of the process as possible. James said it is important that people get involved with this process and asked for volunteers from the Academic Senate. Adrienne Peek, Brian Sinclair, and Chad Redwing volunteered to be part of the delegation. It was mentioned that there are several others who might be interested but were not present at the Academic Senate meeting. John Zamora took note of the list of names.

V. REPORTS

STUDENT SENATE

James Varble, ASMJC Vice President reported the following:

This summer continues to be a busy and productive one for the Student Senate. Some highlights:

- i. The Annual ASMJC Fireworks Booth is taking place from June 27 to July 5. We are in urgent need of faculty, staff, and administrators to help staff the booth.
- ii. The Fireside Lounge renovation is continuing on schedule and should be completed by the end of summer and online for student use this fall. A memorandum of understanding is being drafted to ensure student primacy on the usage of the lounge.
- iii. The Inter-Club Council has adopted new standing orders to reflect the Constitutional change to take effect July 1. The Student Senate is also in the process of adopting new bylaws.
- iv. The Student Senate has continued to be well represented and active in its participatory governance responsibilities on campus including campus-wide committees.
- v. The Student Senate for California Community Colleges Council will have its first meeting of the 2012-13 year on July 6-8. Kevin Sabo and James Varble are returning as Senators for Region V.
- vi. Vice President of ICC Varble attended the June 19 California State Assembly Higher Education Committee meeting to testify on legislation pertinent to higher education. SB 1456, the Student Success Act, was passed to Appropriations. SB 1550, the Extension Course Pilot Program, did not have the votes to pass to appropriations. Kristin Olsen, the Assembly Member who represents Modesto, supports it despite the opposition of the YCCD. President Sabo and Vice President will be coordinating

an open response to Member Olsen and would appreciate the assistance of all stakeholders including the Academic Senate.

FACULTY CONSULTANT TO THE BOARD/DISTRICT COUNCIL

NO REPORT

INSTRUCTIONAL ADMINISTRATOR'S COUNCIL (IAC)

NO REPORT

ACCREDITATION/INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (AIE)

Dr. Fay reported that he and Brenda Thames recently went to an ACCJC meeting where there was an increased emphasis on distance education. Dr. Fay said that ACCJC referred them to a webinar where it was explained that the federal auditors are looking more closely at distance education courses offered. Dr. Fay said that he recently prepared a letter that went out to all faculty members who teach distance education courses (online courses). The letter was accompanied by a rubric analysis that Jim Clarke created and an ACCJC best practices document to insure that each faculty member is meeting the standards. Dr. Fay said that on June 25th and 28th a workshop will be held to assist those who have questions or need assistance with a revision of their online course.

ASSESSMENT WORK GROUP

James Todd distributed the newly revised Assessment Work Group membership. James explained that the Assessment Work Group now has a smaller Assessment Executive Group that will meet every other week prior to the Assessment Work Group meetings. James reported that an email announcement will be sent shortly for the Assessment Coordinator position. Mr. Todd stated that a faculty vice-chair position will also be announced soon after the Assessment Coordinator appointee is announced. James said that the work group is in the process of finding more representatives from divisions to participate as members of the work group.

James stated that the group is shifting away from the idea of representatives gathering data from faculty. James said that this should now be common practice. James said a pilot is currently in place to assess a couple of program learning outcomes. James stated that Dr. Antoinette Herrera is currently working on a manual that will assist faculty when assessing program learning outcomes.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

NO REPORT

COLLEGE COUNCIL

Allan reported that College Council met on June 11, 2012. Allan said that Dr. Retterer, Dr. Fay and Brenda Thames visited ACCJC to give a five minute presentation to address and respond to the accreditation recommendations. Allan said that judging by the responses and questions asked by the commission to Dr. Retterer, it sounded like it went very well.

Allan stated that it was reported in College Council, that Jenni Abbott has been selected as the new Distance Education Director.

Allan mentioned that program viability was discussed, and there was a rather articulate expression of a need for student involvement. Allan mentioned that Program Review was also discussed. Allan distributed a draft 4 of the Program Review Flowchart. Allan stated that it was noted at College Council that there is no indication present for the Senate's input in this process which is a mutually agree area. James Varble stated that there is another draft that just came out with additional data that was recently discussed at the AIE meeting.

Allan reported that the move of the Career Center was discussed at the council meeting. It was reported that the Career Center is scheduled to be moved into the Student Center. The Student Center is reported to be modified as well. Allan stated that several delegates expressed concern that decisions are being made without a broader discussion, and asked the College Council who is making these decisions? Allan said that he spoke with Brenda Thames who claimed the Facilities Secondary Effects Committee made the decision with student support. Adrienne Peek reported that the committee focuses solely on entities that are being displaced because of Measure E projects.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

John Zamora reported that Dr. Retterer made Michael Guerra her designee as co-chair on the Planning and Budget Committee. John reported that Mr. Guerra has been on a leave of absence. The Planning and Budget Committee has not met recently due to Michael's absence.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

John Zamora reported that he recently attended the Faculty Leadership Institute in Temecula, California. John said that it was a good session from the time he arrived until the time he left. John came back with a lot of information to share regarding access to much needed informational data. John mentioned that all of the data shared at the Faculty Leadership Institute can also be viewed at the State Academic site:

<http://www.asccc.org/>

VI. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.