



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
DECEMBER 4, 2014**

Members Present: James Todd (President), Curtis Martin (Vice President), Bill Anelli, Deborah Laffranchini, Rob Stevenson (sub for Chad Redwing), Allan McKissick, Allen Boyer, Barbara Jensen, Belen Robinson, Brian Sinclair (Faculty Liaison to the Board, Christopher Briggs, David Chapman, Elizabeth David, Elizabeth McInnes, Ellen Dambrosio, Eva Mo, James Dorn, Jim Howen, Kevin Alavezos, Layla Spain, Luis Rebolledo (ASMJC President), Mike Adams, Nancy Wonder, Todd Conrado (sub for Gail Brumley)

Members Absent: Adrienne Peek, Jim Stevens, Paul Berger, Travis Silvers

Guests Present: Rusty Stivers

I. MINI LESSON – DEBORAH LAFFRANCHINI – not given

II. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

M/S/C (J. Dorn, E. David) Move to approve the Order of Agenda Items.

22 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (NOVEMBER 6, 2014)

M/S/C (J. Dorn, A. Boyer) Move to approve the November 6, 2014 minutes with changes.

22 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

A. One Year Temporary non-tenure track DSPS Counselor/Learning Disability (LD) Specialist.

M/S/C (B. Jensen, B. Robinson) Move to approve the Consent Agenda.

22 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

V. REPORTS

A. ASMJC Senate – Luis E. Rebolledo

J. Todd/Luis E. Rebolledo said Cram night is tonight from 8 pm to midnight.

B. Instructional Administrator – Susan Kincade – no report

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

D. Legislative Analyst Report – Chad Redwing – no report

E. Accreditation Council – Ellen Dambrosio (reporter until Chad Redwing returns) – no report

F. Instruction Council – Debbie Laffranchini – will be covered in Continuing Business.

G. Facilities Council – Jim Howen

J. Howen mentioned that Facilities Council met on December 1, and due to ASMJC wanting to install benches in Founders Hall, there was a discussion about the process for approving projects. There has not been a good study on the details of the installation and this has triggered a need for a process, similar to the process that Curriculum Committee has been using which states if you want something to go through Curriculum Committee these are the steps to take and the information that needs to be reviewed. They have been given until December 12 for ideas or items that should be on an application such as what other groups or individuals will be affected by a new facilities change.

J. Howen said he will be submitting what he feels is necessary and if there is anyone who has other ideas please let him know.

H. Resource Allocation Council – Kevin Alavezos – report following provided by Nancy Sill

K. Alavezos mentioned that RAC has not met quorum the last two meetings and there will be a meeting tomorrow.

I. College Council – Curtis Martin

J. Todd made a presentation on the Equity Report. College Council goals were discussed and it was felt more specific objectives that can work in a more practical way were needed. B. Thames is working on revising and had a draft with more specific objectives in a more tiered way. College Council has been operating without a proper college goal system for years.

J. Todd asked if based on this do we want a group to get together for a couple of hours to discuss if we want to have a weigh in on this at College Council. Do we want a smaller group that is tasked to look at the College Council goals in more detail? There has been a draft and has been seen by Academic Senate twice. A. McKissick said if there was not an approval there should be a ratification or approval through the Senate or maybe if there is a controversy a committee or a small group could be formed, and if they are agreeable that could be skipped.

J. Todd said he will be put on our next Executive Agenda and they will go through them to see if there is anything they think is necessary and if there are areas on objectives or goals they will bring it forward to Senate.

B. Anelli said things are proceeding with the Respiratory Care and the Baccalaureate Degree.

J. Faculty Representative to the Board – Brian Sinclair

B. Sinclair said the only meeting he attended since Senate's last meeting was College Council, and he has nothing further to add. J. Todd thanked Brian Sinclair for his service.

The qualification is two years on either the Senate Executive Committee or the YFA Executive Committee. If no one is found J. Todd may have to speak with Ted Hamilton and Debi Bolter for suggestions, because this position is needed for next semester. The position is 40% reassigned time and the other portion is overload. There was a suggestion of having the Bylaws changed. J. Todd said we may need to rethink the qualifications of this position.

C. Martin said the options we have need to be discussed. The Bylaws cannot be revamped each time there is a problem. The Bylaws need to work for us and are there to give us guidance. R. Stevenson said technically they cannot be changed as they are owned one third by the District, one third by YFA and one third by Academic Senate and is not easy to change. J. Todd said a list needs to be made with those who have the qualifications. The position would start January 2015.

K. Curriculum Committee – Curtis Martin or Barbara Adams – report following

J. Todd said M. Adams submitted a position paper from the Math Department on course unit values. M. Adams said this was a document that the department as a whole spent a lot of time working on. It is the Math Department's position on units. It has loads of data, but the important part is at the end. It might be to your benefit to read the last paragraph first and then go back through and read all the supporting information.

M. Adams mentioned Math 174, Math 134, and Math 135, a new course, were approved at Curriculum Committee on December 2, 2014.

A. McKissick said this was a large part of what he requested because Curriculum Committee will be doing the close analysis of course by course of what is appropriate; it has become a college wide issue. If anyone has any response to this, or disagreement, or is not happy with this, speaking up is encouraged. The issue has been brought forward on several occasions, and some

of the primary information and arguments on both sides delineated; this is a large step. At this point it is a college wide discussion with no disrespect or disruption to what Curriculum does to say that. He hopes there is further engagement with this, whether it be agreement or disagreement.

J. Todd thinks there is a lot of good and accurate information in this report and M. Adams did a superb job discussing the Math Department's thoughts and position. One key item to note is: there is no State Mandate that says Math courses need or have to be reduced in units or contact time. However, we have an issue with our Computer Science ADT, and there has been difficulty meeting that mandate.

A. McKissick said maybe this discussion is done, yet since the request was made in Senate and followed up and was agreed to, he would like people to be able to look back and know the intent was made by the Senate to get the information out there. So if it is done, great, if it is not done, then there needs to be more responses.

Curtis Martin urged everyone to read it, as it is an interesting document.

L. Distance Education Committee – Eva Mo – report following provided by Leslie Collins

E. Mo went over a few items on the Distance Education Report. Disability Services came and did a presentation. It was brought up that some of the materials given out are poor copies from old books. If there is something that has been cut off at the bottom or is too dark, Disability Services staff has to find the information and type it in to accommodate Disability Students. Faculty need to be educated that when poor quality materials are given out it may be a large job for Disability Services.

According to the presentation, for online courses, if you have a video and that video is something that was personally created, it must be closed captioned whether it is requested or not. If that video is used on YouTube it must be closed captioned. If that video is linked to YouTube, this semester, it does not have to be closed captioned. If that video is being used continuously, it must be closed captioned. There is money available for software and materials to support you. Please contact Disability Services.

There was a discussion regarding the close captioning of videos for regular conventional classes and if they were required to be closed captioned.

E. Mo said when students ask for a closed captioned video, it needs to be ready now, not at a later time or date. We need to have them ready before they are asked. Faculty need to be more educated about Disabilities, and there is a breakout session on Institute Day.

R. Stevenson said it was his understanding that a transcript could be provided along with the videos as opposed to closed captioning, and E. Mo confirmed this.

J. Dorn mentioned there is an Alternate Text Production Center online. Go to toolsthatinspire.com and there are services available to do all the captioning. These are available to all 112 community colleges.

E. Mo said Distance Education Committee is asking for a change in the Search function area on the website and need to get Susan Kincade's approval. They are asking for a small link advisory for every online course, because it seems that students often will take online classes before they have knowledge what it will take.

M. Student Services Council – Ross McKenzie - no report

N. Faculty Professional Development Committee and PDCC – Bill Anelli – No Report

O. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW) – Eileen Kerr – no report

P. District Advisory Technology Committee - John Zamora – no report

J. Todd did mention that he heard that this committee will be restarting in Spring 2015. The date is unknown at the moment, and J. Todd will attempt to find out a starting date.

VI. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Continuing Business

1. Electronic Voting (Rules and Bylaws change to Senate Rules and Bylaws) – 2nd Reading

M/S/C (C. Martin, E. Mo) Move to approve the MJC Academic Senate Rules and Bylaws change to allow for electronic voting.

22 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

2. Elections: Executive Committee

There have been nominations for Bill Anelli for Secretary and Chad Redwing for Legislative Analyst. The nominations are closed and will be voted on in January 2015. This will be for the term beginning in Fall 2015. A Parliamentarian position is still open. J. Todd mentioned that he would like to have an expanded Executive Committee for next year.

J. Todd mentioned there are assessment issues coming our way as a college. The new Accreditation standards ask us to look at our Outcome Assessments according to our sub-population which means we have to track our SLOs in our courses; and we have to track our students by tracking our CLOs, ILOs and PLOs. The issue is: how we are going to do that? The discussion over the last couple of months has been about the kind of device we can have to do that which is probably one program. 85% - 90% of the community colleges in California do not meet the standard. No one has been doing it and now we have to. He would like to have someone that is also assessment, and program review on the Executive Committee that can help us with this.

3. Resolution FA14-A & YFA Contract 37.8

B. Anelli had handouts with the following Update information on Resolution FA14-A included available for the Academic Senate. B. Anelli mentioned that Resolution FA14-A was passed on November 6, 2014, and this had to do with combining shells into one large shell. At the same time Article 37 from the Distance Education Online Education from the YFA contract 37.8 states "An online education course shall be assigned a load factor and class size standards on the same basis as a traditional course including large class accommodations and the number of preparations."

B. Anelli spoke with D. Bolter, YFA and there is a way in which Resolution FA14-A and Contract 37.8 are at cross purposes. He went over the Analysis details, which is YFA would like the administration to write an MOU that is consistent the Resolution FA14-A. Presently the administration is not interested in altering YFA Contract 37.8.

B. Anelli also went over the reasons for the MOU/Resolution. This is just an information update that the resolution we passed in not in alignment with our contract and YFA is in agreement that this was an oversight and no one considered this issue and would like the administration to do an MOU.

Discussion took place regarding combining classes; what is allowed and not allowed and what technology has allowed online faculty to deal with large influx of materials back and forth.

4. Student Equity Plan

J. Todd said the Student Equity Plan needs to be passed today if there are no objections. There has been widespread discussion and planning across the campus, including brainstorming events, brown bag lunches, and many Student Success and Equity Committee meetings.

M/S (C. Martin, R. Stevenson) Move to approve the Student Equity Plan in one reading.

Point of Information was made by K. Alavezos. His division was concerned about the new budget allocation line items. Did the total change from the previous version?

J. Abbott mentioned there was a shift in a few things. More money was put into Faculty stipends and there was a new position, the Instructional Designer) added, but the dollar amount did not change.

J. Todd said after several meetings with the Student Equity Committee, a large discussion took place in College Council regarding the need to provide stipends for the faculty for an increased amount of work in a short amount of time. There was \$110,000 faculty stipends which was moved around and became \$115,000. We also need work from the Outcomes Assessment Workgroup and Program Work Group. There will be a tremendous amount of work to be done in the next six to nine months, as we get ready for a new system, the stipends were changed to \$115,000.

J. Abbott mentioned there were two Program Specialists and one was reduced to 50% and will now be shared with SSSP which allowed some of the money to be moved to other places.

J. Todd added the majority of this plan has gone through Student Equity and College Council. It has gone to the Board but hasn't been approved but they needed a copy in advance of their meeting on December 10, 2014. This is the first proposal as the state has asked for a lot more data.

J. Abbott said as you look at the budget which gives a good idea of the plan, it runs from January 2015 until August 2015, which is a lot of money to spend in eight months. The hope is this will make significant changes.

M/S/C (C. Martin, R. Stevenson) Move to approve the Student Equity Plan in one reading.
22 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

5. Faculty Hiring Prioritization

Before discussion took place R. Stevenson had a quick report item from Instruction Council. A motion was passed asking for the President of the Academic Senate and the Senate to discuss with the President and the District a policy and procedure that could be established for re-instating discontinued programs. Currently one position has been requested for a program that was discontinued and there is no policy.

R. Stevenson said he filled in for J. Todd and C. Redwing for the last three meetings and to help facilitate the hiring prioritization replacements and discussed what kind of format for presentations. He attended the meeting where the presentations were given and the presentations were very efficient by Deans and faculty in the way they were presented and the categories they were asked to answer. They were then scored over the weekend and turned in on the following Monday, so the next Tuesday they could meet and make a preliminary list.

R. Stevenson went over the document that took the individual scoring from the rubric of all the people involved and put them into a ranking. He showed them a version of the rubric that took out the highest and lowest score to see if anyone had manipulated the score, and there were no changes in the top 16-17, then one went back and forth where they had been statistically tied, and there wasn't any changes until the late 20's – 30's that things started moving around, so this is the point where the discussion began. A number of positions came up, was discussed and vetted and this is the list that was approved as the preliminary list. Instruction Council was aware there were a couple of issues going in approving this list. The two main key items being looked at were productivity because these are twelve currently unfunded positions and bottlenecks for completion, whether vocational or transfer.

There were a number of categorical positions put in at the last minute and the Instruction Council knew it was not capable of looking at the budget in determining how one should work with positions that are categorically funded that are coming from grant money for the next few years and how to properly prioritize those in regards to our budget situation in a couple of days' notice.

R. Stevenson said they did their best to prioritize with the couple of criteria they had and the information they had knowing when it was passed there could be changes. The last minute categorical positions added to the list were requested ahead of time to also be ranked and there was no problem in doing that but the financial portion of the picture would need something like AI Alt there to get the whole picture and that is not what Instruction Council was doing at that particular time. This list is the preliminary list that was passed not knowing what the FON would be, how many we would need to hire and not knowing how categorical positions would be dealt with. These were based on the two criteria, how well they would produce and how well they would fulfill the needs of the school.

After a comment was made about small programs and it sounds like people are being hired that are serving the most amount of students, D. Laffranchini said this question was asked at a previous meeting and this particular year because we are looking to grow, those higher numbers got a priority. It is not setting a precedent and raised that question on that day as well to make sure we were not going to lose the ability to hire the faculty down the line. R. Stevenson said the form that comes into Instruction Council ranks on five different areas. One of those areas is the history of the position and another is data.

After being asked about production measures, and was there a certain standard of measurements, R. Stevenson said on the Instruction Council website there is a release of school wide numbers by department for the last three semesters including waitlists, graphs and such. All the data points are listed for the last three semesters, department by department. What made it difficult is people brought in still different types of information and described what the numbers mean. Sometimes it is really difficult to get down to the real data.

J. Howen mentioned that Tech Ed has an issue with this type of hiring methodology if it is used all the time. It only takes a few points lost in any category to drop that position low enough to not be in the running. Every category counts. How many years have we not been asked to grow?

C. Martin said we need not just FTES but we need productivity also. It is very hard to look at all the programs that all deserve to be hired, and make a decision that this year we need to be productive so we don't end up where we were three years ago, letting people go because we couldn't make enough money. Academic Senate could be better at having a philosophical understanding of what we are as an institution. We are a comprehensive institution. We value every program, how we pay for all of them is the question.

A. McKissick thinks we are in an FTE crisis and is being told it is not the usual crisis. He thinks there may be an overwhelming sense and consensus that we really need to focus on FTE at this time but he thinks Senate needs to weigh in, one way or another, at the level of the rubric because that is where the philosophy of what we want to do in our next hires is manifested. He thinks he heard if this is modified it would come back to us again. If it did not come back to us it would be a problem, because he understands with Engaging All Voices the Senate is guaranteed an opportunity to react to the ranking and if objections the President and the Senate would have every obligation to try to come to a mutual agreement and there could even be a separate report to the Board if necessary. There is that obligation of mutual agreement if there is an objection by the Senate. Lastly he wanted to ask if there was any discrepancy between the way the faculty ranked as a group and the overall committee. He wanted to hear a comparison between the two.

R. Stevenson said he looked at the rankings with the names attached so he did look for that. It seemed to him that in terms of productivity and bottlenecks people were in the same mindset. The difference he found between administration and faculty was interest in the categorical positions. He believes that stems from the difference in experience like understanding how the budget works for their division. He didn't really see a difference in that way. His understanding is in order to make growth this year we have to use everything from summer. The twelve positions that are being hired, it seems the district and the college does not really want to hire them, but it is the FON, they have to hire them. We don't know the number for sure, but that is the number that continues to be put out there. Those to be hired need to be productive enough to make up for the loss of summer going

forward. They were focused on it and he didn't see any real difference between faculty, staff and administration.

J. Todd said he is not sure what will happen in the discussion if there are different opinions from the administration in terms of meeting our targets for base not growth when he gets to College Council. There is also a balancing act in terms of we have free categorical positions for the next three years in Counseling, if not beyond. He has College Council on Monday, Dec. 6. J. Todd asked Senate how they would like him to proceed process wise.

D. Chapman said we could say we were happy with the process and how it was handled, and C. Martin said we would not make recommendations on the rankings until after College Council meets and it is brought back to the Senate meeting next week.

J. Todd said if there is a change in the rankings, he could inform faculty and let them know we are meeting here next Thursday, December 11.

Eva Mo said she appreciates all the work and the difficulties the committee went through. She is more inclined to vote for the process, but she has misgivings. 1. The data you said you didn't have at your fingertips, if people are making decisions on productivity, you need the data, otherwise it is not really making decisions on productivity. 2. When looking at the rankings, in her experience in hiring people and ranking, there are a few people less than the rankings but they tend to be similar and she is seeing crazy numbers, and she does not understand how people can be so different. How methodical and logical was the process where people could come to a decision that is unanimous rather than a strong army position. When she looks at the ranking although a few seem consistent across the board the majority are really just up and down. That concerns her.

R. Stevenson said every person that is a Senate appointment represents the Senate not their division. There are a wide variety of expertise areas that are drawn from. He directed twice to all representatives of the Senate that they were making their ranking by the desires of the Senate, they represent the Senate and not their particular division.

C. Martin was not sure by saying that we affirm the process that we are affirming a particular rubric because it is an ongoing process. The process is it went to the committee, it came to Senate and it is going to College Council.

R. Stevenson mentioned those are legitimate concerns and he gave a candid and honest answer. The two bits of data that came out was data that was identified in the process. No information was denied to them. This is the second time they have done it, it is getting better and it is not perfect. Each time you are supposed to identify, and these are things we would have asked for had we known that this is what was being looked for this year. When he says these things would have helped these are things that would still be helpful in streamlining, he does not mean people were ill informed.

M/S (D. Chapman, C. Martin) Move to affirm the Faculty Hiring Prioritization process.

Call to Question was made by D. Laffranchini, seconded by B. Jensen. Non-debatable. 2/3^{rds} vote needed. Vote by counting of hands.

To stop debate – 11 hands, not in favor of stopping the debate – 5 hands. 2/3rds vote carried to stop the debate.

Leyla Spain left the meeting at 5:15 pm. Elizabeth David and Belen Robinson left the meeting at 5:36 pm.

M/S/C (D. Chapman, C. Martin) Move to affirm the Faculty Hiring Prioritization process.

13 Ayes, 1 Opposed – Jim Howen, 5 Abstentions – Bill Anelli, Elizabeth McInnes, Kevin Alavezos, Allan McKissick, Mike Adams

6. Faculty Hiring Committee Appointments

J. Todd mentioned he, as Academic Senate President, is the person who appoints people to hiring committees, and he has talked to other Academic Senate Presidents over the last few

months on how they do it. J. Todd mentioned that we might consider a different process going forward. A number of positions will get hired soon, and he will put out for a large call across campus for those who would like to be on hiring committees and will let them know the positions to be hired. One of the things he learned when thinking about issues from diversity to good teaching, to whatever, it might be beneficial to have someone from a different area be on a hiring committee. What they are really doing is helping us evaluate the person as a teacher and what they can do with our students. He would like to have a more open process in terms of people wanting to be on committees stepping forward and then he will try to assemble more diverse committees.

A. McKissick said he understands that the department can use three members, and he is all for the Senate approving the membership committees but remembers something different. He believes the committee picks that person but thinks we should check. J. Todd said he needs to check the number of members on a hiring committee.

R. Stevenson said there is a specified one person who is outside of that area and that fits what J. Todd is talking about and believes that ratio was come up for a reason, the number of experts in the area, and the number of persons outside the area.

C. Martin said it always has been an Academic Senate President appointment. It is a formality, and C. Martin thinks what J. Todd is saying is it is faculty serving faculty, and it has always been Academic Senate.

J. Todd thought it would be good for us as a college to have as many people as possible who are interested in being on hiring committees.

J. Todd said the replacement positions were approved. J. Todd went over the list of 2015-2016 Faculty Hiring Prioritization Replacement List

M/S/C (M. Adams, E. Dambrosio) Move to approve the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Replacement List.

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

B. New Business – None

- A. **ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS** - none
- B. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** - None
- C. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC** - None
- D. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM SENATORS** - None
- 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."

Resource Allocation Council
By Nancy Sill
December 1, 2014

At the last RAC meeting, November 21, 2014 we did not have quorum (I believe that was the second meeting in a row without quorum) so we were unable to approve any of the minutes or take action. It was decided that the VP of College and Admin Services would send out the minutes electronically and we would vote via email to approve the minutes (we have not received that email to date).

The VPCAS provided a copy of a timeline to the council regarding dates for the process of allocating the IELM monies. It was noted that all funds must be expended prior to the end of the fiscal year and departments would have to conform to the YCCD procedures for purchase cut-off dates to allow for the physical delivery/inventory of items prior the June 30, 2015 year end.

The VPCAS planned to communicate the process to the deans on December 1, 2014.

It was undecided at the adjournment of the meeting as to how the council will allocate funds. There was some discussion of using a rubric or simply meeting as a group to discuss the rankings. It was suggested that the council use the "MJC Instruction Outlook Fall 2014," prepared by the Office of Instruction and presented to the Instruction Council for ranking faculty hires, to provide guidance as to how to prioritize IELM fund allocations.

The council plans to meet on Friday, December 5th to refine how the process will be handled. The meeting time will be changed from its regular start time of 10 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Academic Senate

Curriculum Committee Report

Submitted December 4, 2014

The Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee met on Tuesday, December 2, 2014 at 2:40 PM for their regularly scheduled meeting.

- Committee Actions:
 - Reviewed 27 and approved 17 course proposals (revisions, and adoptions)
 - 11 courses pulled, discussed at meeting – 2 approved, 9 not approved
 - Reviewed and approved 15 requisites requests (maintaining, requesting new)
 - Reviewed and approved 1 local requirement requests (maintaining)
 - Reviewed and approved 12 GE requests (maintaining, requesting new)
 - Reviewed and approved 2 DE proposals (removing, requesting new)
 - Reviewed and approved 6 materials fees requests (increasing, requesting new)
 - Reviewed and approved 2 programs (modifications)

Respectfully submitted,

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

Report to Senate: Distance Education Advisory Committee, December 2014

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

Prepared by: Leslie Collins

Date: December 2nd, 2014

I. Student Success and Equity Plan

- A. Jenni Abbott explained that the Student Success and Equity Plan has two primary goals:
 - 1. To help the college gather and read data more effectively
 - 2. To help the college identify, understand, and support student populations that are disproportionately impacted
- B. Jenni Abbott and Mike Smedshammer highlighted the sections of the Student Success and Equity Plan that have a direct impact on distance education at MJC. These include:
 - 1. An instructional designer
 - 2. Faculty and staff training
 - 3. Funding for technology conferences
 - 4. A student portal

II. IELM (ILEM?) Funds

- A. Brenda Thames explained that funding is available for software and materials to help Distance Education students.
- B. If resources are needed, these should be forwarded to the division deans.

III. DSPS and Distance Education

- A. Claudia Mery from DSPS shared some common issues that students with accommodations encounter in their DE classes. These include:
 - 1. Uncaptioned (or poorly captioned) videos
 - 2. Issues with scanned .pdf copies of text
 - 3. Getting the course textbook in a format they can use (i.e., audio files instead of print)
- B. The committee agreed that more effort needs to be devoted to educating faculty about accessibility, universal design, and copyright law.

IV. Distance Education Committee Structure

- A. The distance education committee's official name change (from "Distance Education Advisory Committee" to "Distance Education Committee") is on hold until College Council reexamines "Engaging All Voices" in the spring.
- B. The Distance Education Committee reporting structure is also on hold until this process is completed.

V. Online Student Readiness Quiz Advisory

- A. A module and associated quiz assessing student readiness for online classes is available now in Blackboard.
- B. DE faculty are encouraged to have their students work through this quiz at the start of the semester to introduce them to the various Blackboard tools needed to succeed in online classes.
- C. An advisory will be added to the schedule of courses for all fully-online and hybrid classes for the spring 2015 semester encouraging students to complete the module and quiz before enrolling in a DE class.

VI. Education Opportunities in Distance Education

- A. An online instruction cohort is being formed for the spring 2015 semester. Most applications to join this cohort are from adjunct faculty.
- B. In response to faculty requests, the DEC will focus on providing more continuing education opportunities for DE faculty beginning in spring 2015. These will include:
 - 1. Short monthly emails sharing teaching tips from experienced DE instructors at MJC
 - 2. Brown bag lunches
 - 3. Office hours with the instructional designer

VII. Information from the District Technology Advisory Committee

- A. The Microsoft Office 365 upgrade is scheduled for April 2015 for faculty. This will give faculty access to:
 - 1. More email space (from 200MB to 50GB)
 - 2. 1TB of cloud storage space
 - 3. A full cloud-based Microsoft Office suite
 - 4. Mobile support (apps on mobile devices)
- B. Fun fact: MJC's wireless network has 10,000 devices access it per day.
- C. A discussion is occurring in the DTAC about whether the "reply all" function to listservs on MJC email should be limited to particular accounts and restricted on others.
 - 1. There were some concerns in DEC about this being an academic freedom issue.
 - 2. There were also questions about whether this is a big enough issue to require this policy.
 - 3. This led to a question about the status of the "Email Etiquette" task force which met about a year ago. Members have not been contacted for a follow-up.

VIII. Online Education Initiative Update

- A. Curtis Martin's course has been approved for the OEI.
- B. Mike Smedshammer believes this is the first MJC course which has been approved to join the OEI pilot program.

IX. Sub-Committee on Large Online Classes - The sub-committee for large online classes is scheduled to meet during finals week to continue their analysis of class size, configuration, and modality.

X. College Council Update

- A. The Student Equity plan was the primary focus of the last College Council meeting.
- B. A UStream channel has been created to live-stream MJC events.
- C. Funds are being earmarked to develop a BA program in Respiratory Care.