



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
FEB. 13, 2014**

Members Present: James Todd, Jennifer Hamilton, Deborah Laffranchini, Bill Anelli, Chad Redwing, Mike Adams, Allan McKissick, Andrew Campbell (ASMJC President), Barbara Jensen, Christopher Briggs, David Boley, Deborah Gilbert, Elizabeth McInnes, Ellen Dambrosio, Eva Mo, Hunter Wright (ASMJC), Jim Howen, Jim Stevens, Kevin Alavezos, Layla Spain, Nancy Wonder (Sub for Lisa Riggs), Mike Morales, Paul Berger, Ross McKenzie (Sub for Paul Cripe)

Members Absent: Allen Boyer, Brian Sinclair (Faculty Liaison to the Board), Bob Droual, Curtis Martin, Travis Silvers

Guests Present: Allen Luty

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

J. Todd mentioned that # 5, #6 and #7 and possibly #3 of Continuing Business will not be discussed today.

M/ (J. Hamilton) Motion to move Victoria Simmons to the first order of business.

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

21 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

A. New Business

Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, Victoria Simmons: Presentation

V. Simmons had discussed with J. Todd what was needed to be talked about. It was decided to discuss the equivalency process, how HR can help, looking at equivalencies in the hiring process, what is working well and what can we improve upon and possibly use as a framework and look at the equivalency process in the recruitment process.

V. Simmons commented that some of the hiring processes are old, and it's possible that it's time to look at revising them. She thought starting with the equivalency process first to see if greater clarity could be added and how the process could work better.

She started the discussion by asking "What is working well that we could continue as it relates to hiring?" and "What is not working which could be improved upon and how can we come up with solutions that could help it work even better?" She wrote the items on the white board as to what was working, not working, and options.

J. Hamilton mentioned that the majority of the equivalencies that were dealt with were when FSAs were signed through the union a couple of years ago. Very rarely has it been in a hiring process, but after the fact or when it is too late. There was discussion of the MJC process. There are a lot of steps. It first goes to prescreeners, which are discipline experts, then to a standing Academic Senate Equivalency Committee who checks the process. Equivalency requests should be done prior to getting to any hiring pools. Better communication with the outside applicants who don't have minimum qualifications should be done, giving them time to obtain the equivalency in a timely manner and be able to apply for positions. Employees of MJC need to have equivalency in place with HR if they are getting hired in a difference discipline. There is not a check list. What do we do when it is not clear? What looks like a good equivalency and what doesn't? Where do we draw the line?

One of the items that work well is that we look to the discipline area experts to make the determination about what degrees are applicable and what is equivalent in their field, which make it crucial and must remain in the process.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Feb. 20, 2014, Faculty Lounge, Library Annex, East Campus

V. Simmons asked “When you have to determine what is good, how do you do that? Is it objective, subjective, discretionary, how do you work through that?”

J. Hamilton mentioned in the cases she looked at there was a handbook for minimum qualifications, and it tells you this degree has these equivalents and that is clear cut. The questions come when you have a professional degree versus a content area degree. Those different kinds of degrees have different requirements. . Both professional and content area degrees are offered from CSUs and UCs. They are two separate degrees. If you look at the minimum qualifications list, it’s not clear, and perhaps the title of the degree matters. There are gray areas, yet the gray areas need to be there because of the fluidity of education but it does cause problems.

V. Simmons said from an EEO perspective, we are considered an EEO employer which means that we don’t discriminate based on protective categories. In EEO vernacular there is something called disparate impact which means you have created a barrier to employment that is not necessarily job related and is impacting a pool of applicants in a protected category. With the State Chancellors Office minimum qualifications, they have said if you have a Masters in Philosophy, for instance, or a BA, they have a list of three or four, the State Chancellors Office is saying you have the minimum qualifications necessary as long as you have that Masters. They are not putting additional caveats on that whether there was a thesis or a certain amount of course work, and unless spelled out with definity in our processes, you can have greater requirements but at a minimum the State Chancellors Office is saying anyone with a masters in Philosophy is qualified. It’s when you don’t have that; you have to figure out the equivalent to that. We can always ask the attorney, Steve Bruckman, at the State Chancellors Office to tell us how to read that. We can ask him for a legal opinion on how to interpret that, as long as we ask in writing he is required to give a legal opinion. She can’t guarantee how quick he will be but that option is available should we choose to ask him to do that. We can then find out how to read Masters or/and then equivalent.

J. Howen mentioned there were a couple of instances where we didn’t do our due diligence to check to see if claims for equivalent were valid or not. They had the title but really didn’t do the work. There were claims about course work, degrees and experience that were not valid and they were accepted anyway. V. Simmons went over the process after a position has been offered. It’s after the fact. Academic Senate, due to prescreening, is looking at a paper screen. A verification of employment is not done until someone has been offered a position. It would be unknown until the post recommendation and the offer has been extended if problems appeared. Worst case scenario, if they misrepresented themselves, the job offer could be revoked. If that needs to change, it can be done. The timeliness of everything comes to mind and how would we approach that.

It was mentioned that it might be beneficial to have the divisions mention what types of requirements that they would like to see as far as experience or course work as either recommended or desired.

J. Todd mentioned what he would like to see, when people from the outside are applying for equivalency; they need a road map of how the process works. There should be a description of what kinds of materials to submit and how to best argue for equivalency. On the other side, when people get an equivalency form, there should be a list that shows them how to look for equivalency in the best and most fair way possible.

J. Hamilton said she would like to see, when people are looking at a job opening and see minimum qualifications listed, there needs to be a form asking if you don’t meet minimum qualifications “mark here”, and if they feel they do meet minimum qualifications, have an equivalency form completed. J. Hamilton said she doesn’t believe it’s her responsibility to get back in touch with someone to fill out an equivalency form. If it is found at the screening process she feels it is too late; maybe have a link on the job posting that is available to click on.

V. Simmons mentioned using Radio Buttons. She is willing to ask if that is a possibility. In an online application process, if Radio Buttons are used, a question could be “Do you meet the list of minimum qualifications? Yes or No. If no, do you want to submit an equivalency?” and can send them an additional email that says “In order to be considered you need to complete this” and give them a timeline.

M. Adams said on the plus side something J. Todd mentioned about training for the committee itself, is having a Senate level Equivalency Committee helps get uniformity, training would help even more, but having that Senate level committee is good.

B. Anelli said it's challenging, not a problem when it says they have a BA in or a Masters in one of the four areas, just look, but if they don't have a Masters we have to decide if they have an equivalent in those areas. It would help if every discipline could give scenarios or if called upon to help out when there is coursework and ask if this is equal to a Masters in a certain area. If something from each discipline could be done ahead of time or find a document from the state that did that. The problem is every discipline does things differently and the state does not have a document that does that. We are the ones that end up trying to make a call, which is very difficult.

J. Todd mentioned that equivalency will always be gray; so we need some kind of language of what reasonable characteristics we want on an equivalency application.

V. Simmons said to think of thresholds. To answer that question, is it more than 50% – 51% threshold or is it higher? Does it need to be 75% threshold? As long as it is consistent, you can set that. If that is where you want to go, pursue that as an option or thought. Ahead of time when you know what the top cut faculty positions that are being forwarded or are recruiting for, that is the time to make sure all this is in place because that way you don't have to go through each discipline but you start the process by ones you know are coming up.

A. McKissick said it has happened repeatedly, Division Deans hiring for part time, have not been aware of our policy. It hasn't been publicized well enough or part of their orientation or training and they do what they think is reasonable; later a committee finds they don't meet minimum qualifications.

E. McInnes mentioned why not put it on the applicant to do a short paragraph to make their argument why they have equivalency. J. Todd said it looks like that is the way it is heading.

What works = +	What doesn't work = ▲
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look to discipline faculty area experts for help with degree and course study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not quick
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate level committee helps with consistency and uniformity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests are too late or after the fact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications need more time for Equivalency paperwork
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't have equivalency in place with HR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear what is good
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional versus content degrees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due diligence on claimed experience/coursework

2. External Applications

- Need road map of process
- Description of materials needed to submit
- Best argument of what is needed for an equivalency
- Radio button on application site

3. Training for Committee

- Documents to look for
- Map of process
- Ask State Chancellors Office for Legal Opinion
- Better way to make deans aware of equivalency process, if employed are going into another discipline

4. Applicants explanation of courses and why there is an equivalency

- Creating timelines

5. Reasonable expectations for Committee/Deans

6. Reasonable characteristics in an application

V. Simmons mentioned that #2, #3, #4, #5 & #6 look like options to her. She will type up and send to us.

J. Todd asked V. Simmons to briefly let us know how we could improve on in terms of our hiring process, getting applicants in diversity.

V. Simmons mentioned Diversity is one of the biggest components at a community college. There are recruitment endeavors that help with diversity but there are multiple approaches to it. One is called affinity groups. You work with affinity groups to get applicants to apply. Start at the Grad Schools; there is a lot of fresh talent coming out of grad schools. Would they be qualified to teach in our adjunct ranks? Do you want to grow your adjunct ranks to help give them the experience they need to apply for a full time job?

If you are working with the institutions as well, you can start targeting diverse candidates. It's also how we get out in the community to see who we can talk to about applying to MJC.

In the overall hiring process, her primary focus right now is to look at recruitment. We don't have a recruitment website so there has been a construction site set up on the HR website for recruitment. There is going to be committee chair check lists, we want to have confidential statements there, and would like to have sample interview questions. We want the hiring process as easy as we can for you because we want you to look for the best applicants.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (Jan. 30, 2014)

M/S/C (J. Howen, J. Hamilton) Move to approve the Jan. 30, 2014 minutes.

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 2 Abstentions – Mike Adams, Ross McKenzie

III. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Appoint Jennifer Hamilton as Faculty Accreditation Chair.
- B. Appoint Curtis Martin, Jim Sahlman, and Rob Stevenson to the standing Academic Senate Equivalency committee.
- C. Appoint Teri Curtis and Noah Hughes to the Great Valley Museum Director Hiring Committee.
- D. Appoint Jennifer Hamilton, Theresa Stovall, Optimism One, and Timothy Hobert to the English Full-Time Tenure-Track Hiring Committee.
- E. Appoint Christopher Briggs, Janelle Gray, and Lawrence Scheg to the Reading Full-Time Tenure-Track Hiring Committee.
- F. Appoint Sara Berger, Ruth Luman, Michael Akard, Gabriele Steiner, and Michael Smedshammer to the ESL Full-Time Tenure-Track Hiring Committee.
- G. Appoint Michele Monlux, David Ward, Bob Droual and Cheryl Mulder to the Anatomy/Physiology Faculty Selection Committee.

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

21 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

B. Continuing Business

- 1. Election for Academic Senate position for College Council

No one came forward to volunteer for the College Council position. J. Todd said that he will post something college wide to see if anyone would like to do that.

J. Todd said due to the upcoming Student Success and Support plan that has to be written and the idea that faculty may be doing advising, not mandatory, but possibly would be using faculty professional time or office hours doing advising, he would like to talk to the President about streamlining governance, councils and committees. Looking at it ratio wise, not to reduce faculty. Maybe we could free up some faculty labor

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Feb. 20, 2014, Faculty Lounge, Library Annex, East Campus

in areas so possibly we can get back to doing some of the other work we are here for. It has been mentioned that there is so much for faculty to do.

2. Election for Senate membership, vacancy – At Large Senator

One person has put his name forward for At-Large Senator and that person is Allan McKissick. Since there is no other person that has put his name forward the Academic Senate President can appoint or we can vote for his becoming an At-Large Senator.

All in favor of Allan McKissick becoming an At-Large Senator.

21 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions.

There is now a vacancy in Arts, Humanities and Communications for a Senator.

3. Academic Senate Faculty Appointee Governance Handbook – 2nd reading.

J. Hamilton mentioned that there were some amendments to the Handbook that were forwarded to her that she didn't get completed to send around, but will be by the next meeting.

4. Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Plan

J. Todd gave an update where we are with the SSSP. It was a good meeting last week. He thinks what we are struggling through is two issues. One is a labor issue. One the one hand, we could tell the administration that instructional faculty are not interested in helping. They would then have to employ a lot more counselors or counselors would have to accept paraprofessionals to do informational sessions.

The other way would be to explore the confines of our contract with the possibility of assisting in faculty advising and how we do better as a college with our students. This plan is not about us marking off that students get merely advised and receive an educational plan, but the idea behind this initiative is for us to do better in terms of getting students completed with degrees. The exploration has to do with whether or not we would take on some small scale of advising. What the evidence would show is connections with students and mentoring is the best way to facilitate completion and success at a college level and if students make connections with professors that is what helps them succeed. He is talking about what can be done inside the structures we already have, not necessarily more kinds of labor. If we streamline this, the Senate could endorse the idea of people that are faculty advising leaders in their areas have time to focus and organize their office hours and professional time in a manner that is oriented specifically towards advising students. These advising faculty may not be asked to do a lot of shared governance work. They are looking at the possibility of presenting this to faculty and getting input in March.

5. The Role of Counseling Faculty and Delivery of Counseling Services in the California Community Colleges (ASCCC PAPER 2012) - delayed to another time
6. Program Discontinuance – delayed to another time
7. FSA Discipline Specialists - delayed to another time
8. Facilities Council - report following
9. Student Services Council – no report
10. Instruction Council – report following

Deb. Laffrachini said in addition to the Instruction Council written report, the issue to vote on is the Instruction Council determined to move the Speech Communication position up to a replacement position. J. Todd reported that with the passing of Charles Mullins, that position was going to be a 1 year position and would become a growth position as read. That was not the intent of that document. He called the president and talked about this issue. If someone passes away that position should immediately become a

replacement position for that division. The Arts, Humanities & Communications division voted and reaffirmed this on Friday and then it went to Instruction Council and was moved to have this Full Time Tenure tract position with the intent to correct the language inside the Hiring prioritization document.

M/S/C (B. Jensen, J. Hamilton) Move to accept the Speech Communications 1 year hire to become a Full Time Tenure tract hire and to review the Hiring Prioritization document and fix the language regarding the untimely passing of colleagues.

21 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

11. Accreditation Council

J. Hamilton reported that MJC is now off sanctions. We can now file a substantive change report with regards to Distance Education. We could not file a report while on sanction and now the Accreditation Council is working on that report. There is an Interim Report coming up in October and there will be committee requests made for writers across campus. For the DE Report the constituents, particularly the people on the DE committee and various constituents that deal with those issues will be included in the writing and the report will come to the Senate before it goes elsewhere.

12. Resource Allocation Council – no report

13. College Council

Ross McKenzie reported that a lot of the time was spent talking about service animals. Service animals are the only animals allowed on campus, other animals do not count. They have to be through DSPS with documentation and have to be a dog or a miniature horse.

There are only two questions that can be asked: 1. You can ask if it is a trained animal 2. You can ask to see the paperwork from DSPS. You cannot ask if it has been trained by a certified trainer. You cannot ask if the animal has been certified. Francisco Banuelos said to refer the student to him as well as DSPS and ask for the documentation. If you tell them where to go that facilitates them getting the accommodations they need.

Michelle Marquez from the Center of Excellence came to do a presentation. Anyone that is in a discipline where the jobs that are currently available in the area you need to talk to her because she has all the research.

C. New Business (continued)

Report from Accreditation Institute

J. Todd mentioned a Report from the Accreditation Institute that he and J. Hamilton attended will be done at a later time but wanted to give a quick observation.

Our accreditation mid-term report is coming up that will be difficult; they talked to them about the new standards. Some of them are very problematic. The new standard on Assessment will also be problematic.

J. Todd mentioned we are now away from accreditation being about showing we have process and being about show us your results and that we are constantly doing better. That is what the accreditation language is about. These are about graduation rates, success rates and retention rates. This is where we as a college have to measure ourselves and know that behind the accreditation standards is funding.

J. Hamilton said the new standards are still in draft form. One of the new standards was they opened up language to make assessment evaluative of faculty as opposed to of the courses. Upon raising the question how is it that ACCJC can mandate things in the standards that are negotiated items; faculty assessment is a negotiated item, the response was not all colleges that are accredited are unionized colleges. We will put forth the dates, what forums and will let you know where to send the feedback. We encourage you to circulate this to faculty because they are taking input from people.

D. REPORTS

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Feb. 20, 2014, Faculty Lounge, Library Annex, East Campus

a. Student Senate – Andrew Campbell

In the matter of SSSP – Faculty Advising, he loves the idea that Senate is talking about it and would like to hear that this group is taking a supportive stance on this matter. It is a great opportunity for expansion into the matriculation aspect of students.

The last meeting was Friday, Feb. 7 and the next meeting is Feb. 28, location unknown at the moment.

b. Faculty Representative to the Board – Brian Sinclair - No Report

c. Legislative Analyst - Chad Redwing – No Report

d. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW) – No Report

e. Curriculum Committee - Jennifer Hamilton – No Report

f. Faculty Professional Development Committee and PDCC - Bill Anelli – Report following

Bill Anelli mentioned there is roughly \$30,000 left in Title V Summer mini grants. He continues to work with Title V to make things more transparent. They are applying for a new Title V grant.

Professional Development Center: The idea is to have a lounge for faculty in the basement with nice couches, coffee, pastries and when you want a break or have a meeting you can go downstairs to the Professional Development Center.

g. Distance Education Report – Eva Mo – Report following

The Start Here Module is still being worked on. They discovered it was more complicated than they thought it would be because they are having interesting conversations about what is intuitive. For example: As instructors we like to duplicate information but in an online environment it may turn them into scanners. Not good pedagogy. Another conversation was what is actually required in a syllabus? They could not find it. If anyone knows where to find the official word on this please let her know.

There was Standards for New Online Instructors that are not being applied to how we hire. The issue of large online classes is being discussed. The online instructors have to drop students if they are not participating. There is a different standard of teacher-student contact, and these contact hours are a 1 on 1 and it has to be proved.

The Voice Thread is not being given out and they have been working on getting online forms to YCCD and that has been put on hold.

h. President Report – James Todd

J. Todd mentioned that he met with the CSU Academic Senate and discussed our Student Success Initiatives. They discussed ways that they could work together, our faculty knowing their faculty, whether in particular disciplines or general education kinds of pathways. There is a 75% success rate of our students that transfer to a CSU and within a six year period get their degree versus 49% for them when they get there. We do a good job prepping them. They would like to have more strategic relationships with us.

It is unknown whether we will have a meeting on Feb. 20. It is scheduled and we will let you know. If not we will continue the first week of March.

E. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS - None

F. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC - None

G. ADJOURNMENT adjourned at 5:45 pm.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Feb. 20, 2014, Faculty Lounge, Library Annex, East Campus

Academic Senate (February 13, 2014)
Facilities Council Report by John Zamora
Facilities Council Meeting of February 3, 2014, 2pm

There was only one action item related to the planting of a memorial tree at the West Campus arboretum to honor a former YCCD groundskeeper. In this person's will, it was requested that a tree be planted in their memory.

Two informational items presented by President Stearns included the Measure E Project Proposal to the YCCD Board that included West Campus parking and roadway infrastructure as well as certain roads and pathways on East Campus.

The second informational item regarded repurposing the East Campus Library Basement and Morris Memorial Building. The current plan is to do the following:

Library Basement (includes the following offices):

- Distance Education
 - o Staff
 - o Faculty Development Lab
- Professional Development (no employees, but office assigned to space)
- Large Meeting Space (conference room to accommodate up to 50 people)
- Academic Senate

Morris Memorial (includes the following offices)

1st Floor

- Community Ed
- Workforce Development.
- MJC Foundation
- Expanded Health Services
- Relocated Events/Facilities/Mailroom

2nd Floor

- TRIO (in proximity to Pre-College Programs)
- Center of Excellence
- Grants

Instruction Council Friday, February 7, 2014 12:00 - 4:00 pm
Prepared by Debbie Laffranchini

- Deans gave oral or technology-created presentations of their top two ranked positions for growth in their division
- Each presentation was performed in five minutes per position
- Some divisions presented only one position
- Each presentation was then followed by a five-minute question/answer session, entertaining questions from the Instruction Council and guests, per agreement

Report to the Senate: professional development 2/13/14

1. INSTITUTEDAY/FLEX

- a. In general feedback was overwhelmingly positive in regards to the format for spring Institute day. As a result, administration has *informally* suggested the following structure for flex and Institute days:
 - i. **A two-day Institute day** (Thursday and Friday) before the start of each fall semester - similar to the spring 2014 institute day format but with more offerings and choices, and an longer all-campus meeting (2 hours?). These would be mandatory (?) flex - ie, non-flexible flex (**inelastic-flex**).
 - ii. **A one-day Institute day** before the start of the spring semester. Also non-flexible flex? (**inelastic-flex**)
 - iii. a set number of flexible FLEX (**flexy-flex**) hours (17) to be completed during the school year.
 - iv. Issues that will be discussed this spring: should this be a contract item? Should the institute days be mandatory? If so how will they be enforced? If not, would the **flexy flex** (during the school year) include more hours if needed?
- b. **ITEMTO DO:** determine whether the state of California legislature has formally/legislatively adopted the recommendations of its Student Success Initiative's Professional Development Committee.
- c. **ITEMTO DO:** meet with the VPI and PDC regarding these suggestions. Invite faculty to weigh in on this and give me direction.

2. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

- a. Should we have a dedicated Professional Development Center for both staff and faculty? Something aimed at improving our skills and knowledge as staff or faculty? The Student Success Initiative will likely be allocating monies for this purpose to individual colleges in order to institutionally-enact this new requirement from the state (77).The amount of monies and our exact requirements are still unclear.
- b. A walk-through of the basement of the library as a possible future site for the Professional Development Center was conducted last week with myself, Judy Gonzalez, Barbara Adams, and Susan Kincade. There is very little funding for making any structural improvements (lighting, walls, ducts, conduit piping, etc). Presently the senate and Distance Education have claimed space adjoining windows. There is ample windowless space available (or we can share with DE?):ie Wes's old video services center and the old east campus duplicating center. It is not yet clear exactly what the space would look like or include. Possibilities: grants, a library, a cafe, meeting rooms, presentation/training spaces, housing related groups that address professional development: the diversity committee, the professional development committee, title v mini-grants, etc.
- c. I have raised the possibility of using part of the PDC space as an inviting "cafe" for faculty, staff, and administrators. However I am not sure whether others are interested or would visit such a cafe.

3. TITLE V, AND MINI-GRANTS

- a. Title V approved funding of 15 mini-grant proposals for faculty and denied funding for 5 mini-grant proposals. Concerns were raised regarding the decision making process. As I understand it was as follows:
 - i. A faculty-only committee was informed that there were monies to cover all proposals.
 - ii. The committee then approved all for funding except for five proposals as the committee determined that these five did not meet criteria outlined for mini-grants in title V.
 - iii. The committee did not rank the proposals as they were told that there were sufficient monies to cover all grants if need be.
 - iv. Currently there is no appeals process for those who are rejected.
- b. Roughly \$30,000 remains for summer mini-grants.
- c. Monies are also available on a rolling basis for supplemental grants. Supplemental grants can be applied for at any time. We discussed whether it was fair that only some have been in the know about the supplemental grant process.
- d. I have asked that Title V send out a list of faculty grant recipients as has been done in the past.
- e. The grant expires in September of 2014 and all monies must be spent by then.
- f. Roughly \$18,000 was allocated for Online Training course sequence at YCCD.
- g. Title V is applying for a new Title V grant.
- h. **ITEMTO DO:** Clarify procedures for disbursing summer monies and if the grant is renewed.

Distance Education Report to Senate - February 2014

- Start Here Module: the committee continues work on creating a better version of the Start Here Module. In addition, they are also working on a student online diagnostic to help students decide if they are a good candidate for online courses. As part of the conversation on best practices, the subcommittee is considering this difference: Sometimes faculty live on campus courses find it prudent to deliver information in multiple places and times to their students. However, in an online class, duplication of information may have an unintended negative effect.
-official syllabus definition?
- It was expressed that we want to maintain the approval process and standards of new online instructors. Because the agreement was finalized (approved) recently, last semester, Fall 2013 by Senate and College Council, it doesn't seem to be equally rigorously applied across campus.
- The issue of large online classes is being discussed.
- Five Camtasia licenses were distributed to faculty. The Voice Thread licenses fell through because it turns out, we cannot use lottery funds for this kind of purchase.
- Online instruction has been funded for summer. Faculty who will be teaching online in the future should take advantage of this while they can. Applications go out in March, and the first class will start in mid-April. Title V grants (from which these faculty stipends are funded) will run out in September. We anticipate that these courses will still be offered in the future, but probably without stipends to participants. However, faculty can still get flex and unit credit.
- Online classes that are more than two years old will be archived every May.
- The embedded MJC real librarian was successfully piloted.
- Online writing/tutoring center is currently up in the air.
- Online forms is on hold.