



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
APRIL 16, 2015**

Members Present: James Todd (President), Curtis Martin (Vice President), Steve Amador, Chad Redwing, Deborah Laffranchini, Allan McKissick, Allen Boyer, Bob Droual, Rob Stevenson (sub for David Chapman), Elizabeth David, Ellen Dambrosio, Eva Mo, James Dorn, Jim Howen, Nancy Backlund (sub for Kevin Alavezos), Layla Spain, Luis Rebolledo (ASMJC President), Mike Adams, Nancy Wonder, Paul Berger

Members Absent: Adrienne Peek, Belen Robinson, Jim Stevens, Shelley Circle

Guests Present: Jeff Beebe, Ross McKenzie, Laurie Hatch, Brian Greene, Barbara Jensen, Bill Anelli, Pedro Mendes

I. MINI-LESSON - none

II. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

J. Todd stated he wanted to make a change to the order of the agenda, and under New and Continuing Business, move the Curriculum Committee Report up to be #1, followed by Curriculum Review Process, #2. J. Todd also wanted to move the Library & Learning Center Reorganization Concerns up to #3, and followed by the Executive Committee Elections as #4. C. Redwing and J. Todd agreed if time runs out Program Discontinuance and Program Review could wait until the next agenda.

Since there were no objections the Reorder of the Agenda Items was approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (March 19, 2015, April 2, 2015) The minutes were not reviewed and will be ready at the next meeting.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Appoint Debra Bolter, Kim Gyuran, Kim Kennard, and Brian Sinclair to the BBSS Division Dean Hiring Committee.

Since there were no objections the Consent Agenda Items was approved.

V. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. New and Continuing Business
1. Curriculum Committee Report

B. Adams was requested to give a historical timeline of what has been going on at Curriculum Committee to clarify some misperceptions which occurred. She began in 2013 and went in chronological order of events which took place which included the holding of courses at the Dean level, a Resolution that was passed regarding moving curriculum through the approval stream, the holding of some Math courses and what happens to courses after the justification form has been completed and submitted. B. Adams also went over other highlights of what has taken place in their meetings and what has taken place with other disciplines.

B. Adams went over a few things that will take place in the fall and also mentioned some recommendations. She also encouraged attending a Curriculum Committee meeting to see what they do and how they operate.

2. Curriculum Review Process

C. Martin said at the last meeting the debate was postponed and it was understood the process from the discussion that the last item of the process, after step 8, lacked clarity. The Curriculum Committee passed a motion giving clarification as to what the motion meant.

M/S/C (S. Amador, J. Howen) Motion to limit the debate to two debates per person, per motion for a maximum of three minutes and overall motion of 30 minutes long.

Non-debatable, requires 2/3 majority vote to restrict the debate

Majority vote prevailed. 4 – Opposed, B. Droual, J. Dorn, M. Adams, A. McKissick

M/S (J. Howen, A. McKissick) Motion to approve the MJC Curriculum Review Process.

Discussion took place regarding the 4/14/15 motion regarding the C-ID.

Pt. of information - J. Todd wanted B. Adams to explain the motion made on 4/14/15. As P. Mendes made the motion he explained. The clarity for that C-ID for the motion was that it be the standard from a unit perspective or contact hours perspective.

Pt. of information – J. Dorn asked if it is supposed to follow the contact hours as dictated by the C-ID. He doesn't recall seeing the contact hours on the C-ID.

J. Todd explained that the latest version of the curriculum process was that for transferable courses, the C-ID would become standard *under the circumstance as described in the proposed process*; and the course outline of record would follow the units listed on the C-ID. B. Adams said if the course outline of record does not conform with this standard as defined, then the course proposal justification form would be requested.

Discussion took place, and there was confusion about how to articulate that contact hours would equal C-ID units. Many classes have labs and some do not, and it is not spelled out well in the C-ID. Barbara Adams explained that in the way the C-ID is written, there are also lab units in some of the C-IDs. In a proposed lecture, in terms of what is being defined as standard, the contact hours would equate with the C-ID units.

M. Adams and R. McKenzie again went over their interpretations of what has taken place with the Curriculum Committee.

Discussion continued about what happens when there is not a resolution with a course at the end of the curriculum process. Some members stated that there needs to be more clarity and comments made as to who makes the decision to decide to go with C-ID or what CSU Stanislaus follows. Barbara Adams explained that the decision was up to the discipline writers to put the proposal forward.

M/S/C (M. Adams, A. McKissick) Motion to extend the debate for 15 minutes.

2/3 majority vote needed.

The motion was carried with a 2/3 majority vote. 1 Opposed – James Todd

D. Laffranchini attended a workshop at the Spring Plenary, called 10 + 1 Ways to Decrease Pressure Between Academic Senates and Curriculum Committees. It seems that the Chancellors Office has not been clear and the colleges are seeking clarity. Other colleges have had the same issues as MJC has had and those discussions have also been heated, emotional and people have ended with name calling. At Plenary, they kept saying "*do your job as an Academic Senate, do your job.*" Our job is not to look at work load; that is YFA's job. Our job is to look at our charge and to follow our charge.

There were comments again made from members that the motions are unclear and states something that is not there. A member stated that voting against this should not make one feel uncomfortable, and it is okay to voting against something that the Curriculum Committee has done. A member mentioned that there is a missing document—one that actually defines lab and lecture; perhaps if that document was available this would be looked at in a different way. A member mentioned that there is too much emotion tied up in this and believes this could lead us to make a bad decision.

M (J. Todd) Motion to make an amendment on the 4/14/15 motion, to help with clarification for the Senate and Curriculum Committee, to read: For transferable courses, the standard for

course outlines of record for courses with C-ID will follow not only the units on the C-ID but also the contact hours associated with those units.

M/S/C (S. Amador, 2nd heard but unknown) Motion to extend the debate for 10 minutes.
2/3 majority vote needed. Division of the house resulted in less than 2/3 majority vote.
Motion failed.

J. Todd pulled his amendment.

All those in favor of the Curriculum Review Process with the amendment of the 4/14/15 approved motion.

Voting took place with the raise of hands.

10 Ayes, 8 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

Opposed – Bob Droual, James Dorn, Mike Adams, Rob Stevenson, Allen Boyer, Allan McKissick, Elizabeth David, Paul Berger

3. Library & Learning Center Reorganization

E. Dambrosio went over the Library & Learning Center Support for the Proposed Reorganization document. This document has been forwarded to Brenda Thames and they understand the new Dean will soon be hired. B. Greene said it would be helpful for the Academic Senate President to advocate for it.

M/S (E. Dambrosio, S. Amador) Move that Academic Senate voice the Library & Learning Center's position to the President.

A member mentioned as a member of the DE Committee she would not characterize M. Smedshammer's position as someone that would support this. Being under the VPI is not a bad thing but is happy where DE is right now, not that they would not be happy in the new area.

Move the previous question was made by S. Amador

17 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 1 Abstention – Allan McKissick

M/S/C (E. Dambrosio, S. Amador) Move that Academic Senate voice the Library and Learning Center's position to the President.

15 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 3 Abstentions – Allan McKissick, Eva Mo, Elizabeth David

4. Executive Committee Elections

There are two nominees for the Secretary position and those are Bill Anelli and Shelley Circle.

M/S/C (A. McKissick, M. Adams) Move for a paper ballot.

18 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstention

The results of the paper ballot were: Bill Anelli as Secretary.

The other item that needs to be voted on is for Parliamentarian and Legislative Analyst. Steve Amador for Parliamentarian and Deborah Laffranchini for Legislative Analyst are the only names that were brought forward.

M/S/C (A. McKissick, S. Amador) Motion to approve S. Amador for Parliamentarian and Deborah Laffranchini for Legislative Analyst by acclamation.

18 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

5. Hiring Prioritization Process (Revised) 1st Reading

J. Todd said there have been some very good conversations in Instruction Council recently about relooking at the growth position process. They are asking that everyone get a packet on Institute Day so they can understand what is ahead for hiring. In September the

Instruction Office will present a report on what the institutional outlook is and everyone will be able to understand the view of the college.

The researcher will pull the numbers for the positions so everyone will be using the same data. J. Todd briefly went over the document which included clarifications of Emergency hires, a one-time retirement announcement deadline and future retirement announcement deadlines.

Discussion took place regarding the deadlines and growth positions.

M/S/C (M. Adams, A. Boyer) Move to approve the Hiring Prioritization Process (Revised) for a 1st Reading.

17 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

Chad Redwing left prior to the vote.

6. YCCD Core Values

J. Todd asked if anyone was opposed to the YCCD Core Values. This is the ranked list that was approved. When he goes to District Council he will say they do not look objectionable.

M/S/C (J. Howen, M. Adams) Move to adjourn.

17 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

7. Program Discontinuance
8. Program Review
9. ASCCC Spring Plenary Recap
10. Part-Time Faculty Award
11. GE Pathways

VI. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- A. Library & Learning Center Reorganization Concerns – moved #3 of the New and Continuing Business

VII. REPORTS

- A. ASMJC Senate – Luis E. Rebolledo
- B. President's Report – James Todd
- C. Legislative Analyst Report – Deborah Laffranchini
- D. Accreditation Council – Brian Greene
- E. Instruction Council – Deborah Laffranchini
- F. Facilities Council – Jim Howen
- G. Resource Allocation Council – Kevin Alavezos
- H. College Council – Curtis Martin
- I. Faculty Representative to the Board – Bill Anelli
- J. Curriculum Committee – Curtis Martin or Barbara Adams – *Moved to the top of New and Continuing Business*
- K. Distance Education Committee – Eva Mo
- L. Student Services Council – Ross McKenzie
- M. Faculty Professional Development Coordinating Committee and PDCC
- N. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW) – Eileen Kerr
- O. District Advisory Technology Committee – John Zamora

VIII. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

X. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

XI. OPEN COMMENTS FROM SENATORS

XII. ADJOURNMENT Adjourned at 5:38 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."

MJC Curriculum Committee

Curriculum Review Process

The following procedure will be followed when a course is pulled for discussion at a curriculum committee meeting.

1. Course is pulled for discussion at meeting.
2. Item(s) is resolved at meeting or withdrawn at meeting (with no objections) and brought back at a future meeting after the rep and author have revised. The course is approved and the Course Justification Proposal Form does not need to be completed.
3. Item(s) cannot be resolved at the meeting or at a future meeting after the rep and author have revised. The Committee does not approve the course and requests the Course Justification Proposal Form is completed. The Curriculum Co-Chair unlocks the course proposal for editing purposes.
4. Author completes Course Justification Proposal Form and attaches to CNET course proposal.
5. Course proposal is placed on next available Curriculum Committee meeting agenda for discussion.
6. If the course proposal is approved, the course is moved through the approval stream for completion of implementation process.
7. If the course update proposal is not approved, the active compliant version stays in effect. In the event the course is not compliant, existing law and procedures apply.
8. If it is a new course proposal that isn't approved, it may be brought back to the committee in the future with revisions addressing the concerns of the committee.

2/17/15 Approved Motion: If a course has come before the Curriculum Committee and has then gone back and forth, if after two semesters from the date the course was originally scheduled on the Curriculum Review Matrix, if the course has still not been approved by the committee and all other means have been satisfied through the curriculum review process, then the discipline faculty will either follow the C-ID or CSU Stanislaus.

4/14/2015 Approved Motion: For transferable courses, the standard for C-ID will follow not only the units for C-ID, but also the contact hours associated with that C-ID.

Accreditation Council Report

April 7, 2015

By Brian Greene

- ☐ MJC's Accreditation Cycle and Timeline document has been updated in preparation for the development of our 2017 self-evaluation (attached). Standards committees are expected to submit initial drafts in April 2016, one year from now. Feedback on the proposed timeline is requested by the end of the month.
- ☐ Per the proposed timeline, membership of the standards committees is being identified this month. If you would like to serve on a standard committee or can recommend someone please contact Brian Greene.
- ☐ The Accreditation Council held a study session on April 7 to go over the new (2014) accreditation standards to familiarize ourselves with them, identify areas in need of attention and formulate recommendations/next steps. This process will be completed at another study session on April 21.

Accreditation Cycle and Timeline

MJC's Current Six Year Accreditation Cycle and Timeline

2011-12 (1st year)

October 2011 = MJC submitted its Self-Evaluation; November 2011 = External evaluation visit
February 2012 = ACCJC action letter: MJC sanctioned with probation; Eight recommendations for improvement given, two requiring "immediate attention."
March 2012 = MJC filed a Special Follow Up report on immediate recommendations.
July 2012 = ACCJC action letter stating immediate attention recommendations were addressed.
October/November 2012 = MJC submitted the Follow-Up Report to address the remaining six recommendations; another team visit; report generated and sent to ACCJC.

2012-13 (2nd year)

February 2013 = ACCJC action letter: MJC remained on probation; one recommendation considered met (faculty evaluations); five recommendations considered partially met
October 2013 = MJC submitted additional Follow-Up Report to address five recommendations only partially met
November 2013 = Team visit to see if all recommendations were fully met

2013-14 (3rd year)

February 2014 = ACCJC action letter (reaffirming accreditation)
October 2014 = Midterm Report Submitted (Accepted February 2015)

2014-15 (4th year)

February 2015 = Begin MJC Institutional Self Evaluation process; report due August 2017; ACCJC suggests beginning this project two years before its due date. See revised [Manual for Institutional Self-Evaluation](#).
April 2015 = Standards committees established and co-chairs identified; stakeholders, including ALO and faculty leadership strategize how key areas are or will be addressed.

2015-16 (5th year)

September – April = Standards committees meet, identify evidence, write
April = Drafts from standards committees due

2016-17 (6th year)

September = rough draft of report to constituency groups for feedback, due Nov. 1
January = 2nd draft to constituency groups for feedback, due Feb. 15
March/April = Constituency groups vote to support Self-Evaluation
June = Board of Trustees adopts Self-Evaluation

2017

August 2017 = MJC submits self-evaluation
October 2017 = Comprehensive site visit (Per Feb. 2015 ACCJC letter)

Resource Allocation Council

April 3, 2015

By Kevin Alavezos

- President Stearns informed the RAC of the additional full-time, tenure track, faculty positions that will be hired for the 2015-2016 academic year.
- We discussed the fall schedule to review how the State and District Budget Calendar frames the MJC budget development model.

Next meeting is scheduled for April 17, 2015, from 10 a.m. – 12 p.m. in Student Services Room 203.

No actions were taken and no recommendations were forwarded to the College Council.

Student Services Council

April 10, 2015

By Ross McKenzie

Student Services Council didn't have a quorum. We had an update on the new bar codes on the student IDs (the bookstore and the library still have incompatible systems, but they're working to reconcile that), and Brenda gave a presentation on the Achieving the Dream program that we're now a part of.

Faculty Professional Development Coordinating Committee and PDCC

By Bill Anelli

April 15, 2015

Bill Anelli has been meeting with the PDCC and they are now planning Fall 2015 Institute Day. Bill will be sending out a survey to faculty regarding breakout preferences/suggestions.