

Mendocino College Academic Senate  
MINUTES  
Thursday, April 27, 2017  
12:30p.m. – 2:00p.m., LLRC 4210

- Call to order* President Edington called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m.
- Present* Jordan Anderson, Maria Cetto, Jessica Crofoot, Jason Davis, Jason Edington, Conan McKay, Tascha Whetzel
- Absent* Doug Browe, Catherine Indermill, Vivian Varela
- Recorder* Jason Edington
- Agenda Approval* **M/S/C (McKay/Anderson) to approve the agenda**  
Minutes removed for March 30 and April 6. Yeas: Unanimous
- Consent Calendar* **M/S/C (McKay/Whetzel)**  
Yeas: unanimous
- Public Comment* McKay announced that he was elected as the Area B representative for ASCCC on Saturday April 22, 2017.
- Reports* **President's Report:** Edington reported that McKay was elected as Area B Rep and asked to take a moment to congratulate him.  
**Senator's Report:** The Dual Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee (Crofoot/Whetzel) submitted a report (attachment 1).

Anderson asked if these teachers are high school teachers or if they were college teachers. Whetzel responded that they are high school teachers teaching college, and that there was some confusion on this, even after reviewing the Instructional Service Agreement's (ISA), stating that there are contradictions in the ISA's as to who is district and who is agency and who is responsible for them.

Crofoot followed up with discussion on the confusion in the ISA, stating that the ISA states that the high school supplies the instructor, but there is confusion in the contract regarding this issue.

Another concern is the evaluation, as the periods in a high school class are 45 minutes, and this time is supposed to include the 10-15 minute student evaluation. Further, any departments that do not have full time faculty, there is concern over who is reviewing syllabi for rigor as well as how the subject is being taught at the high school.

The question was if we as a senate want to follow up with these issues, and thus we can formulate questions to have Edington follow up with administration to obtain answers and clarification.

McKay questioned how the curriculum is being developed. Whetzel responded that the teachers are using our curriculum. The question is if the syllabi are being looked at and consulted. Edington pointed out that there is a requirement for the syllabi to be turned in to the Instruction Office. Crofoot agreed but pointed out that there may be instructors who are unsure of their responsibilities to the college and high school due to their employment status/assignment. Anderson pointed out that, while how they feel is important, the fact that they are teaching a college class means that they are college instructors, and thus must follow college policy and, more importantly, they must meet minimum qualifications. If the policies and procedures are not being communicated to them, that's another issue that needs to be addressed.

There was also some conversation about the classes being on the bell schedule and whether or not the class was open to any student to attend or closed only to the high school students. Edington mentioned that there is legislation that stipulated when a class can be closed. Crofoot questioned on who should be making the decision – the college or the high school. She suggested that a 'closed class' could pose a problem for an independent study student to be able to take the class at the high school campus. Edington stated that there are specific requirements that need to be met for a class to be closed, but that he did not have the information available to him at this time.

The discussion concluded with the senators agreeing that we should probably have the questions come forward from the ad hoc committee so that we can further discussion with administration.

**Committee Report – Curriculum Committee:** Tascha Whetzel submitted a written report (Attachment 2). There was some discussion on why some of the programs have not completed their five-year review at this time and how some of them were in process or being planned. Whetzel went on to discuss where we are in terms of the transition from Curricunet to Elumen. A question came up about when Elumen would be fully implemented, and Whetzel stated that since our contract with Curricunet is up in October, we have to have things in place by Fall. She went on to state that Elumen is currently in use but it is not ready to be used widely yet.

Whetzel also discussed how the current curriculum committee handbook,

which was drafted in 2014, has some errors and needs to be updated. Also, while there is a process in place, we need to develop a policy for course substitutions as no policy exists. Edington stated that there are some things he and Whetzel have discussed some discoveries from the committee handbook that we will discuss more in Action Item 3, but it lead him to believe as well that the curriculum committee handbook needs some updating.

**Other Committee Updates:** Edington pointed out that with the Curriculum Committee Report, we have received all but two of the reports from the committees that we agreed to ask for reports at the beginning of the year. The only other two were Flex and Professional Development. He stated that for Professional Development, no progress has really been achieved *again* this year, and that this is something that needs to be fixed. HR Director Meyer is aware as well and knows how important this committee's work is.

As for Flex, Lynn Haggitt has been the only committee member up until the last meeting when Leslie Banta and Rachel Donham were appointed to finish the semester. The plan is to ask the new committee to come as soon as they feel ready to discuss the committee's work – perhaps they would like to come and discuss their plans for the committee in the future.

*Action Items /  
Old Business*

**1. Curriculum Committee Chair Criteria**

Edington projected the recommendation from the Curriculum Committee (Attachment 3). Edington thanked everyone involved for working to ensure that the criteria has been updated and represents the duties that are expected of the chair. He also pointed out that the faculty on the curriculum committee requested that in the future the chair be selected by February so as to allow for planning on the schedule, since the positions includes 40% release time. He suggested that this is probably a good idea for any position that involves release time, and suggested that it would we might want to discuss it at a future meeting.

**M/S/C (McKay/Cetto) to accept the Curriculum Committee Chair Criteria as presented from the Curriculum Committee. Yeas: unanimous**

**2. Curriculum Committee Chair - Call for Applicants**

**M/S/C (McKay/Cetto) to direct the Senate President to request applications for Curriculum Committee Chair to be submitted to the Senate President by May 5 to be included in the May 11 Senate Agenda. Yeas: unanimous**

**3. Committee Appointments for Fall 2017**

Edington projected a suggested recommendation for each of the committees (Attachment 4), and explained that the recommendation is based on the survey

that he distributed to the Faculty in April. He thanked the faculty for getting the survey back to him as this made the process of placing faculty on committees a little bit easier. He added that there was one addition to include to the projected recommendations; Bart Rawlinson had since contacted him and volunteered for the one-year replacement on Distance Education. Edington also explained that, looking over the recommendations, green highlighting means the committee will be good (if the senate accepts the recommendations as presented) and yellow indicates something the senate needs to discuss.

Edington then went through the recommendations. (Please see Attachment 3; only committees that needed discussion, or that the senate chose to discuss, are outlined in these minutes.)

Accreditation Steering – This committee needs a Senator. McKay stated that he is willing to sit on this committee if no one else is, but also pointed out that he is also very busy. Edington suggested that, since this committee is not one of the five committees that our bylaws require us to staff by the end of spring semester, and since McKay is also so very involved on other committees both locally and at the state level, perhaps we should see if other another senator would be willing to take this appointment instead. Anderson asked for a brief explanation of what this committee does. Edington stated that the committee is charged with setting up our internal process to develop the Self Report. The steering committee works on parsing out the over 100 sub-categories of the report to the employees that should be working on each part, from all constituency groups. He also informed the senate that Vice President Polak (who is chairing this committee as the Accreditation Liaison Officer) has communicated to both he and Indermill that Polak is working on a plan to prepare how all of this work will be done.

McKay suggested that perhaps these appointments should be three-year appointments since we are three years away from our accreditation, and that it would be best to have the same people involved all the way through. Edington replied that he understands the concern, but suggested that since the Senate just last year made a change to have every committee appointment, including part-time faculty appointments, be two-year appointments, that we suggest to the appointees that they should, if possible, serve a 2<sup>nd</sup> term.

Curriculum Committee – Edington discussed the fact that a committee chair would need to be appointed at the next Senate meeting, but he also brought up the issue that the Whetzel pointed out to him from the Curriculum Committee Handbook. The Handbook states that the appointments to the Curriculum Committee go through a process of the Senate President taking the suggestions to the curriculum committee chair, who then takes the recommendations to the curriculum committee to discuss, and then the recommendations come back to the Senate.

For this semester, since this is one of the committees that we are required to have staffed by the end of the semester, and since we have exactly the same number of volunteers for the committee as we have open slots, Whetzel and Edington

discussed that we accept the volunteers, if the Senate agrees.

Distance Ed – We will still need one faculty member, but this is not one of the five that we must fill by the end of the semester.

Enrollment Management Committee – Edington pointed out that this committee is not staggered to have half of the faculty switch out each year, and that he asked Marcus Frederickson to continue for one more year. This will stagger the committee appointments. He also stated that we would like to have a Senator serve as a Co-Chair of this committee. He went on to explain that currently, Indermill is the Co-Chair, but this is not codified. Rather, it is a standing practice for the last two years.

McKay asked if we will have any Senators on the committee next year. Edington indicated that we do not. Edington also stated that he and Indermill have been discussing for quite some time the idea of having Senators on key committees across campus. However, this is something that needs to be discussed in our bylaws.

Equity – Maria Cetto would like to continue. In order to stagger the committee properly, Edington suggested that we ask Cetto to serve a one-year appointment (as opposed to a full two-year appointment). He stated that Cetto would still be able to ask to be put back on for a two-year appointment next year.

Edington also stated that others were interested in being on this committee, but that at least two of the volunteers are in their first year and the preference was to only place them on one committee.

Further, Edington pointed out that we also still need one of the faculty on the committee to serve as a faculty co-chair. He stated that he has spoken with Adan and that the focus for the committee is on where the committee is going, hoping to move beyond any past issues. Edington also stated the importance of having a faculty co-chair as the work being done by the Equity Committee is intended to be faculty-driven. Anderson questioned if we've left room for a faculty co-chair to join or if the intention was to have one of these faculty on the committee become the co-chair. Edington indicated that the committee has been operating one person short and without a co-chair. He went on to suggest that, while it would be preferable to have a co-chair, if no faculty wish to serve, then at least this will allow the committee to have the full number of faculty serving as members. Cetto suggested that currently, the committee is working as it is set up.

Facilities – Edington suggested that there were a few faculty interested in serving on Facilities. However, as there are discussions about allocation of space that are coming soon, he is recommending keeping the same faculty on at this time. Based on this he made sure that all of the other volunteers were placed on other committees.

Faculty Association – Varela indicated to Edington that she would like to step off of this committee at this time. He indicated to her that in the past, these committee members usually recruited the next committee members, but he has talked to a couple of individuals that indicated they were interested in being on this committee ‘in the future’.

Whetzel pointed out that the dates on the document indicate that Rhea and Vivian started at different times, but she knew they started at the same time. Edington responded that, in the case of this committee, he ‘made up the dates’ that their terms should end to have the staggered affect. He also indicated that he did try and ascertain this information but did not get a response.

Cetto asked if there was some place where a faculty member could find information about each of these committees. Edington stated that there is information on the college website, but that it is not as complete or user friendly as he’d like it to be. He also stated that he plans to focus on helping to improve this, the ‘Committee Handbook’, next year.

He went on to answer Cetto’s question about this particular committee, stating that the committee handles the year-end awards for faculty and classified, as well as sending flowers and or a card in the case of a death in the family of a faculty member. Also, they handle the Scholarships each year from the Faculty Association.

Flex – Jody Gehrman let Edington know that she was willing to be put on for a one-year term – this would allow for staggering on the committee.

Outreach and Marketing – Appointing Steve for a one-year term to stagger the committee.

President Policy Advisory Committee – Recommendation is to have Phil Warf replace Catherine Indermill on this committee. Edington stated that currently, there is nothing codified in our Constitution or Bylaws that state that the Vice President serve on PPAC. Anderson asked if PPAC was OK with this. Edington stated that the Academic Senate decides who serves on what committees that have faculty representation, and that there is precedence for this as the Classified Representatives on PPAC are not the Classified President and Vice President.

Edington also stated that he would like to see the Legislative Liaison be the person that sits on the committee with the Academic Senate President, but that this is conversation for the bylaws in the future.

Part-Time Faculty Appointments to Committees – Edington stated that he was hopeful to place part-time faculty on committees at the next meeting, but that he was waiting to hear back from the Part-Time faculty Senators on this topic. Crofoot indicated that she had sent out communication to the part-time faculty requesting information on who was interested in serving on committees, and that

one of the concerns was that some faculty may not be teaching in the fall and thus may not be eligible to serve or continue serving. Crofoot also indicated that she would communicate this information back to Edington as soon as she receives this information, which she felt would be before the next senate meeting.

Other committees not listed in the attachment – Whetzel asked about the other committees that are not listed. Edington stated that he only listed committees that needed appointments this year. He went on to state that someone had asked him why EAP wasn't listed, for example, and he let them know that the only position on this committee that is appointed by senate does not become vacant until next year; all of the other faculty on EAP are there by virtue of position. Whetzel followed up by pointing out that she would have liked to have known how the committee assignments had been divvied up, hoping to be able to 'spread the wealth.' Edington stated that there were approximately 138 committee positions that we, as the senate, appoint faculty to, and that that means there would usually be about two to three committees per person. He also stated that there are perhaps one or two faculty members that, due to their circumstances, are not currently on committees, but that every faculty member that is in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year and beyond is on a committee.

**M/S/C (Anderson/Davis) to appoint faculty to committees as per recommendations and discussion.**

#### **4. Resolution S' 17-01 Distance Education Committee Recommendations for Canvas: Second Reading**

Edington read the resolution (Attachment 5). McKay handed out two recommended changes; first to the Second Whereas and second to replace the fifth whereas (Attachment 6).

Edington pointed out that the final phrase probably needed to have an 'and' so it would read 'initial and on-going Professional Development activities related to Canvas and on-line education **and** on-going Distance Education Program needs.

McKay suggested that we spell out what LMS means in the third whereas and also spell out OEI in the fifth whereas.

McKay also discussed his reason for wanting to change the 2<sup>nd</sup> whereas in order to strengthen it, based on the resolutions passed in 2014 and 2017 at the ASCCC Plenary Sessions. McKay further stated that the changes to the 5<sup>th</sup> whereas are simply wordsmithing.

McKay proposed that we include both whereas and not send them out for a second-second reading as he felt that the changes did not change the intent

of the resolution. Edington stated that the only issue he had with the changes is in the wordsmithing of the 5<sup>th</sup> whereas. Edington felt that by changing the statement from reading ‘the Distance Education committee encourages faculty to comply with certain standards as set forth by...’ to ‘the Distance Education (DE) committee strongly encourages faculty to comply with the standards set forth by...’ was changing what the DE committee stated they said. Edington suggested that if the DE committee was willing to amend their statement, that would be fine, but that he felt we could not change what they say they said.

It was suggested that we table this until the next meeting, send the statement back to the Distance Education committee, and let them decide if the new whereas is correct.

Crofoot asked if we could approve this 2<sup>nd</sup> reading with the changes *pending* the Distance Education committee agreeing. Edington stated that, while he was not sure if that was possible, and it may very well be possible, he is going to say no at this time. McKay asked if we could put the new second reading on Consent if the DE committee approved the changes. Edington stated that he would look into that but that the model we use is to read and then accept.

**M/S(McKay/Whetzel) to accept the S’17-01 Distance Education Committee Recommendations for Canvas**

**M/S/C (Davis, Crofoot) to table the S’17-01 Distance Education Committee Recommendations for Canvas to the May 11, 2017 meeting, and to send the suggested whereas to the Distance Education committee to see if they concur with the changes**

Yeas: Unanimous

*Discussion Items /*

*New Business*

**1. Resolution S’ 17-02 Mendocino College Faculty Decision-Making Processes for President’s Policy Advisory Committee (PPAC):  
First Reading**

Whetzel read the Resolution (Attachment 7). Edington noted that he needs to check to see if two ASMC students are included in the constituent group representation, or if it is only one. Edington read into the record a statement from Catherine Indermill who was not able to attend the meeting.

- This list is only the folks that contacted Indermill directly or indirectly that she was able to follow up with and share the Resolution. There are others, she is told, that she has not communicated directly with --- with

this in mind, she thinks it is very important that we are very clear that anyone who wants to add their names does so *and* that we encourage them to do so. Further, she thinks it will be good to have all FT Senators add their names.

- Faculty representatives on PPAC, as well as other key decision-making committees have been asking for these things for some time – to no avail, and faculty in general are now seeing how this poor communication on the part of the District may be detrimental to us and our ability to do our jobs (aka serve students).
- It is important to note that current practice at PPAC is not in-line with Accreditation Reports (what we *say* we are doing).

McKay asked that if there were any wordsmithing or things we'd like to see in the resolve, should he send these changed in tracked change form. Edington indicated that would be preferable, and that the changes be sent to both he and Indermill.

Cetto wanted to know if the procedures in PPAC were to have everyone vote on each item. Edington stated that, with the exception of the AP on k-12 admissions, for which faculty asked for a vote, a vote was taken, and both faculty members voted against, and everyone else voted yes, including the student on the committee, items are approved by consensus. There was discussion on if this was appropriate, with questions about whether or not actual votes needed to be counted for minutes. Edington stated that we at least need to do what we say we are doing in our accreditation report.

Crofoot noted that there is no stipend currently for this committee for part-time faculty, but if the makeup of this committee was to have membership from each constituent group, that that should include part-time representatives. Edington stated that he felt that since, in the past, the President and Vice President of the Academic Senate have been the representatives on the committee, that they were representing all faculty, but that this is something that perhaps should be considered.

## **2. Resolution S' 17-03 College Hour: First Reading**

Edington stated that we had run out of time for the meeting and that we would not be able to do this first reading.

## **3. Minimum Qualifications Equivalency BP 7211 and AP 7211.1 Draft**

Edington asked the faculty to go out to their constituents and ask them

directly if there are issues related to the BP and AP on Minimum Qualifications Equivalency Process and, if so, please get this information back to you in the next week. Then, please be sure to get that information to me right away. Crofoot asked if Edington could please send out the BP and AP again to the senators. He indicated he would do so right after today's meeting.

*Open Forum*

Meeting adjourned at 2:07 pm

## **Dual Enrollment AD Hoc Committee (Senate Report 4/27/2017)**

Tasha Whetzel and Jessica Crofoot

The following are observations & questions re: Dual Enrollment.

1. Notification of HS teacher for evaluation process
  - A. How are they oriented/notified?
2. The current evaluation form is not as applicable to HS setting
  - A. Observing one HS class- there is not enough time in one observation.
  - B. Departments that do not have FT faculty, who is reviewing the syllabus and the rigor and course of record prior to the teaching assignment?
3. Who mentors the HS teacher; who do they contact w/questions: HS or Mendocino College?
  - A. Issues/questions with curriculum
  - B. Issues with student/parents.
  - C. Issues around student behavior.
  - D. Process for HS teacher and student attendance.
  - E. If student leaves the class... and HS transfers them to another school, how does it work as a college class for transcript? Who drops them?
4. Reviewing the ISA
  - A. It states who hires them and who evaluates them, provides the facilities, etc., but the actual process appears to be unclear.

~The above is shared as requested by the Academic Senate.

Next step should be discussed with the Senate and if deemed necessary, should support the AS President to follow up with appropriate administration to obtain answers and clarification prior to the next Academic Senate Meeting.

## Curriculum Committee Update for Spring 2017 for Senate

Reported by Tascha Whetzel

4/27/17

- 4 meetings completed, 3 more to go
- 5 year review for 2016-17 completed (BIO, EAS, GEO, GEL, LRS, NRS, PSY) and in process of being completed (AGR, BUS/ECO, CDV, CHM, SCI, HST)
- 5 year review for 2015-2016 completed (AUT), not completed (BOT, CCS, MUS)
- Curricunet and eLumen Updates- our course data from Curricunet has been uploaded into eLumen. Amy Nelson, Curriculum Technician, is working with eLumen on the formatting. Once the formatting is cleaned up, Amy will begin the process of reviewing and approving each course. From there, we will work on setting up work flow and permissions.
- Committee proposed a new criteria for Curriculum Chair, voted on and approved it at 4/7/17 curriculum meeting.
- There will be 3 full time faculty positions as well as the Chair position needed for Fall 2017. Our handbook indicates that a counselor must be one of the 5 faculty members on the committee.
- Future endeavors: update the Curriculum Handbook (draft 2014); transition from Curricunet to eLumen; develop a policy for course substitutions

**Proposed new criteria, voted on and approved at 4/7/17 curriculum meeting:**

1. A full-time tenured faculty member who has previous service of at least one (1) term on the Curriculum Committee (One year of service is sufficient if the member has attended 90%+ of the meetings).
2. Familiarity with the curriculum process and the elements of the Course Outline of Record
3. Familiarity with institutional requirements, Generation Education, pre and co-requisites, and Chancellor's office mandates and priorities, such as Transfer Degrees.
4. Ability to establish priorities and execute committee goals.
5. Ability to communicate and coordinate with all faculty, committee members, and relevant college staff.

**Faculty requested that an \* and statement be placed at bottom of criteria to read:**

**\*ideally the chair should be appointed by February to begin serving the following fall semester to allow for consideration of teaching loads.**

## Committee Recommendations for 2017

Please note that the year in parenthesis next to a faculty members' name indicates the end of their two-year term, ending in Spring. Also note that any **anomalies are highlighted in yellow**, and generally indicate either a placeholder when no one has been identified to take this position, or it indicates a change to the general practice of 'two-year' terms to properly stagger the committee assignments.

**Green Highlights** indicate that that committee will be set and ready to go with these recommendations.

This set of recommendations was summarized based on the committee survey and communications afterward with faculty.

### Academic Review – 4 FT Faculty

Deborah White (2017), Steve Crossman (2018), Catherin Indermill (2018)

Recommendation: Cintya Da Cruz (2019), Deborah White (2019)

### Accreditation Steering – 1 Senator, 1 FT Faculty

Alicia Mendoza (2018)

Recommendation: **SENATOR (2019)**

### Curriculum – 5 FT Faculty, 1 FT Faculty Chair

Leslie Banta (2017), Tim Beck (2017), Conan McKay (2017), Tascha Whetzel (Chair-2017), Julie Finnegan (2018), Marcus Frederickson (2018)

Recommendation: Mike Giuffrida (2019), Tanja Ramming (2019), Sarah Walsh (2019), **Faculty Chair (2019)**

**Need to select chair at next meeting**

### Distance Ed – 5 FT Faculty

Steve Crossman (2017), Dan Jenkins (2017), Catherine Indermill (2017), Phil Warf (2018), Vacant (2018)

Recommendation: Greg Hicks (2019), Conan McKay (2019), **Faculty (2019)**, **Faculty (2018)**

### EMC – 5 FT Faculty, 1 FT Faculty Co-Chair

Marcus Fredrickson (2017), Catherine Indermill (Chair-2017), Conan McKay (2017), Vivian Varela (2017), Roger Hock (2018)

Recommendation: **Marcus Fredrickson (2018 – 1 year extension of term to stagger)**, Reid Edelman (2019), Steve Hixenbaugh (2019), Lisa Rosenstreich (2019), **Senator (Co-Chair 2018)**

Willing to join: Stephen Decker

### **Equity – 5 FT Faculty, 1 FT Faculty Co-Chair**

Maria Cetto (2017), Rhea Hollis (2017), Tanja Ramming (2017), Julie Finnegan (2018), Alicia Mendoza (2018), **Faculty Co-Chair (2018)**

Recommendation: **Maria Cetto (2018)**, Steve Crossman (2019), Nicholas Petti (2019), Lidia Sanchez (2019)

Interested: Cintya Da Cruz, Mike Giuffrida, Briana Zuber

**Need to discuss faculty co-chair**

### **Facilities – 2 FT Faculty**

Steve Cardimona (2017), Jim Xerogeanes (2018)

Recommendation: Steve Cardimona (2019)

Interested: Rodney Grisanti, Nicholas Petti, Deborah White, Stephen Decker

### **Faculty Association**

Vivian Varela (2017), Rhea Hollis (2018)

Recommendation: **Faculty (2019)**

### **Faculty Office Space – 4 FT Faculty**

Sue Blundell (2017), Greg Hicks (2017), Deborah White (2018), **Vacant (2018)**

Recommendation: Greg Hicks (2018), Phil Warf (2019), Reid Edelman (2019)

Willing to join: Stephen Decker

### **Flex – 3 FT Faculty**

Lynn Haggitt (2017), **Vacant (2017)**, **Vacant (2018)**

Recommendation: Leslie Banta (2019), Rachel Donham (2019), **Jody Gehrman (2018)**

Interested: Tiffany Drake, Greg Hicks, Rhea Hollis

### **Foundational Skills – 5 FT Faculty, 1 FT Faculty Chair**

Jamie Cechin (2017), Rodney Grisanti (2017), Roger Ahders (2018), Ginny Buccelli (Chair-2018), Conan McKay (2018), Alicia Mendoza (2018)

Recommendation: Maria Cetto (2019), Cintya Da Cruz (2019)

### **Outreach and Marketing – 3 FT Faculty**

Jody Gehrman (2017), Rodney Grisanti (2017), Steve Hixenbaugh (2017)

Recommendation: **Steve Hixenbaugh (2018 – 1 year extension to stagger)**, Nicholas Petti (2019), Lidia Sanchez (2019)

Interested: Steve Crossman, Rhea Hollis

### **PPAC – AS President and Vice President**

Recommendation: Place Phil Warf in place of Catherine Indermill.

Rationale: to have a faculty member be on PPAC instead of both P and VP of Academic Senate; perhaps in future this would be the Legislative Liaison.

### **Professional Development – AS President, 1 FT Faculty**

Catherine Indermill (2017), Jason Edington (2018)

Recommendation: Rachel Donham (2019)

Interested: Tim Beck, Cintya Da Cruz, Nicholas Petti, Lidia Sanchez

### **Professional Leave – 3 FT Faculty**

Jody Gehrman (2017), Nicholas Petti (2017), Roger Hock (2018)

Recommendation: Rachel Donham (2019), Tim Beck (2019)

Interested: Maria Cetto

### **SLOT – 5 FT Faculty, 1 Faculty Chair**

Jordan Anderson (2017), Rachel Donham (2017), Vacant (2017), Dan Jenkins (Chair – 2018), Doug Boswell (2018), Casey Terrill (2018)

Recommendation: Doug Browe (2019), Conan McKay (2019), Brianna Zuber (2019)

### **Staffing – 5 FT Faculty**

Steve Crossman (2017), Rachel Donham (2017), Greg Hicks (2017), Rodney Grisanti (2018), Lisa Rosenstreich (2018)

Recommendation: Bart Rawlinson (2019), Greg Hicks (2019), Jody Gehrman (2019)

Interested: Reid Edelman

### **Technology – 3 FT Faculty**

Sue Blundell (2018), David Pai (2018)

Recommendation: Stephen Decker (2019)

Willing: Rodney Grisanti

### **Still Need:**

Accreditation Steering:	1 Senator
Distance Ed:	2 Faculty (one 2 year, one 1 year)
Enrollment Management:	Senator Co-Chair
Equity:	Faculty Co-Chair

**Senators on Major Planning Committees:**

Accreditation Steering:	VACANT
Enrollment Management:	VACANT
Equity:	Maria Cetto
Foundational Skills:	Maria Cetto, Conan McKay
SLOT:	Doug Browe, Conan McKay
Staffing:	(Rodney Grisanti)

**S'17 – 01:**

**Mendocino College Faculty Distance Education Committee Recommendations for Common Course Management System (Canvas)**

Contacts: Vivian Varela and Dan Jenkins

Academic Senate First Reading: **April 6, 2017**

Academic Senate Second Reading: **April 27, 2017**

Academic Senate Action:

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) purchased Canvas for a Common Course Management System (CCMS) for distance education courses throughout the state, allowing this course management system to be provided at little or no cost to colleges and districts;

Whereas, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly recommends that any monetary savings which result from a district or college transitioning to a Common Course Management System (CCMS) be used primarily to support the professional development needs of distance education faculty making the transition to the new CCMS;

Whereas, Mendocino College will begin using the Canvas LMS beginning in the Summer Session 2017, and all Mendocino College classes will have a Canvas “shell” available for all faculty to use in classes beginning in the Fall 2017 semester;

Whereas, faculty currently using Etudes are required to engage in the laborious and time consuming task of migrating online course content to a new and essentially different CMS;

Whereas, migration from Etudes to Canvas provides faculty an opportunity to evaluate and update their online and hybrid courses, in doing so the Distance Education committee encourages faculty to comply with certain standards as set forth by the OEI may adopt its rubric in order for courses be considered for inclusion in the OEI Exchange;

Whereas, Mendocino College faculty must ensure all course content is accessible to students regardless of their individual limitations and the mode of course content delivery;

Therefore be it resolved; that Mendocino College require Canvas training for all faculty, as follows:

- a four-week training for instructors who are new to online education, and who will use Canvas for an on-line course,
- a basic two-week training for all faculty who are experienced online educators, and/or who will use the LMS for on-line ; and
- a basic two-week training is recommended for all faculty who will use the LMS strictly for on-the-ground classes as a teaching supplement;

Therefore, be it further resolved, that any funds budgeted for the Etudes costs remain in the Distance Education Budget to supplement the District's General Fund and support initial and on-going Professional Development activities related to Canvas and on-line education on-going Distance Education Program needs

**S'17 – 01:**

**Mendocino College Faculty Distance Education Committee Recommendations for Common Course Management System (Canvas)**

Contacts: Vivian Varela and Dan Jenkins

Academic Senate First Reading: **April 6, 2017**

Academic Senate Second Reading: **April 27, 2017**

Academic Senate Action:

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) purchased Canvas for a Common Course Management System (CCMS) for distance education courses throughout the state, allowing this course management system to be provided at little or no cost to colleges and districts;

Whereas, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges passed two resolutions (12.04 Fall 2014 and 11.01 Spring 2016) strongly urging that all monetary savings which are a direct result from Mendocino-Lake Community College moving their Common Course Management System (CCMS) to Canvas, be used primarily to support professional development needs for faculty teaching Distance Education Courses; ~~strongly recommends that any monetary savings which result from a district or college transitioning to a Common Course Management System (CCMS) be used primarily to support the professional development needs of distance education faculty making the transition to the new CCMS;~~

Whereas, Mendocino College will begin using the Canvas LMS beginning in the Summer Session 2017, and all Mendocino College classes will have a Canvas “shell” available for all faculty to use in classes beginning in the Fall 2017 semester;

Whereas, faculty currently using Etudes are required to engage in the laborious and time consuming task of migrating online course content to a new and essentially different CMS;

Whereas, migration from Etudes to Canvas provides faculty an opportunity to evaluate and update their online and hybrid courses, in doing so the Distance Education committee strongly encourages faculty to comply with the standards set forth by the Online Education Initiative (OEI), using the OEI's rubric for possible consideration for the OEI exchange. ~~encourages faculty to comply with certain standards as set forth by the OEI may adopt its rubric in order for courses be considered for inclusion in the OEI Exchange;~~

Whereas, Mendocino College faculty must ensure all course content is accessible to students regardless of their individual limitations and the mode of course content delivery;

Therefore be it resolved; that Mendocino College require Canvas training for all faculty, as follows:

- a four-week training for instructors who are new to online education, and who will use Canvas for an on-line course,
- a basic two-week training for all faculty who are experienced online educators, and/or who will use the LMS- ~~for on-line in traditional on-the-ground classes~~; and
- a basic two-week training is recommended for all faculty who will use the LMS strictly for on-the-ground classes as a teaching supplement;

Therefore, be it further resolved, that any funds budgeted for the Etudes costs remain in the Distance Education Budget to supplement the District's General Fund and support:

- initial and on-going Professional Development activities related to Canvas and on-line education

~~—on-going Distance Education Program needs license in 2016-17 will remain in the budget, encumbered for the purposes of compensating faculty for converting to Canvas and/or participating in Canvas training;~~

~~—Therefore, be it further resolved, that such funds, equal to the cost of the 2016-17 Etudes license, remain in the District budget, proportional to the savings realized by any related costs to the District incurred by a licensing agreement with Canvas, for the purposes of compensating faculty for converting to Canvas and/or participating in Canvas training.~~

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.29" + Indent at: 0.54"

**S'17 - 02**

**Mendocino College Faculty Decision-Making Processes for President's Policy Advisory Committee (PPAC)**

April 27, 2017

Contacts: Sue Blundell or Catherine Indermill

Sponsors: Jordon Anderson, Leslie Banta, Steve Cardimona, Jaime Cechin, Julie Finnegan, Jody Gehrman, Roger Hock, Dan Jenkins, Conan McKay, Bart Rawlinson, Sarah Walsh, Phil Warf, Tascha Whetzel, Jim Xerogeanes,

Academic Senate First Reading: **April 27, 2017**

Academic Senate Second Reading:

Academic Senate Action:

Whereas, the Academic Senate of Mendocino College understands and supports the importance of the Decision-Making processes of the Mendocino Lake Community College District (District);

Whereas, the Academic Senate recognizes the responsibilities afforded to the faculty by AB1725 and that all constituent groups have the right to consistent, comprehensive and open contributions to the governance and decision-making of the District;

Whereas, all decisions made by President's Policy Advisory Committee (PPAC) affect members of each constituent group, their representatives must be able to carefully consider the ramifications of each proposal – including, but not limited to: researching issues, soliciting input from constituents, and providing thoughtful comprehensive feedback. Constituent members must have ample time to discuss the impact of proposed Board Policies and/or Administrative Procedures;

Whereas, PPAC constituent representatives need to be fully informed about proposed Board Policy and/or Administrative Procedures presented and have time to consult with each other and members of their group when appropriate;

Whereas, PPAC members need to have ample time to consider proposed Board Policy and/or Administrative Procedures presented at

Whereas, PPAC members do not receive meeting agendas in a timely manner to allow for the aforementioned activities, for example agendas for recent meetings were provided less than 6 working hours before the scheduled 2:00pm meetings:

- 3/31/17 @ 11:26 am
- 2/24/17 @ 10:10 am
- 2/10/17 @ 1:11 pm
- 12/16/16 @ 11:23 am
- 12/2/16 @ 11:31 am

- 10/27/16 @ 5:09 pm for 10/ 28
- 9/30/16 @ 11:43 am
- 9/1/16 @ 12:34 pm

Whereas, according to the *Mendocino College Institutional Follow-Up Report*, Spring 2015 the District has a system/process in place for the review of Board Policies and/or Administrative Procedures:

“The college’s existing process for review of BP’s and AP’s includes the following steps: BP’s and AP’s are slated for revision; first drafts of proposed revisions are created through the President’s Office, revised policies and/or procedures are brought to the President’s Policy Advisory Committee (PPAC) for discussion and first reading. Next PPAC members, who represent student, faculty, classified and management, share those drafts with their constituent groups for feedback. At the following PPAC meeting, constituent group feedback is brought back for discussion and modifications are made as needed.” (page 13)

Whereas, PPAC discussions, suggested revisions etc. are important for the continuity of the committee’s on-going work and campus-wide communication. Records of these need to be complete and functional documents, however they are generally incomplete inaccurate, unhelpful, limited and not easily accessible for the campus community nor PPAC members;

Whereas, records of meetings are inconsistent in the use of the terms “Meeting Notes” and “Minutes”. Minutes imply the record has been reviewed by and approved by the committee members which does not occur;

Whereas, the President/Superintendent needs to provide leadership that is open for input from all constituent groups and abide by AB 1725 as it pertains to “participatory governance” by supporting, encouraging, and allowing input on policy decision from all member of the constituent groups. In addition, the *Institutional Self Evaluation Report* (2014) states:

“Board Policy 213 specifies that ‘the Board is committed to ensure that members of the District’s constituent groups participate in developing recommended policies for Board action, and administrative procedures for action by the Superintendent/President’. Administrative Procedure 213.1 specifies how each group will participate. This procedure acknowledges the College’s commitment to AB 1725 and states the ‘procedures are predicated upon sincere commitment on the part of all participants to work together for the good of our students, our professions, and our institution.’” (page 204)

Whereas, achieving “consensus” on decisions that affect the campus, as a whole, is important and often encouraged, it is not the process by which decision-making occurs at PPAC. Committee Handbook (2013) indicates the representative of each constituent group, as appointed by their peers, approve on Board Policy and/or Administrative Procedures

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that, as the Chair of PPAC, the President/Superintendent will provide agendas, with supporting documentation, at least 48 hours prior to meetings;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, all Board Policy and/or Administrative Procedures under consideration by PPAC have *at least* two “readings” before action is taken;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that there will be no less than three weeks between the First and Second Readings of any proposals and constituent representatives will provide Board Policy and/or Administrative Procedures to their constituent members for a minimum of 10 working days prior to a “Second Reading”;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the official record of PPAC Meetings are made by the process of “Minutes”, which are provide in a timely manner for voting members of the committee to review and approved by a vote of the eight constituent representatives (two each – Associated Students of Mendocino College, Classified, Faculty and Management/Supervisory/Confidential);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that each decision made by PPAC is achieved by a vote of the constituent leaders appointed by their respective groups (two each – Associated Students of Mendocino College, Classified, Faculty and Management/Supervisory/Confidential) and the official record of the meeting reflects the votes cast Ayes and Nays, as appropriate.