

## **Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**

September 17, 2015

Called to order:

### **Present:**

Alfred Hochstaedter (President)  
Kathleen Clark (Vice President)  
Paola Gilbert (ASCCC Delegate)  
Lynn Kragelund (Secretary)  
Heather Craig  
James Lawrence  
Mark Clements  
Mike Torres  
Sunny LeMoine  
Jacque Evans  
Merry Dennehy  
Glenn Tozier  
Robynn Smith  
Sandra Washington  
Eric Ogata  
Dan Schrum – student representative

### **Absent:**

### **Guests:**

Dr. Tribley

## **I. Opening Business**

### **A. Public Comments/Welcome (2:30-2:35)**

MD – the English Department has done several things to help students perform well on their assessments: outreach in the spring with high school students, workshops, and distributed information about assessments.

### **B. Approval of Draft Minutes from the Sept 3 meeting (2:35-2:40)**

Deferred until next meeting

## **II. Reports**

### **A. President's Report [Notes](#) (2:40-2:50)**

MPC news and information as provided through venues such as AAAG,

the College Council, the Board of Trustees, Accreditation, and other areas of interest.

- College Council – discussed hiring a consultant firm to perform an operational audit, with special attention given to budgeting issues. Four entities were investigated. A decision was made to submit a Request for Proposal (RFP) to Collaborative Brain Trust
  - PG – also attended the meeting and feels that another of the entities – FCMAT (Fiscal Crisis Management Assistance Team) with a stronger budgeting emphasis might be a better choice. And the council members will continue to investigate the other three companies.
- AAAG – Discussion about block scheduling and a draft of this type of schedule was presented. Consensus was that there will be exceptions but that this is a good idea to move toward.

*Discussion:*

- *RS – would like to discuss this issue in the AS before any decisions are made. Creative arts classes would have a hard time with this type of schedule.*
- *HC – this will cause a traffic issue and with holidays or shorter length classes will have problems with this. Having block evening classes would allow students to potential over book themselves.*
- *AH – If the AS would like to talk about this issue, we can put it on a future agenda. The AAAG has the same reservations about this issue and discussed many of them. Should we allow the AAAG to handle this issue?*
- *PG – this is a AS issue and should be discussed here.*
- *JL – depends on if this is a requirement or a suggestion, because clearly many classes will not fit well.*

**ACTION**

RS – moves to add Block Scheduling to a future AS agenda

PG – seconds

8 – in favor, 7 – against

one abstention (MT)

Motion carries

- A new “Faculty Prioritization Rubric” for hiring has been developed to help guide hiring. After AAAG has gone through the prioritization

process, the recommendation will go to the Superintendent/President and to the College Council as information not for action.

### **B. COC (Action Item)**

An addition to the Flex Committee may be possible  
Blanca Morgan to replace Adria Gerard as one of the Learning Center rotating reps on BSI Committee

### **ACTION**

HC – moves to approve Blanca Morgan  
MD - seconds  
Unanimous approval  
Motion passed

### **C. Recruitment to Completion Report**

Paola Gilbert, Fred Hochstaedter, Heather Craig

Kiran Kamath ran a meeting last week with approximately 30 faculty and staff to discuss how to improve enrollment in a fiscally stable manner.  
PG – good results, but a few “givens” did not seem accurate. Hoping all the ideas generated and put on cards were saved.  
HC – brilliantly organized, but overall felt that the ideas may not be practical. Many specific ideas were broadened to a large scale and may not translate well to a larger format. I hope some of these ideas move forward. What is the next step?  
PG – would like to see different groups do this process and become engaged in the discussion and add different ideas.

[Main results of the retreat](#)

## **III. Old Business**

### **A. Using the BART (Behavioral Assessment Resource Team) for Plagiarism reports:**

[Plagiarism Report Example](#)

[Draft Web Page Wording](#)

Discussion in the AS last year about this problem clearly demonstrated opposition to the use of “Turn It In” software to screen for plagiarism.

AS discussed a proposal to use the BART software to track students for plagiarism. This software allows selected individuals to view if students have a pattern of behavior.

*Discussion:*

*RS- the arts faculty are not aware of BART and how do we decide when to use it.*

*AH – this is a great question, but not entirely on our current topic. I encourage the arts department to arrange for informational meeting on BART.*

*MC – it is one axis of communication to help identify and ideally intervene if there is a problem. Whether you report is a question of severity.*

*SL – adjunct faculty need to know about these services. And there should be a way to communicate these important services.*

*Dr. Tribley – A software program that puts the onus on the student to submit their papers and get a report and can be a learning experience rather than a punitive one. Tracking software like BART puts students on a list – what happens then? When and how can students get off the list? Is this is primarily punitive?*

*JL – Just getting on the BART system doesn't equal punishment, correct? That is not the objective. But rather looking for a pattern that needs to be addressed with a student.*

*EO – If we do see a pattern, then we can decide what to do: education or punishment. That will depend on the severity of the infraction. But BART does not automatically institute punishment.*

### **ACTION**

MC - Endorse the use of the BART system for faculty to use when they encounter students cheating/plagiarizing. Use this system for one year and then reassess.

SW - seconds

Unanimous approval

Motion carries

## **B. GE Area Descriptions**

Current [descriptions](#) that are used to determine placement of courses into MPC GE areas. The CAC agreed to review and potentially revise the GE descriptions. Does the AS endorse the idea that the CAC address this issue and then bring their revisions to the AS.

### **ACTION**

JE - moves to endorse the CAC make revisions to the GE Descriptions and then present them to the AS for approval.

EO – seconds

Unanimous approval

Motion carries

## **IV. New Business**

### **A. Basic Skills Committee Annual Report (First Reading)**

Merry Dennehy

#### [Draft report](#)

The state requires evaluation of key areas and the report consists of 5 narrative questions. Answers to the question include information on: ESL projects, student support, long-term program goals, data tracking and statistical analysis.

*Discussion:*

*PG – is the funding from the state going to change?*

*MD – that is not expected. \$90,000 is what we have been receiving and expect to receive.*

### **B. Learning Assessment Committee Reincarnation (First Reading) (3:50-4:05) [Draft Charge](#)**

Catherine Webb

Letter from ACCJC listed issues of concern across the college that CW put into a chart to evaluate the areas that need attention. Instructor reflections need to be done for at least 40% of courses. There are some issues due courses that are not offered on a regular basis,

*Discussion:*

*RS – how is this information used? Will it lead to getting rid of courses that haven't been offered in a while? Traditionally faculty was encouraged to offer courses at least once every 6 years. And this issue goes to the mission of the college – as a 2-year transfer institution or a lifelong learning institution.*

*CW – there is process to take into account if the course had been offered recently.*

*PG – Kiran Kamath spoke about having courses repeated every 2 years and if they are not, then they may need to be cut.*

*Jon Knolle – there is no plan to get rid of courses based solely on how often they are offered. But every division will be asked to look at their courses and decide if they are still appropriate. We can also improve our numbers with the assessment by doing the reflections.*

*CW – The committee's mission is to help the institution, not just respond to the letter. Looking at how to use the information should be faculty driven and the committee is designed to address the need to reflect on our courses with the goal of improvement and a focus on professional development.*

*AH – proposed membership for the SLO committee is in the draft. This is the first reading and will be included on the agenda for the next meeting.*

### **C. Academic Senate Goals for the 2015-2016 Academic Year**

Deferred

4: 25 Meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Kragelund MSN, RN