

In attendance:
Heather Craig
Jacque Evans
Alfred Hochstaedter
Glenn Tozier
Adria Girard
Mark Clements
Kathleen Clark
Amber Kerchner
Merry Dennehy

Guests: Walt Tribley; Kiran Kamath; Gamble Madsen; Michael Gilmartin

I. Opening Business

We may need to shift the agenda because accreditation team might want to stop and ask questions.

Fred moved to change the meeting agenda if needed for the accred.

Mark 2nd. Unanimous approval.

A. Public Comments/Welcome (3:00-3:05)

MPC hosted CAPED conference (California Association for Postsecondary Education and Disability)

Walt thanked us for our flexibility in having this extra meeting.

B. Approval of [October 6, 2016 Minutes](#) (3:05-3:10)

Table minutes: Mark made motion, Kathleen 2nd, unanimous approval

II. Reports

A. President's Report (3:15-3:20)

Comments on draft Board Policy for equivalency:

- Word "primarily" can't be deleted as that is part of title 5
- Effective date. Some discussion on why that isn't necessary, or when it would be

College council:

- Accred. Committee came in and asked questions about the institutional decision making handbook. Was the reasons for the controversy regarding that document effectively explained?
- Heather gave an explanation for faculty concerns
 - Some discussion about what the "crux" of the issues were regarding that document
 - Revised document will be presented at next AS meeting

B. Committee on Committees (3:20-3:22)

None

III. Old Business

A. Institutional Decision Making Handbook: Review of Academic Senate Bylaws, Membership, and Purpose (3:22-3:35)

Academic Senate Bylaws

Discussion of Article V, Section 3:

- Does posting our agenda to the website require us to physically post the agenda? Maybe we should revisit the brown act?
- Section a: is one week too long to put things on the agenda? Some discussion, (exec. Meeting is one week prior). Probably need to keep that time frame.
 - How do things get on the agenda? There has been some problem with folks not knowing how to get things on the agenda.
 - More process in regards to getting things on the agenda? How do things make it from the public comment to getting on the agenda. Should public comments count as a submission?
 - Discussion about the challenge of framing things so that they are on the agenda
 - Making very clear how to communicate with the senate?
 - Maybe a simple form on the website to submit ideas?
 - How can people get feedback for items that do not get on the agenda?

Article III, Section 1:

- 1a suggests that someone who is supervisory cannot be on on the AS. How does that work with division chairs?

Members of the Accreditation Team were in attendance and asked questions of the senate:

- What do you see as the role of the AS on campus?
 - Heather: the role of the AS in institutional memory,
 - Mark: the importance is that faculty have a place to voice their concerns. Make sure that the faculty have a voice. Faculty communicate the things that are important in the classroom, curriculum development, equivalency and having qualified instructors. The senate is instrumental in giving the college a common voice, and bringing concerns to the president and the board.
- Where does the AS take things?
 - Mark: depends on the issue. Maybe the board, College Council, the advisory groups etc.
 - Fred: we work collaboratively with everyone on campus. CC was the conduit for things to go to the pres from the AS. We rely on our faculty colleagues in the CAC to do curriculum responsibilities. It's not a subcommittee, but an equal committee (in power) to the AS. We have delegated the equiv issues to that subcommittee.
- Can you elaborate a little bit on the curr. Process?
 - Gamble Madsen: Perspective of CAC has changed: used to look at the proposals in a technical way, now it goes through a different process so that the CAC can spend time on more philosophical concerns. Explanation of process for adding a new course (they divide responsibilities for the technical stuff) then to Michael Gilmartin, then to Kiran Kamath, then to the full CAC.
- What is the cycle for course revision:
 - Fred: every six years in conjunction for program review.
 - Gilmartin: every division looks at their courses every six years (minimum).
- Question about course outline, and the outcomes:

- Fred: the course outline of record does not currently have the outcomes, but they can be seen in CURRICUNET and in a report called the “All Fields Report.”
- Process for developing online classes?
 - Gamble: goes first to distance ed. comm., then to CAC
 - Fred: primary part of distance education review is effective contact between instructor and student.
- Who makes sure that all the stuff gets done?
 - Gamble: folks on CAC specialize, then the chair also looks at. Meetings involve discussion.
- How do you make sure courses have rigor?
 - G: CAC introduced critical thinking component as part of the rubric.
- When a course is approved what happens?
 - G: it goes from the CAC to the board
 - Accreditation team: Not AS?
 - H: no the Academic Senate has chosen to delegate curriculum matters to the CAC.
- There was a large component of lifelong learning, do you have a large number of noncredit courses?
 - Some discussion about credit and noncredit aspects of LLL, gentrain etc. ENSL has both credit and noncredit versions of all of its classes
- What is the AS role in having a comprehensive curriculum in regards to LLL, basic skills, & degree/transfer?
 - F: this has been a contentious issue. AS has not been able to make progress about prioritization of the different parts of our mission. The mission states them as equals. An accomplishment of AS was to define LLL. The reduction of emphasis on LLL statewide has had an effect on MPC
- What was our role in the accreditation process?
 - F: the AS reviewed drafts of accred reports. We focused on the aspects that we had purview over.

Adjourned at 4:15