Members Present: Bob Brown, Mark Renner (by phone), Dave Bazard, Peter Blakemore, Steve Brown, Dan Calderwood, Mike Cox, Kady Dunleavy, Marcy Foster, Garth Johnson, Philip Mancus (by phone), Laura Mays (by phone), Sandra Rowan, Chris Vicory, Kevin Yokoyama

Members Absent: Sandra Rowan, Raul Romero, Keith Snow-Flamer

1. Call to Order: Co-President Bob Brown called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm

2. Introductions and Public Comment: No comments.

3. Approve the October 18, 2013 Meeting Minutes: On a motion by Peter Blakemore, seconded by Steve Brown, the minutes were approved as written.

4. Action Items
   4.1 Approve October 25 Curriculum Committee Recommendations: On a motion by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Chris Vicory, the roll call vote was taken and the recommendations were approved: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Vicory – y; Yokoyama – abstain.
   4.2 Approve Faculty Qualifications Committee Recommendations: On a motion by Steve Brown, seconded by Peter Blakemore, the roll call vote was taken and the recommendations were approved: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Vicory – y; Yokoyama – y.
   4.3 Approve Revisions to Senate Bylaws: Executive Committee: On a motion by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Peter Blakemore, the roll call vote was taken and the bylaws were approved: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Vicory – y; Yokoyama – y.
   4.4 Approve Revisions to Senate Bylaws: Academic Standards and Policies: On a motion by Dave Bazard, seconded by Peter Blakemore, the roll call vote was taken and the revisions to bylaws were approved: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Vicory – y; Yokoyama – y.

5. Discussion Items
   5.1 Committee Revisions to Senate Bylaws
      - Multicultural and Diversity: Chair Mancus was asked about the reason the Executive Dean was explicitly listed as a committee member, and he explained that with the Executive Dean, the representation would be across the divisions, and that the suggestion to change it from a general dean representative came from the Co-Presidents. He also explained how the Student Diversity Coordinator
designee would be more specific to the committee’s needs for ASCR representation than would the past designee of “at least one student”. The Student Diversity Coordinator is an existing ASCR position, and ASCR requested this officer be added to MDC.

- Curriculum: Chair Potamianos explained that the added distance education representative is an addition to the membership, and would replace MaryGrace McGovern’s piece of the DE process.
- Faculty Qualifications: The Senate-suggestion revision to add an Associate Faculty member was taken to the FQC by Chair Haggerty, discussed by the committee and agreed to; an added benefit beyond AF representation was that it creates an additional member within a committee having quorum issues.

All three committee Bylaw revisions will be forwarded for Action at the November 15 Senate meeting. The substitute section in the bylaws was questioned. Substitutes are not allowed for voting privileges within committees, and a substitute cannot be used to fulfill quorum requirements.

5.2 Educational Pathways Summit: Co-President Brown presented this item as a venue for getting perspective from Senators regarding what components Senators believe should be a part of this Summit, similar to the Assessment Summits. Some discussions points included:

- If we aren’t sure what the new standards will be then it may be a problem to fit all the necessary components into the conversation. The funding models, completions, success rates, etc. will have data that is connected to “pathways”.
- The summit may be in January and February, and we should get to work on figuring out what we need to get it going.
- What are we talking about with “pathways”? Certain degrees require specific courses. Transfers will have pathways. Or are we talking about course pathways?
- The state may set up a funding model that generates additional funds and it’s hoped that administrators let the state know that we need more funding, more support for these pathways. We can’t predict what the state will do.
- There will not be enough support for the smaller colleges like CR.
- What do the Co-Presidents envision this summit will look like? Small groups?
- Strategy to include community needs
- Where do we get data that we don’t have…
- There needs to be increased communication between Counseling and Advising in order to ensure that students are actually following their pathways.
- It is not stopping/holding the work on the nine programs currently “on the books”.
- More discussion on other programs to get “on the books”.
- Do we have a timeline for when an outline will be available for this Summit?
- The timeline is in the works; the leadership (District) will get more specific as we know more about what how we will approach the summit.

5.3 Program Initiation: BP/AP 4020 Program and Curriculum Development: Co-President Brown introduced the topic. We are all aware of the component that is NOT in Interim AP 4021 Program Revitalization, Suspension or Discontinuance – and that is program Initiation. Discussion resulted in a few suggestions that should be included in a program initiation process:

- Does AP 4021 include initiation or should we include it?
- Other college Senates are developing initiation policies.
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- Faculty authors new programs? If it’s new, the faculty may not exist.
- We need a more structured process. We do not have a Program Evaluation Committee.
- Grant facilitated/initiated programs vs. grass roots program development.
- Deadlines for grants and subsequent sustainability.
- Upside down-get a grant, write a program for it.
- The various levels of participation from different campus entities.
- Sustainability of programs.
- Include rapid response processes for certain instances.
- Clarify boundaries of responsibility throughout committees.
- Simplicity/clarity is needed.
- Monitor the program in order to ensure it complies with college missions/values.
- Criteria for different processes-some may be comparatively simple while others are more detailed (shortcuts for simpler startups, certificates, licenses, etc.).
- Research at all points (sustainability, availability of faculty, community needs, etc.).
- Assessment process included.
- One policy vs. up to four different policies?
- Noncredit/credit course vetting (one college did address this in their policy).
- Is it the Curriculum Committee’s decision if a program is viable? No, the Senate should be involved, with faculty and ASPC, College Council, etc.
- Constituent review built into process.

6. Reports
   6.1 Budget Planning Committee Update: Co-President Brown participated in a public forum on Measure Q project fund usage, which included the reaffirmation of currently approved projects and the reallocation of unused funds. An email went out for new projects. BPC will do original analysis, and then it will go out for review; the process is underway.

   6.2 College Council Update: Co-President Renner presented the new and old business with emphasis on AP 7217 Faculty Prioritization Process, which was modified a little, but will be utilized immediately. We’ll use the guidelines in the latest version to appoint faculty to currently scheduled committees.

7. Announcements and Open Forum
   7.1 Open House November 2
   7.2 ACCJC Visit November 12
   7.3 Home Game November 2, admission free as participant of Open House!

8. Adjournment: On a motion by Kevin Yokoyama, seconded by Dan Calderwood, the meeting was adjourned at 2:22 pm.