Call to Order: Travis Gibbs called the meeting to order at 3:58pm.

Roll Call:

President
Travis Gibbs (present)

Vice President
LaTonya Parker (present)

Secretary/Treasurer
Edd Williams (present)

Senator-at-Large
Nick Sinigaglia (present)

Business & Information Technology Systems
Cheryl Honore (present)

Communications
Valarie Zapata (present)

Health, Human & Public Services
George Gage (present)

Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences
Sal Soto (present)

Math, Science & PE
Ellen Lipkin (present)

Public Safety, Education, & Training
Chris Nollette (absent)

Associate Faculty
Vacant

Visitors:

Vice President, Academic Affairs
Robin Steinback

Dean of Instruction
David Vakil

Dean of Instruction, CTE (Current Technical Education)
Christopher Whiteside

Dean Student Services
Greg Sandoval

Library Representative
Debbi Renfrow

Curriculum Committee Chair and
Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Coordinator Carolyn Quin

VP Student Government
Regina Miller

Gibbs called meeting to order at 3:58pm; quorum was achieved at 4:06pm.

The first report was for information only from Nick Sinigaglia (see II. a. below)

I. Approval of Minutes: 11/18/13 Motion to approve, Zapata; Tolunay second—unanimously approved with minor changes from suggestions by Carolyn Quin.

II. Ongoing Business:

a. Associate Faculty and Student Club advisors: Nick Sinigaglia reported that Ruth Adams (legal counsel for the District) reports that nothing in any legal documents that she is aware of prohibits part time faculty from being club advisors; nothing requires full time faculty to be club advisors. Williams questioned why this was an issue in the first place. Zapata made a motion and Tolunay seconded for Senate to investigate this further – does a Board Policy apply? Unanimously approved
b. Senate agreed to move Maureen Chavez’s report to this item on the agenda (from below). Information about grants is available on-line; so too budget issues, etc. Senate continued to discuss if the Grants Committee would become a Standing Committee of the Senate.

c. Curriculum Reports (Distance Education Document—vote to accept or reject): Carolyn Quin reported to the Senate; Gibbs noted that all three Senates must approve these in order for them to move forward. Quin reported these will now be the RCCD guidelines for Distance Ed.

As an addendum to the Dec 2 minutes, the following is added (from President Gibbs):

**DE Processes Implemented for Spring 2014**

**Teaching Assignments for Distance Education**

To ensure that the standards for DE courses are the same or exceed those of face-to-face courses, RCCD faculty who elect to teach using distance education methods of delivery are required to indicate that they have read the *Summary of Regulations for Regular and Effective/Substantive Contact for Distance Education* and the *RCCD Guide to Recommended Best Practices* by placing a check page 54 RCCD Curriculum Handbook, Spring 2014 Draft beside the following statement as part of the Teaching Assignment (TA) approval process in WebAdvisor:

- I have read the *Summary of Regulations for Regular and Effective/Substantive Contact for Distance Education* and the *RCCD Guide to Recommended Best Practices to Achieve Regular and Effective/Substantive Contact in Distance Education* which clarify regular and effective/substantive contact with students for distance education courses.

Web-Enhanced Course Sections are not DE. As use of technology in higher education has become more common, many faculty offer web-enhanced courses. These are not to be confused with hybrid or fully online sections. These sections are not distance education. All class meetings take place on campus as scheduled and technology is used to enhance the student’s learning experience. Faculty put technology to a wide range of uses, but because these are enhancements to established methods of instruction, they are not subject to any additional scrutiny. Faculty wishing to teach web-enhanced sections must notify the Instructional Department Specialist (IDS) when the class schedule is being developed.

1. At the meeting on Dec 2, Edd Williams noted on-going emails that have surfaced in the last 48 hours from Mark Sellick of the Faculty Association and Tom Allen’s (RCC) response to Sellick via an RCCD-all email, noting Allen’s concerns about Distance Ed. costs to the district as well as the error in comparing Distance Ed. classes with face-to-face classes, specifically, Distance Ed. class have a different cost to the District and much smaller financial benefit than face-to-face classes.
2. Gibbs suggested that there may be some discussions going on about the FA’s protocols and responsibilities; these discussions do not directly “undo” these documents that are before us. Motion: Williams; Lipkin Seconded. Unanimously approved the DE Docs
3. AP 4260: Limitation on Enrollment, Co-requisites, Prerequisites, & Advisories – Motion to vote on AP4260: Honore, Second Tolunay.

Discussion: There may be an issue at RCC, so Gibbs suggested that this is still in-process. Quin and Gibbs discuss what has already happened within the District. Quin reported minor changes in the names/subheadings of the documents. There was also a recommended link. Quin reported these documents were approved by the Curriculum Committee and are being moved forward to MVC Senate. Quin report included the following:
--At District Curriculum, we agree to move docs forward to college Curriculum Committees.
--In section of Curriculum review, some language is not included in Title 5 but is unique to us. 
--We have been moving back and forth with “appropriate expertise” and how to deal with the 
language not in Title 5. We decided that the colleges can discuss this and decide for themselves 
how to deal with this language.
--We passed the docs at MVC Curriculum, but RCC’s Richard Mahon reported that RCC had not 
passed the docs yet because some changes were suggested by RCC. Content review apparently 
is at issue, and who would do that review (protocols should be more specific)? Why not have 
each college decide this?
President Gibbs pointed out that there are no separate APs for the colleges because APs are 
District Policy. The discussion ended; we are not, at this time, voting on this.
--Suggestion to TABLE this for now.

Soto wanted to know if there is any urgency for us to vote today?
Quin said from an accreditation standpoint, the answer is yes.
Gibbs pointed out that we already have protocols and are simply dealing with the revisions that 
are currently under foot. Quin and Soto continued the validation process that has already 
occurred, but can we table this for now, Soto asked.
Gibbs added that sometimes our vote simply means “we vote to approve this at this time. We are 
on the record as saying we agree with the documents” as they are currently presented.
Soto agreed but suggested we may have changes that will change the document.
Gibbs replied that these are things that may occur, but nothing in front of us now is stopping us 
from tabling or voting.

Sinigaglia pointed out that District Curriculum has not approved it, and Quin said District 
Curriculum agreed to move this forward, but cannot report that it was actually approved.
The protocol, as the MVC Senate sees it, is the three college Curriculum Committees would 
approve first; then the District Curriculum Committee would approve; THEN the Senates would 
approve. So it seems the District Curriculum Committee has not approved.
Quin reported that the District CC agreed to send the doc forward for consideration by the three 
college CC and then to the Senates. Williams finally asked, “Are we voting on this or not?”
Gibbs asked if the CC at MVC has approved it? Yes, said Quin.
Gibbs called for the vote. AP4260 6 ayes, 3 nays.

After the vote, Renfrow read aloud the actual language from District Curriculum minutes:
“Approved to send forward the doc to the three college Curriculum Committees.”
f. AP 4021: Program Viability and Discontinuance – INFORMATION ITEM: Williams 
reported the DASC (District Academic Standards Committee) approved the title change and has 
sent it forward (as per Sylvia Thomas, administrator for the DASC).
g. AP 7211: Equivalency – Gibbs reported “Discipline Facilitators” is problematic language. 
Williams reported the DASC has eliminated “Discipline Facilitators” from the document 
language, but the document is, as yet, not completed. The DASC is revisiting this document on 
Dec 4 in HUM-234 3:45pm – 5:15pm and may need until Spring to complete it.
Gibbs referred to page 4, “Optional Considerations” RE: teaching experience,” which is 
“something that we want to pay attention to.” Professional experience or teaching experience is 
not the same thing as an M.A. or M.S., so we need to be making sure we specify what teaching 
experience means – Gibbs said, “We should just eliminate TA experience.”
h. AP 7160a: Professional Growth: There will be a vote to accept or reject – Gibbs reported 
Kathy Saxon and the PG&SL committee reviewed and revised this document during their last
few meetings and are presenting it to Senate for approval. Gibbs sent this on Nov 26. Motion: Williams; Second: Sinigaglia CTA is happy with the document, according to Sinigaglia. The vote was 7 approve, 2 abstain.
i. Grants Advisory Committee: Standing Committee of the Senate: Report by Maureen Chavez (see II. b. above).
j. Distinguished Faculty Lecturer, Spring 2015 – Soto suggested we table this. Dean Vakil asked about who will speak at Commencement this coming June. Gibbs reported that an Associate Faculty is supposed to speak every third year; last year was Ann Pfeiffle, full time faculty; the year before was Jose Duran, full time faculty; the year before was Mark Carpenter, Associate Faculty. An Associate Faculty is due to speak this coming commencement.
k. Committee appointments: Ree Amezquita, SPC Faculty Co-Chair, approved to continue; Matt Fast was approved to join the Safety Committee.

III. New Business:
a. Gibbs reported Spring 2014 Senate meeting dates: 2/24; 3/3 & 3/17; 4/7 & 4/21; 5/5 & 5/19; 6/2

Gibbs reported LaTonya Parker, Senate VP, will head the 2/24 and 6/2 meetings because he will be attending the District Academic Senate meetings on those dates.

Motion to approve these dates: Zapata, Second, Warner Unanimously approved

b. ADT in Philosophy – Quin reported the CC would like to recommend the approval of the ADT in Philosophy. Sinigaglia “signed it” and reported his satisfaction with the ADT.

Soto moved, Sinigaglia seconded. Tolunay pointed out it is interesting a student can get the degree without taking Introduction to Philosophy. Sinigaglia confirmed but pointed out that any of the upper courses would cover the major areas of philosophy. It came down from Sacramento that Into or Ethics is required, not both after a student takes Logic.

Call for the vote: unanimously approved

c. Start of Term Information: sent by David Vakil, Dean of Instruction, for Senate consideration. Williams called up portions of the document on the overhead, specifically ADDING STUDENTS, and asked if the language, as is, may be considered a mandate. Dean Vakil noted areas that he shall revise to “It is strongly recommended…."

Williams emphasizes we report to our departments that we MUST stress how important it is for students to complete their first hour of lab BEFORE census.

Soto and Gibbs talked about “highly recommended” that faculty notify (when possible) the IDS and their students if the faculty member will be absent and has sufficient time to notify students.

d. Campus Beautification Project – Gibbs reported, for the record, that some faculty and students have wondered who made the decisions of the colors and process. Norm Godin was notified by Gibbs; an email response was circulated; comments ensued. Gibbs suggested that if and when a process like this takes place, there ought to be more open communication with how this was done, what steps were taken, etc.

Steinback and Parker reminded the Senate that Steinback had reported the Beautification Project was going to take place; how the colors were selected (by students).

Regina Miller (Vice-President Student Government) reported that students were not really involved with selecting colors, and the color that the students finally selected (from only two colors offered) ended up not being the color that was used. The selection process was bogus.
Soto wanted to know who “District Standards” is? And “Is Teal still the school color?” Soto reported that he agrees with Miller’s comment that “only two colors” were offered for selection, and the two colors were offered on the day before the painting began. Soto noted that some faculty are pointing out that some of the painting is “second-hand” with overlapping, etc. Soto also said that this is part of the problem with “choosing the lowest bid,” but Soto then pointed out that the Board has made it a practice to select more middle-of-the-road and not just to accept the lowest bidder. Gibbs suggested that this whole beautification process has been a learning experience. Steinback said she will report this tomorrow to the President’s Cabinet meeting. Soto emphasized that the colors might not be consistent with the school colors, but the colors are not going to be changed now. The quality of the work is also clearly “not up to standard.” Norm Godin should be notified by the Senate, the information in the Minutes for Dec 2. Steinback reported that Godin “wants this to be better”; he is working with the painting contractor to address these issues. Soto also reported that students and faculty are, in many cases, unhappy with the changes. And the quality of the work is low. “We owe it to our students…” to do a better job. e. Graduation Venue – Honore is on the Commencement Committee and says they wanted to reserve the space and arrange the graduation activity at the Grove Community Church. However, someone in the District said, “No” because it’s a church. Honore wanted to know why that Venue has been turned down. Sandoval reported the soccer fields here at Moreno Valley College are very difficult to set up and very costly. So we might want to go to an off-campus facility. The Grove Community Church has been discussed. Dr. Mayo agreed that an off-campus site is a possibility. We are going to keep having challenges with these kinds of large meetings. Yes, we are interested in going off-campus. The bottom line about Grove Community Church is it’s a church and might be offensive to some of the attendees. But BCTC has its events at the Grove Community Church. Tolunay commented using any religious facility could create problems. Soto also commented that some may simply not show up because it’s a religious facility and faculty should not be required to go if MVC uses a religious facility. Gibbs asked about a time line. Honore reported the time line is now because a large facility must be reserved well ahead of time. Honore talked about how expensive it is to set up the soccer field here on campus. Gibbs suggested a vote. Williams moved to approve Grove Community Church; Second: Honore. There was no further discussion. VOTE: 7 nay; 2 abstain. The Grove Community Church facility was flatly turned down as an option for MVC Commencement. Do we have a motion to consider other secular sites: Motion: Honore; Tolunay second. Vote: 7 ayes, 2 abstain. Steinback wanted to know what other venues are out there. Parker asked about cost comparisons. Gibbs suggested that we take this back to the Graduation Committee.

IV. Officer and Student Liaison Reports
a. Student Liaison – Miller: this week, door decoration contest, done by Dec 3, judging Dec 4 1-3pm; Dec 5, BCDC judging finals; decision will be made at MVC Dec 6 Contestant winners will be announced at the holiday party on campus. Dec 20, Santa is visiting kids at Early Childhood Studies; the kids walk over to the Student Activities Center.
b. President: Travis Gibbs – Akia Marshall has asked about staff CSEA Union signing accreditation report. Steinback is seeking advice for an answer. It’s not a requirement; we are trying to be inclusive. Some colleges do this; some don’t. CSEA has not signed this before at MVC. Marshall has stated she does not think it’s appropriate for her name to be on page for signature. Steinback is awaiting Dr. Mayo’s recommendation. Senate need not make a recommendation.

c. Vice President: LaTonya Parker – On Nov 22, the APC did prioritize faculty hiring: (1) Fire Tech, (2) English, (3) Business, (4) Math. Lipkin asked about Chemistry.

d. Secretary/Treasurer: Edd Williams - $917 was sent from RCCD Trust Fund for MVC Senate; collection of cash funds of $175 for donation to Alzheimer’s Foundation is still being held, pending deposit of both cash and $917 into MVC Senate fund. The deposit is to be made at Admissions and Records (Michael Fiedler); then, the Requisition form needs to go to Frankie Moore, and the signature card.

e. Senator At-Large: Nick Sinigaglia - no report

f. Administrator Reports

1. Steinback: Mr. Marvin Martinez, President of East Los Angeles Community College, will be the lead on the Accreditation Team; we have agreed upon the format for responding to the recommendations; the Board of Trustees Committee Meeting will be held in the SAS Building tomorrow evening here at MVC. Dr. Steinback will be working as an Interim Vice-Chancellor at District Office and will be available here at MVC as well.

2. Sandoval reported an MLK project is in the works with local school districts and many faculty at MVC; an essay competition and a speech competition to establish an annual scholarship here at MVC. This is a new and independent scholarship.

g. Associate Faculty (Part-time Faculty): Unfilled

V. Committee and Liaison Reports: (No Reports will be given until Feb. 24th Senate meeting).

a. Classified Staff Liaison: Akia Marshall

b. Strategic Planning Council (SPC): Robin Steinback

c. Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Coordinator: Carolyn Quin

d. District Program Review (DPR): Carolyn Quin

e. MVC Faculty Assessment Committee: Cheryl Honore & Sheila Pisa

f. Safety Committee: Joyce Kim

g. Academic Planning Council (APC): LaTonya Parker

h. District Academic Standards (DAS): Edd Williams/Kim Metcalfe

i. Diversity Committee: Adviye Tolunay

j. Basic Skills Committee: Sonya Nyrop

k. Faculty Development Committee: Dan Clark

l. District Profession Growth & Sabbatical Leave Committee (PG&SLC): Kathy Saxon

m. RCC District Faculty Association (RCCDFA)/CCA/CTA/NEA

n. Student Equity Committee: Ann Yoshinaga

VI. Open Hearing – Honore announced the Gospel Singers up-coming performance.
Tolunay asked about a faculty tour of the SAS Building.
Steinback reported that relocating faculty reviews some of the considerations for portable and permanent buildings and space for offices that are too small. Some faculty are in a space as small
as 53 Sq Ft; State Standard is no less than 96 Sq Ft. A list was generated months ago and more recently choices have been selected via communiqués with Senate (nothing has changed since last Spring) and the campus at-large.
Tolunay said she never got the list and was not clear about who was moving, how the choices were made, etc.
A review of the memo process was discussed by Vakil, Gibbs, and Steinback. Possible tours of the SAS building can be arranged with Dean Vakil. He gave the first tour this morning at 11am. Steinback suggested that faculty show up for the Holiday Party on Dec 6, noting the SAS building will be open and available for viewing on that date.

VII. Adjournment at 6:28pm