



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
MAR. 20, 2014**

Members Present: James Todd, Jennifer Hamilton, Deborah Laffranchini, Bill Anelli, Chad Redwing, Mike Adams, Allan McKissick, Allen Boyer, Andrew Campbell (ASMJC President), Barbara Jensen, Bob Droual, David Boley, Brian Greene (sub for Ellen Dambrosio), Eva Mo, Jim Howen, Jim Stevens, Kevin Alavezos, Lisa Riggs, Mike Morales, Paul Berger, Paul Cripe

Members Absent: Christopher Briggs, Curtis Martin, Deborah Gilbert, Elizabeth McInnes, Layla Spain, Travis Silvers

Guests Present: Brian Sinclair (Faculty Liaison to the Board)

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

M/S/C (M. Adams, E. Dambrosio) Move to approve the order of the agenda items.

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (Feb. 13, 2014), Mar. 6, 2014 minutes to be approved at the next meeting.

M/S/C (E. Dambrosio, J. Hamilton) Move to approve the Feb. 13, 2014 minutes.

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Appoint Greg Hausmann, Bobby Hutchison, and Susan Kerr to the Instructor of Sociology – Full-Time Tenure Track Hiring Committee.
- B. Appoint Nancy Backlund, Linda Kropp, Nancy Sill and Kevin Alavezos to the Instructor of Business Administration Full-time Tenure Track Hiring Committee.
- C. Appoint Al Smith, Curtis Martin, and John Zamora to the Instructor of Economics – Full Time Tenure Track Hiring Committee.
- D. Appoint Jeff Beebe and Sean Slamon to the Regional Fire Training Center Director Hiring Committee.

M/S/C (E. Dambrosio, J. Stevens) Move to approve the Consent Agenda with the minor spelling change in K. Alavezos' name.

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

J. Todd reminded all present due to changes in the Brown Act, whoever is present, unless they oppose or abstain are to be presumed as AYES. The requirements are now to document all votes at the meeting.

IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Continuing Business

1. Substantive Change Report – 2nd Reading

M/S (J. Hamilton, D. Laffranchini) Move to put the Substantive Change Report for a 2nd reading.

J. Hamilton mentioned there some edits proposed and they were incorporated for the betterment of the document and another appendix was added due to Mike Smedshammer doing a progress update on action items in the Distance Ed Plan up through this spring. If you want to see the update, click on the link previously given. The changes add more factual detail, substance and legitimization to why they should take the report; but there was no content change having anything to do with any of the standards.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Apr. 3, 2014, Faculty Lounge, Library Annex, East Campus

J. Hamilton summed up the report. This is telling the Accreditation Commission that these are the changes that occurred in our curriculum. There are 37 degrees and 4 certificates listed. We are letting them know these areas are over the 50% threshold, and we have already been delivering them in the Distance Education mode. We have to let the commission know that we are doing so, to show in doing this it will not prohibit us from meeting the standards and that it follows the mission.

M/S/C (J. Hamilton, D. Laffrachini) Move to approve the Substantive Change Report as a 2nd reading.

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

2. The Role of Counseling Faculty and Delivery of Counseling Services in the California Community Colleges (ASCCC PAPER 2012) – 2nd Reading.

J. Todd mentioned that a meeting has been set up on Mar. 28 to discuss Student Success Initiatives. It's a question of how, as a college, will we fulfill the task of doing the initial educational plan, the comprehensive educational plan, the assessing and the orientation with the students. How do we want to approach Student Success in general? What can we do as a college to improve student success and completion?

He briefly went over the concerns of the counselors. He met with them last week and they are willing to work with faculty in terms of faculty advising; not mandatory faculty advising, but for those who want to give some of their office hours to student advising.

It was mentioned that it would be advantageous if counseling would have a seminar that would teach the high and low points of faculty advising. At what point do they send the students to counseling? Training is requested.

J. Todd said the counselors would like to hold on to the student comprehensive educational plans as an area of primacy. The comprehensive educational plan is the map of the student's entire education. He has talked about instructional faculty helping to do the initial educational plans, and the question is how instructional faculty might collaborate effectively and assist the building of comprehensive plans.

J. Todd mentioned some of the options that are being considered, including online orientations and educational plans that are available electronically for students and faculty that advise students. They are also in the process of thinking of ways that they could come up with different models that faculty could use to give students optional choices and also have secondary back up choices.

C. Redwing mentioned that he has worked on language for a motion that might balance counseling faculties concerns for infringement on professionalism and structural faculty concerns for the desire and the need to continue to engage with students in certain realms of advising.

M/S (C. Redwing, J. Howen) Move to approve the document as best practices while recognizing the contributions and contractual obligations of instructional faculty related to student advising.

Discussion took place. C. Redwing said the feeling he felt at the last meeting was some resistance to questions that were fielded, that even talking to students in certain areas might seem inappropriate. He feels it is appropriate to talk to students about their program of study when they are studying in your program.

A. McKissick asked is there anything in this report that suggests that it mitigates against or undermines the notion of faculty advisement? He doesn't see a problem in adopting and endorsing this document. He would like to offer an amendment.

M/S (A. McKissick, P. Cripe) Motion to endorse this document.

J. Todd asked as a compromise and to respect the integrity of counseling and the current role of faculty advising, what about accepting this paper and adopting it as best practices at MJC and getting rid of the other language?

A. McKissick decided to revise his amendment.

M/S (A. McKissick, P. Cripe) Motion that Academic Senate endorse this document as a description of best practice.

J. Todd asked if C. Redwing would accept this amendment as a "Friendly Amendment."

Chad Redwing had a question to ascertain the friendliness. The general sense of what he read was counselors have terrain over just about everything when it comes to counseling. He thinks that it does back up against some instruction faculty concerns about the rights and responsibilities we share in advising students in our program.

Chad Redwing read his amendment again.

Discussion took place regarding the amendment which was not accepted as "friendly." P. Cripe thinks that by adopting it we are saying we agree with it, including all of the recommendations in the paper.

J. Todd mentioned those papers are always written as best practice, and also by the State. He doesn't know if we are affirming any more than what the state is saying.

J. Howen said he is speaking against the motion. He would like to see stronger language about the faculty's role in this process. Faculty has a significant role, but to leave it out completely as this amendment does, it's a big mistake and he Calls to Question. P. Cripe seconded. Non-debatable.

Call to Question (J. Howen, P. Cripe)

Voting on the Call to Question. Need 2/3rds in support. Passed.

13 hands were raised. 0 Opposed, 7 Abstentions

Those who abstained were: Debbie Laffrachini, Bill Anelli, Lisa Riggs, Jim Stevens, Allan McKissick, Allen Boyer, and Kevin Alavezos.

Voting on A. McKissick's amendment that is cut off after best practice.

**Adopt the Role of Counseling Faculty and Delivery of Counseling Services in the California Community Colleges (ASCCC PAPER 2012) as best practice at Modesto Junior College.
Motion passed**

M/S/C (A. McKissick, P. Cripe) Motion that Academic Senate endorse this document as best practice.

12 Ayes, 7 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

Those opposed were: Chad Redwing, Bob Droual, Ellen Dambrosio, Jim Howen, Kevin Alavezos, Mike Morales, Paul Cripe

Those who abstained were: Barbara Jensen.

3. Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Plan

This is informational only since it will be discussed on Friday, Mar. 28. Also discussed will be the student equity plan. These initiatives have us looking at not only how we will get student goals but to address different ways or various populations do through the college and through the classrooms. We have to look at how race, ethnicity, gender and how different groups are doing our programs. On that Friday one of the things that will need to be done is to establish a Student Equity Committee; another is a call to see what faculty would like to be part of a faculty advising effort, and a general discussion of

what we want to do going forward and what we want to accomplish over the summer going into the fall.

J. Todd went to a Student Equity Conference and there were various speakers talking how to address our equity plans which will be discussed later.

4. FSA Discipline Specialists – Those will be forwarded to that committee and they will probably meet toward the end of April.
5. Facilities Council - B. Sinclair mentioned that J. Zamora spoke to him and there wasn't a lot that took place but they were doing a tree plan. It's just an investigation of what kinds of trees to plant to replace the ones that are being removed because they are diseased or dying.

A. McKissick said his impression was there was once a plan to preserve the trees and believes it got stalled. He thinks the trees are diminishing on campus over the last couple of years and there hasn't been a real effort to replace them. He hopes there is enough publicity that faculty who are interested in the physical plant can get involved. There seem to be few people who make decisions about the trees and you find out about it when a new stump appears.

B. Sinclair brought this up as informational purposes only and didn't know what the senate wanted to do with this. If you care about the campus environment, and he knows J. Stearns does because she mentioned that maybe the senate would want to weigh in some way on this. He didn't get the details on what a tree plan is.

J. Todd will try to get information for the next meeting. He will follow up and try to find how they are planning it for those who want to get involved. A discussion needs to take place.

6. Student Services Council – no report

J. Todd mentioned that is another call that will go out on Friday, Mar. 28. Two more faculty members are needed for Student Services Council.

7. Instruction Council – no report

M. Morales is concerned there has been a lot of cancelled meetings and there is a large gap since they last met. No reason was given for the cancellations. It was mentioned, if there are co-chairs, meetings should be cancelled by perhaps a consensus based approach especially if faculty, who are a majority in that committee, want to meet on important matters and it was cancelled without both chairs agreeing, it should be emphasized at some point.

As Engaging All Voices is revisited, if there is a faculty co-chair with an administrator there needs to be a policy written in how meetings are cancelled.

J. Todd said he would try to find out some information regarding this.

8. Accreditation Council –

They had a meeting and went over the finalized document that was approved today. There was an update on the annual report which is being finalized and has to be filed by Mar. 31, 2014. The annual report is information we have to give every year. A project timeline was put together for completion of the October midterm report and as members of the senate you will be invited to be involved in the compilation of this document. In 2011 we submitted a report and in it had several planning agenda items which we self-identified. In this midterm report we have to go back to the planning agenda items and let the commission know where we are with regards to each individual item. We will invite people to be involved with the gathering of data, making sure that what we report with regards to the planning agenda and where we are going from here is accurate. It gives a full picture where we are.

9. Resource Allocation Council

K. Alavezos said there was a short meeting, with some informational items. A short meeting is scheduled for tomorrow. They were probably waiting for the new VP of College Administrative Services, Dr. Albert Alt, to come on board. It is unknown whether he will be at the meeting.

It was mentioned that the Engaging All Voices document needs to be revisited and make sure the procedures and policies are being followed on all councils as spelled out in the document. There were some consensus and some disagreements and finally got through it but if it is not followed what good is it? There were some disagreements as to what our role is as explained in the document as to what was spoken at the meeting. Example: It does say we will engage in college budget, planning and Resource Allocation, but the feel of some of the committee is we were dealing with discretionary funds only. It is to be revisited tomorrow to clarify.

J. Todd said hopefully within the next meeting or two it will be known how the new Vice President will be moving forward and collaborating with the RAC.

10. College Council

a. Faculty Growth Hiring Prioritization

J. Todd said the main issue at College Council was the Faculty Growth Hiring Prioritization. He met with several and debated the list of 5 faculty positions that came forward: PE (Athletic Trainer), Speech Communication, CLDDV, ADJU, and Engineering. They were informed that the District wants to do 3 hires that would replace the 1 year hires and extend those 1 year hires as growth positions. The president was concerned about the Athletic Trainer position. J. Stearns made comments at College Council: 1. In Fall 2013, 97 sections of PE were removed from the schedule and there was 83% fill rate, down from 115% in prior terms. Her concern was that repeatability has reduced the demand for PE and she was concerned with moving forward with that position. J. Todd understands why that position was argued for as a faculty position, mainly because that position will get very qualified applications and they would like it to be a full time faculty member. The concern from the administration was they wanted to provide the best 3 positions for the college. During that meeting the next 3 positions were discussed: ADJU, Speech and CLDDV. In the middle of that meeting, B. Anelli was concerned with losing good pools and asked if we could go forward with those 3 based on the problem with the timing, but J. Todd said that it would have to be brought to Senate and we have collegial consultation that is written inside the Hiring Prioritization. He is hoping the Senate can consider what the College Council asked which was to move forward with those 3 positions.

J. Hamilton said the positions that were contentious; if we skip down below those and went ahead with interviews and hires on those, we would be overriding the work of Instruction Council who heard all the presentations and were presented with all the data. We need to move with caution and not undo the work of a committee that has been involved in the particulars that we were not involved in. She would be really cautious to make a move that controls their considered choices.

J. Todd spoke with R. Stevenson; there were concerns about the way in which the mandate got argued, was discussed and got voted on in the meeting. He had asked R. Stevenson to attend the Senate meeting, but he was not able to make it at the last minute. He has no more information than that. The real problem is we have a position that is in the Hiring Prioritization list that the President has noted could be faculty or could be classified.

P. Cripe agrees 100% with J. Hamilton. It's easy to make armchair quarterback decisions when involved in the process. The process is important. The president does have the right to do with those recommendations as they see fit. For us, we ought to be very hesitant to say anything, because we weren't there. He feels there is a more important issue with that list. J. Stearns said there is another problematic choice on that top 5 list. The Science Math and Engineering position is problematic because there is no such group. There is no Engineering group. It matters if more positions open up down the line due to funding from the state which is not impossible. If that happens then what is going to happen? Is Instruction Council going to go back and redo the list, or are they going to say this

is our list, let's follow it, in which case it's very important. The Senate said years ago that they didn't like what happened with people when they were let go or rified; we want to show our support for bringing back things we lost and think are valuable. He was a little disappointed to hear it was problematic because we don't have an engineering program.

J. Hamilton believes that J. Stearns said "did we want to add a faculty to a program that is diminishing?"

J. Stevens wanted to address the issue with repeatability and the diminishing of the division. The sections being offered are still fairly extensive; although PE did reduce and eliminate some. We have an extensive and incredible Sports Medicine Degree Program that very few community colleges have; it's accredited and certificated because we have an individual who is a certificated individual to be able to do that, not just from our hiring stand point but from under the National Association. That program is thriving and sends student throughout the U.S. and to select institutions throughout California who also are accredited. That is where the discussion on the mandate issue was. A classified individual can serve at our athletic events and can serve treatment to our student athletes. The other issue on a mandate is a classified person cannot teach in the sports medicine environment. The potential loss of that program is immeasurable. It is an issue with him that he gets answered the questions. It is a mandated issue. It is a mandated position that someone from that environment be at that event. It is mandated to treat our athletes that a classified person can do but they can't teach the sports medicine classes, they can't prepare our students for that transfer and that's what the faculty person is. That individual would teach a realm of classes.

His purview for his division is to support and represent his faculty. He has no concept of how classified situations work. He doesn't understand the classified direction or how it is done. It is a mandated position in a number of different areas. Bobby Boswell is currently teaching those classes and he is currently exploring options in relation to retirement. There is no specific date.

A. McKissick discussed with J. Stevens, also sat with Bob Boswell and it is very plausible we won't have B. Boswell beyond December. It was explained to him in greater detail that the mandate is not just to have an athletic trainer at our events; it is also for a thriving major at our college.

He wanted to address the whole relationship of this body to the Instruction Council on the hiring ranking. He feels there should be a presumption against changing it, but thinks we have a duty to look at it and raise any concerns. No disrespect to the Instruction Council, they did the work, they heard all the information. There should be a presumption in favor of supporting what they do. We have a duty for due diligence.

He also wanted to address the engineering issue. The reason we lost Engineering was a fiscal emergency that provided an excuse for a President's vision of what this college should be. This was an opportunity where the Senate should weigh in strongly in the Engineering position #5 on the ranking list. We should be consulted. We have a right if we disagree to talk to the Board about it.

J. Todd said we need to look at the process and policy. He has asked two members in the Senate, P. Cripe and K. Alavezos, to do that when we revisit the Hiring Prioritization process.

J. Todd did demand in College Council that the hiring prioritization needed to come back to the Senate so that the process of collegial consultation would fully take place. The president asked us, in terms of collegial consultation, to consider the 3 middle positions. He was also concerned about the discussion of engineering; as we discuss our program discontinuance policy, we need to consider how programs can come back, as well as to develop new ones.

M. Morales said the problem he has is the changing of the whole process after the process was over. There was ample opportunity to make changes, and made sure it was solid and set before starting. It was done that way and after the presentations were given, it was mentioned corrections needed to be made to the process because there were some problems with it. In the self-review they said they had a list of things that had to be addressed. 16 positions were ranked and the list was put forward. Only

5 positions were showed. At that ranking it was discussed in open forum what was the definition of the mandate. Why wasn't this discussed prior to the whole process instead of afterwards? The administration said they could hire this as a certificated position instead of a faculty member. That's changing the process. We said we would honor the first choice from the division; if we don't honor the first choice from the division why is the division taking the time to rank them? If they are going to change regardless, they were going off PE's, they justified with their presentation why it was number 1. Changing the process afterward was throwing everything off. The rankings are a recommendation. He is worried about the policy and changing it midway.

P. Cripe said he was at College Council, and J. Todd is the one that said "No" after the president spoke, and that he didn't feel comfortable doing that and we're going back to the Senate. He followed the process. Most of the people speaking are speaking in favor of giving serious consideration to the council that did the work and when J. Stearns summarized the problems there was not a clear representation of the details. She painted the picture one sided. What would have happened if J. Todd had not spoken up? We can't afford to disrespect the group that did the work. We have to think about it and be on alert. He is proud of this group for sticking up for the group that did the work.

M. Adams said the senate does have the responsibility to make changes if changes need to be made. As one who sits on Instruction Council and was part of the ranking, it sounds like perhaps they were deceived about some things. If they say we didn't take into consideration certain things, why wasn't it provided to them? The senate needs to be willing to make changes if it needs to be made. They were told not to worry about the rankings, because it was a dry run and it was a dress rehearsal.

J. Todd said he feels they need to have something to take back to College Council. J. Todd said for a faculty majority council, 3 out of 4 positions were accepted by the administration. P. Cripe said this list could be used in the future and M. Morales said we needed to take it seriously.

M/S/T/C (K. Alevezos, B. Jensen, P. Cripe) Move to accept the rankings 1-16 that the Instruction Council put forward and will support those positions as ranked.

16 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Absentions

It was mentioned that Bob Droual, Jim Howen and Allen Boyer left prior to the motion being made and therefore did not vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 pm.

B. New Business

1. Academic Senate Election Bylaws and Procedures
2. Accreditation Institute, Feb. 6 – Feb. 9, 2014
3. Building Pathways General Education Conference, Mar. 14, 2014 – Bill Anelli and Jennifer Hamilton
4. Community College League of California Equity Conference, Mar. 14, 2014 – James Todd

V. REPORTS

- A. Student Senate – no report
- B. Faculty Representative to the Board – Brian Sinclair - no report
- C. Legislative Analyst - Chad Redwing – no report
- D. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW) – no report
- E. Curriculum Committee - Jennifer Hamilton – No Report
- F. Faculty Professional Development Committee and PDCC - Bill Anelli – no report
- G. Distance Education Report – Eva Mo – no report
- H. President Report – James Todd – no report

VI. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS - None

VII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC - None

Next Academic Senate Meeting: Apr. 3, 2014, Faculty Lounge, Library Annex, East Campus

VIII. ADJOURNMENT adjourned at 5:40 pm.

"In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act and SB 751, minutes of the MJC Academic Senate records the votes of all committee members as follows. (1) Members recorded as absent are presumed not to have voted; (2) the names of members voting in the minority or abstaining are recorded; (3) all other members are presumed to have voted in the majority."