

Modesto Junior College
College Council Meeting Minutes
September 10, 2012

MEMBERS

Council Member	Representing	Present	Absent
Jill Stearns	Chair	X	
Susan Kincade	VP Instruction	X	
Michael Guerra	VP College Administrative Services	X	
Brenda Thames	VP Student Services	X	
Debi Bolter	YFA Rep		X
Jillian Daly	YFA President	X	
Rosanne Faughn	CSEA President	X	
Bill Kaiser	IAC Rep	X	
Allan McKissick	Senate Rep	X	
Debbi Partridge	CSEA Rep		X
Tanya Smith	CSAC Rep	X	
James Todd	Senate Rep	X	
John Zamora	Senate President	X	
Kevin Sabo	ASMJC President	X	
Mike Sharif	ASMJC Executive	X	

GUESTS

Name	Title
Rose LaMont	Economics professor
Elaine Schuber	Admin Secretary, Allied Health
Martha Lee	Administrative Specialist, Allied Health
George Boodrookas	Director MJC Foundation
Bob Droual	Anatomy/Physiology Professor
Lisa Riggs	Nursing Professor

Business

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Jill Stearns called the meeting to order and welcomed Susan Kincade, the new Vice President of Instruction. Introductions followed around the table.

2. Review of Minutes

Action Item

Jillian Daly requested that her comment on the arrow up on the Program Improvement graphic be “is a great addition” and *not* “has been huge”.

Kevin Sabo moved to approve the minutes of August 20, 2012 with Jillian’s amendment. Mike Sharif seconded. The minutes of August 20, 2012 were approved as amended.

3. Review of Agenda

Jill Stearns reviewed the agenda with members.

4. First Reading - Revised Proposal of MJC Participatory Decision-Making Handbook

Jill Stearns expressed deep appreciation for the great work that has been done over the past several months to bring the college to the required level of proficiency. A major challenge to reaffirmation of accreditation is the implementation of changes to strengthen the college governance structure. A dedicated group of faculty, staff, students, and administrators met regularly over the last 8 months to begin this process. The group brought forth the proposed MJC Participatory Decision-Making Handbook that establishes guiding principles for decision-making and delineates our current college governance structure.

Jill Stearns presented her proposal of September 6th (Revised Proposal of MJC Participatory Decision-Making Handbook) to College Council for consideration. Jill has also shared her proposal with the Academic Senate. Her proposed council structure incorporates the work and recommendations of the taskforce while also providing:

- Clarity on the role of each constituency, college governance council, committee, and the president in decision-making
- Transparency of membership, charge, responsibility, and meeting information
- Opportunity for increased participation of faculty and staff in college governance councils
- Greater authority for constituencies to identify the best individuals to serve as representatives on each governance council
- Enhanced alignment to Title V
- Delineation of processes for integrated planning
- Decision-making tied directly to the college mission

There will be an open forum for the president to receive feedback on Tuesday, September 10 at noon and again on Thursday, September 13 at 4:00 p.m. This will be an opportunity for discussion and dialogue. The proposed structure is designed to establish venues for collegial dialogue and strong recommendations, based on shared data, that will lead to the best decision-making on behalf of the students of MJC.

Jillian Daly requested discussion of *process* for how it is going to work for the approval.

Jill Stearns stressed that expediency is our challenge at this point. The September 6th document she authored serves as a starting point. Jill stated that College Council needs to have the opportunity to look at this proposal framework ahead of time. She acknowledged that there is no way we are going to have a perfect solution in place.

Jillian Daly clarified that she is just asking what are the next steps? Next steps process will be added to the agenda.

Allan McKissick said he was “hearing” the conclusion that the document was inadequate for accreditation, but not hearing how. He agreed that time is of the essence and we don’t have time to answer questions. Allan stated that the document was brought to the Senate and now it will be discussed in a public forum. He added that the Senate could not discuss the proposal at the meeting because of the Brown Act. Allan said that he agreed with holding forums by all means, as long as they are not taken for governance meetings. He pointed out that this new version of the decision-making handbook has just arrived.

Jillian Daly stated that these forums are a way of getting general input, but clarification needs to be made and ultimately come to College Council. She thought it was interesting looking at the two documents side by side. She said in looking at the flow chart in the original document, things going to College Council are just YFA, Senate and CSEA. Looking at the new proposal, that is a given who is on College Council, the arrows and visual is different for her. Jillian stated that she doesn’t understand why certain items are under College Council, adding the piece that is missing is how recommendations get to College Council.

Jill Stearns responded that this proposed structure is designed to clarify how that happens. According to the standards, we have to insure there is an opportunity for all constituents to have dialogue. Jill stated that this structure gives us the opportunity to have that dialogue. She stressed that it needs to be very clear that the representing constituent group makes the selection of their representatives. We need to point to how work is driving SLOs and to define our role in supporting and how we are going to use SLOs to drive our work.

James Todd said that he is thinking what kinds of deadlines and processes are we going to have and the deadline we are facing.

Jill Stearns informed members that there are three recommendations that have not been addressed. A draft will be coming to this group at the next meeting to start dialogue. The next piece is recommendation 5 and 6. College Council will be meeting on a weekly basis to have the time carved out. Ideally, we would have had a structure in place earlier. Timelines will be set out that would delineate what the next steps are, who is responsible, and when they will be complete.

Allan McKissick pointed out that the narratives for all groups are gone in this document. The Senate committee is gone and it is not clear who reports where. He questioned the Accreditation Council and the Instruction Council in the document and the Accreditation/Institutional Effectiveness Committee is no longer.

Jill Stearns responded that this document does not propose to say or structure what the constituent groups do. This document establishes a participatory governance structure giving everyone a representation so they can share with their group. Jill stressed that College Council does not have any purview in the areas of Senate, YFA, CSEA and CSAC. Those are really independent groups. The notion of an Instruction Council is to have participatory governance group to have discussion like the Student Services Council, assisting in terms of providing and having input where discussion can occur.

Jillian Daly commented that she likes the split between accreditation and instruction. Finally, we can have discussion on what we think while following the standards, of course. She asked is it positive or negative to have standing committees?

John Zamora informed members that the Planning & Budget Committee has decided to move to the Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) and have College Council do planning. John stated that the Academic Senate can take issues directly to the Board. He added that a graphic needs to be created. We use council and committee in a very loose fashion and that needs to be cleaned up and made clear. John asked where do people report and where do people become members of these committees?

Allan McKissick said that disappearance of the clause that says it goes back to the Senate bothers him and maybe we should take the organizational document and fine tune it.

Jillian Daly said the document doesn't say how recommendations come in, it just says who participants are.

John Zamora added that it is just about constituency, it doesn't say how the process comes in. Information needs to be made into a graphic and created from that. The skeleton was created and needs to be flushed out.

Jill Stearns stated that her September 6th document reflects as much of the great work of the task force as she felt an outsider could understand.

James Todd distributed a graphic of participatory decision-making and shared governance structure, making it clear that he is not proposing anything from the Senate, that it is something he came up with. In his graphic, he placed the Senate after College Council with dotted lines with the words "rely primarily" and "mutual agreement" issues which is based on Mt. San Jacinto's wording. The Academic

Senate box has dotted lines. James added that this has to be about cooperation and expediency. If we have Senate representatives on all these, we should be able to ratify recommendations. He clarified that he is using the dotted line because not everything is 10+1. He felt our problem was representation and he would like a graphic showing where the Senate is and where 10+1 comes in.

Michael Guerra felt that we do not need a dotted line to represent. The Senate has purview to have discussion. Take it back to the Senate and discuss 10+1. He added that we need a process we can do to expedite business with.

Susan Kincade stated that she likes both documents because it expands representation which means there are more voices at the table.

Jill Stearns said that James did a great job of representing groups on the graphic. She gave an example of where something would go to what council.

John Zamora said that his biggest concern is does this capture who we are? The document has to be tweaked and it doesn't have to be a direct line to the Board. He does not want things to get lost that are important pieces in the other document.

Jill Stearns has observed that not a single group has expressed satisfaction with the way things have been. The process the workgroup took has been hugely important. A structure has not been built here to allow the college to build in a healthy manner. What she proposes when we become experts and have more conversation centered on specific things like accreditation, facilities, educational master plan, how do you improve on these things? The ultimate goal is to have a structure to be able to maintain and not feel a drift when someone comes in. They are not going to turn it upside down when there is evidence of efficiency and when it is working.

Allan McKissick referred to the one-page *Participatory Decision Making on Academic and Professional Issues at Modesto Junior College* document narrative which the Senate approved to be added into the decision-making document. Allan stated that he does not see why this narrative could not be included in anyone's proposal.

Rosanne Faughn understood the ACCJC representatives to say that the Accreditation Standards do not just fall under the purview of Title V, that it was more than that and since the discussion today seems to revolve around Title V that maybe we need to take a step back, take a breath and re-evaluate our motivation regarding this document. It was her understanding that if this is living document that we should be able to modify it as we go along.

Kevin Sabo felt that a change in culture of our campus is the answer in these charts.

Jill Stearns stated that she thinks our best fit now is her document and the standards. Her goal is to have a revision of her document next Monday after the forums and to have a document that will meet the standards. She has already received some thoughtful suggestions for the document. Jill added that we have a group who has 8 months vetted in that original document. Her document is reduced down from that. Jill stated that she doesn't own this, not like that group who went through the extensive process and the document is all up for change and improvement. Jill stated that this document will clearly speak to our visitors and the Commission that this college has moved forward and taken a risk to change something.

James Todd stated that he feels it is important that we have a group where we are comfortable to be at a starting point with the document.

Allan McKissick suggested having a meeting with Senate representatives and the president.

ADDITIONAL MEETINGS

Two additional College Council meetings were scheduled in addition to the September 24th previously scheduled meeting. The additional meetings will be September 17th and October 1st. The agenda for these meetings will be limited to the proposed mission statement and the decision-making handbooks.

FUTURE AGENDA

1. Transfer/Career Center

ADJOURNMENT