

**Modesto Junior College
College Council Meeting Minutes
September 17, 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
Jenni Abbott	Director Planning & Grant Dev & Interim Director Distance Ed
Elaine Schuber	Admin Secretary, Allied Health
Maurice McKinnon	Dean, Allied Health, Family & Consumer Sciences
George Boodrookas	Director MJC Foundation

Business

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Jill Stearns called the meeting to order.

2. Review of Minutes

Action Item

Rosanne Faughn moved to approve the minutes of September 10, 2012. Kevin Sabo seconded.

The minutes of September 10, 2012 were approved by aye vote.

3. Review of Agenda

Jill Stearns reviewed the agenda with members.

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

President Stearns revised the decision-making documents with suggestions that were given to her. Since posting the revised document September 14th, there are two significant changes on page 24. Jill will update to include language regarding facilities. The charge of the Professional Development Coordinating Committee has been added to the document. Page 32 indicates prior and the group has made a change.

Jillian Daly asked if this document with the flow chart has been discussed with John Zamora, James Todd and Allan McKissick. She understood that they would be meeting with Jill Stearns and Susan Kincade.

John Zamora responded that he did have a meeting Thursday with Rob Stevenson, Allan McKissick, James Todd, Susan Kincade and Jill Stearns. He added that he also spent a lot of time with the document over the weekend. John said that some things that come to mind have to do with professional development and what it means to have effective participatory meetings. It is about an understanding across the institution. He stated that he can understand the merits of each document and regardless of which document we have, we will continue doing things over the campus. The wording has to be clarified that College Council makes a recommendation and it does not go to the Senate after that. He went through Jill's document and the things they are changing are from the Resource Allocation Committee and memberships. He wants to make sure we don't lose some of the narratives. John stressed that he does not want to lose some of the information, and maybe it is appropriate for some of the history to be in the decision making document.

Jill Stearns responded that the task force document is a snapshot that captures what happened. It needs to be as accurate as it can be to codify what was in place at MJC.

Allan McKissick informed members that Thursday's meeting group only met an hour and then the forum took place. He felt that the document needs an introductory paragraph and the Senate purview needs to be clarified. He reiterated that most of what AIE does is considered Senate purview. Allan requested clarification of the Accreditation Council as compared to AIE. He asked is there a way to clearly delineate what the Senate does. Changes should be made to include significantly more of the first draft and clarify the Senate.

Jillian Daly stated that she understood we delegated it out to Jill and the Senate to sort out the 10+1 issue.

John Zamora stated that the Technology Committee charge in here has been jumped up from what it was. He recommended that the Professional Development Coordinating Committee include such things as 10+1 and needs to be global. He added that any constituent can bring anything to College Council. If we focus on 10+1, we can lose other areas on campus. As a faculty member he felt he shouldn't have to battle it out with administration, staff, and students regarding 10+1. John observed that a student representative is missing on the Technology Committee and needs to be addressed. He will bring it to the Technology Committee tomorrow.

Jill Stearns stated that in regards to technology, she put a lot of thought into it. For our existing technology, our annual contract funding has not been identified. In order to offer what we currently have, we are in a position of replacing and something else has to go. She felt that it is unfair to ask a technology group to make decisions without resources to support a recommendation. She stressed that there aren't any dollars to support it. SLO needs to be the responsibility of everyone. One of the ways you can show is that every governance group can have responsibility in that area to ensure ongoing evaluation is taking place. There needs to be a broad conversation. We are all being held accountable for it. In her document, she didn't try to define what the groups would do. Budget development and institutional effectiveness are the role of the different councils and there needs to be a statement of what that is.

Jillian Daly asked for clarification that when Senate meets this Thursday, it is to see what can be used and incorporated from the first document.

John Zamora stated that it has to be figured out how 10+1 language is going to get across the campus. He stated that there is merit in Jill's document but not to lose pieces the task force worked on and how to incorporate it in our everyday work on campus. Allan McKissick stated that he would like to flush out more on Thursday.

James Todd said that they are bringing as much information as possible to the Senators and he welcomed edits.

Action Item

Jillian Daly moved that College Council use the most current draft as our working rough draft knowing that maybe some portions of the August 26th draft be included but this be the primary draft. Michael Guerra seconded.

Most council members supported – motion passed.

Allan McKissick stated that the participatory body made for the council is constructed in such a way that all constituents are there.

Jill Stearns stated that we are approaching this from two different perspectives. From her perspective, it is going to work. She felt that it is going to be rare when the Senate doesn't agree and that we need to put something in place that allows us to move forward.

Jillian Daly said that at some point in the future, she would like to see some ground rules for discussion here. She knows the Senate is going to meet on Thursday and maybe some focus should be spent on the August 26th document to determine what should be included in the September 14th document. She asked when we should have our discussion of when College Council should change or edit?

James Todd said the Academic Senate can really look at the document and come up with ideas that can be presented to College Council on Monday and finally get this cleared in two weeks. His thinking is that is our timeline if the Academic Senate vets this week.

Brenda Thames stated that she needs to hear from students and everyone what those edits are that should be included from the old document not just the Academic Senate.

Allan McKissick stated that he is ok with focusing on the September 14th document. We have to present the first document and the September 14th document.

Jill Stearns will get the two edits in and post and have it go to this group. Jill would like to get different names for the two documents, other than the dates.

Allan McKissick said that he would object to it being called the College Council document, adding that the task force version had a couple of problems that were fixed.

The two decision-making documents will be referred to as:

Original Task Force document
Revised September 14, 2012 document

These documents will go to constituent groups, coming back to College Council this coming Monday (September 24, 2012).

5. MJC Mission Statement

Debbi Partridge asked, if after the Senate meets, can College Council get a *Reader's Digest* version of suggestions on Friday to review for Monday's College Council.

Jillian Daly asked why the mission statement is so long. Jill Stearns responded that the workgroup felt it was important to have all of this in the statement. She added that this is our first opportunity to try and refine the statement.

Jenni Abbott reminded members of the history of the meeting in May and again in August with committees to discuss data where a workgroup was formed to create a draft mission statement (draft statement was attached to the College Council agenda). The group met and felt the first paragraph met the criteria. Because of recent history, paragraph two identified the student population. In the end, the group put it all together and felt if we put something up as a measure, the first paragraph was very broad and just alone, it cannot be used to measure anything.

James Todd added that the statement speaks to the fact that we are multiple communities out there?

Allan McKissick stated that he would like to see civic engagement included in the statement. There is a big movement to promote civic engagement and it seems like the logical progression for the second paragraph. Allan added that we are practicing civic engagement right now.

Jenni Abbott did not feel that a separate values statement was needed, and the second paragraph is lengthy.

Jill Stearns added that the list of bullets does not necessarily align with what we do. James Todd responded that he thinks the group wanted to at least put it forward because it was important.

Allan McKissick expressed concern with the fourth bullet point, *Personal responsibility and wellness* and the third, *Communication* which we do all the time.

Jenni Abbott stated that the workgroup felt very strong about the first and second paragraph and not so much about the list of bullets.

George Boodrookas said that he liked the statement because it is broader, bold, and focuses on what we do.

Jenni Abbott added that in some ways the bullets will require that we measure our success in attaining the statements.

Jillian Daly recommended that we keep the first two paragraphs and eliminate the third part. She recommended *working in our ILOs later*.

George Boodrookas informed members that after the August meeting, an employer wanted employer needs included in our mission statement.

Recommendations: Add workforce needs and civic engagement and delete the third paragraph and bullets.

Action Item

There was general consensus to amend the workgroup's mission statement as follows (additions in red; deletions indicated with strikeouts):

MJC Mission Statement

MJC is committed to transforming lives through programs and services informed by the latest scholarship of teaching and learning. We provide a dynamic, innovative educational environment for the ever-changing populations **and workforce needs** of our regional community. We support the development of intellect, creativity, character, and abilities which shape students into thoughtful, culturally aware, engaged citizens.

Education is the reason our institution exists. To this end, we value innovation, professionalism, integrity, and responsible stewardship. We foster respect for and interest in the diverse individuals and histories of our community. These values are foundational to the way we shape our programs and services, make and communicate decisions, and reinforce collaborative relationships within our community, **and promote civic engagement**.

~~MJC fulfills its mission by developing knowledge, skills and attitudes that prepare learners for further education and the workforce through:~~

- ~~● Information literacy~~
- ~~● Critical thinking and problem solving~~
- ~~● Communication~~
- ~~● Personal responsibility and wellness~~
- ~~● Global, cultural, social, and environmental awareness~~

Jenni Abbott will make revisions tonight and send it out. This revision will go to the Senate for a first reading.

Allan McKissick will tell the Senate that College Council asks us to consider approving.

FUTURE AGENDA

1. Transfer/Career Center
2. Ground rules for discussion

ADJOURNMENT