

**Modesto Junior College**  
**College Council Meeting Minutes**  
**September 24, 2012**

**MEMBERS**

<b>Council Member</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
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	Academic Senate Rep	X	
Debbi Partridge	CSEA Rep	X	
Tanya Smith	CSAC Rep	X	
James Todd	Academic Senate Rep	X	
John Zamora	Academic Senate President	X	
Kevin Sabo	ASMJC President	X	
Mike Sharif	ASMJC Executive	X	

**SUBSTITUTE**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Member Substituting for</b>
Emily Malsam	Jillian Daly

**GUESTS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Jenni Abbott	Director Planning & Grant Dev & Interim Director Distance Ed
Lorena Dorn	Dean, Counseling
Bob Droual	Professor Anatomy/Physiology
James Varble	ASMJC Executive

**Business**

**1. Call to Order and Introductions**

Jill Stearns called the meeting to order and welcomed Emily Malsam who is substituting for Jillian Daly.

**2. Review of Minutes**

**Action Item**

Kevin Sabo requested that "Academic" appear before Senate in the attendance to read *Academic Senate Rep*.

Allan McKissick stated that according to the current College Council rule, voting is by consensus and we don't vote. Allan read an excerpt from the College Council Role and Operation document as follows: "Decision-making is by consensus, defined as a decision that all Council members either agree with or can live with. Differences or clarifications may be submitted by members for inclusion in the minutes."

Allan McKissick pointed out that on page 3 of the minutes that 3 abstentions by Academic Senate were noted and the vote should have been by consensus.

After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed to word the action item as follows: Most council members supported – motion passed in the September 17, 2012 minutes.

Kevin Sabo moved to approve the September 17, 2012 minutes as amended. Michael Guerra seconded.

There was general consensus to approve the minutes of September 17, 2012 as amended.

### **3. Review of Agenda**

Jill Stearns reviewed the agenda with members.

### **4. Third Reading - Revised Proposal of MJC Participatory Decision-Making Handbook**

President Stearns reported revising the decision-making documents with suggestions she received. Jill reminded members that the original document will stand and will be provided as evidence. She stated that this document was a snapshot in time. Jill informed members that she has not received any more input and to let her know in 24 hours if there are changes to the revised document.

Allan McKissick informed members that he brought copies of the decision-making handbook of September 21 to which there has been incorporated some other language into it. He distributed copies to everyone.

Jill Stearns reported that she added the following paragraph regarding student learning outcomes on page 12 of the most recently revised decision-making document.

#### *Student Learning Outcomes*

*Each college governance council is responsible for supporting student learning outcomes and assessment as part of the ongoing, systematic process of continuous quality improvement. The councils will serve as a forum for evaluation of student learning outcomes processes to ensure that fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.*

Jill Stearns clarified that this gives responsibility to the councils to support the work. She stressed that this document is a starting point, especially the language regarding the councils. These groups will define once they have started. Each council needs to have its own annual review to be developed by those groups. Councils are addressed in the original document on page 18.

Allan McKissick noted that college academic and professional matters is not in Jill's document and the Senate wanted it back.

Jill Stearns said a recommendation was previously made in the open forum about the technology committee and moving it forward. She thinks that is a very significant change and it is definitely on the list for consideration at a later date. That is there in terms of incorporating it into the document. She has received some input from the Student Senate but no structural changes. Input has been received from YFA and CSEA regarding including CSAC.

John Zamora distributed a copy of the Technology Committee document with recommended change to designate the College Technology Council as a sixth council with the specific responsibilities of developing and revising the college Technology Plan and prioritizing resource requests from program review related to technology and personnel needed to support technology.

John added that the reason he abstained from voting on September 17<sup>th</sup> was because he did not have a chance to review the document. Jill responded that having a vote provides an opportunity for when there is dissent, it is important to know if something was not agreed upon by a certain group. Jill added that it is easy to get mired down in process when attempting to come up with something everyone can *live with*.

Jill Stearns observed hearing in today's discussion that consensus is wanted instead of voting. She hopes that the time spent in laying out how we are going to operate and what is already laid out will lead to an environment of good faith.

Debi Bolter stated that YFA wants to keep technology staying as a committee and not a council.

John Zamora pointed out that the Technology Committee moved this campus forward in terms of resource allocation. Now the current proposal will go back for technology to continue as it was. Technology is geared up to be just like last year for the Resource Allocation Committee.

Jill Stearns clarified that the Technology Committee would still make recommendations as in the past. They need to make recommendations to the owner/user of the technology. The college is in a scenario where everything we do is a replacement. We have to give something up to be able to buy new technology.

John Zamora informed members that the work of the Technology Committee was given commendation by the accrediting visitors.

James Varble interjected that this is good where you are, where you get a commendation one year. The Commission is saying this is good, keep going with it, and not necessarily keep it the same.

John Zamora responded that it was exactly as James Varble said, and that was less than a year ago.

Kevin Sabo stated that their concern was that there are not enough CSAC representatives.

#### Action Item

[There was general consensus to add a CSAC representative on the councils.](#)

Allan McKissick reiterated that he brought comments from the Senate which are incorporated into the September 21 proposal of decision-making document. The recommended changes from the Senate are underlined. The Senate voted for the Exec to go ahead and make changes and work with constituent groups.

Rosanne Faughn asked if she should have incorporated her changes into the document to the president instead of sending a list of the recommended changes.

Susan Kincade clarified that the agreed upon process was to bring changes to the president and not to edit the document with the recommendations.

James Varble offered that maybe there was some miscommunication there and we could just look at the Senate document.

Kevin Sabo stated that he does not understand why the co-chair has to be faculty instead of a student or CSEA or other.

Brenda Thames added that part of the conversation is what are the responsibilities of the chair and co-chair which is clerical, making sure agendas and minutes are sent out.

Jill Stearns said that further consideration came from the task force. John Zamora said that changes of the committees will be flushed out over time is his understanding.

Kevin Sabo stated that consensus should have equal parts in it. John Zamora responded that the dynamics of College Council will change and they want to keep their three representatives from the Senate.

Jill Stearns informed members that the pieces not decided by this body are housed in the appendix.

John Zamora went through the Senate's recommendations for the decision-making document.

### **NEXT STEP**

Jill Stearns will incorporate recommendations into her document, hopefully to be out by noon tomorrow.

### **Next Agenda**

The mission statement which was tabled for today's meeting. Deciding on the decision-making handbook which will have to be by consensus as that is what is in place.

### **ANNOUNCEMENT**

Kevin Sabo distributed ASMJC's prop 30 handout.

### **FUTURE AGENDA**

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

### **ADJOURNMENT**