

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes – May 19, 2016

Present:

Alfred Hochstaedter (President)
Kathleen Clark (Vice President)
Lynn Kragelund (Secretary)
Paola Gilbert (ASCCC Delegate)
Heather Craig
Jacque Evans
Merry Dennehy
Sandra Washington
Robynn Smith
Glenn Tozier
Dan Schroom
Mark Clements
Alethia DeSoto (proxy for Mike Torres)
James Lawrence

Absent:

Mike Torres
Sunny LeMoine
Eric Ogata
Mary Johnson

Visitors:

Walt Tribbley
Jon Knolle
Kiran Kamath
Diane Boynton
Heather Faust

Called to Order at 2:32

I. Opening Business

A. Public Comments/Welcome (2:30–2:35)

- How is it decided if an item is an ACTION item and what does “ACTION?” designate?
How does a discussion item become an ACTION item? Answer: the executive committee makes the agenda and marks things as ACTION items. This is done as a recommendation, not necessarily a requirement. And the AS can modify discussions and ACTION items during the meeting.
- Recognize that this is PG’s last AS meeting – a thank you token is given to her for service.

**B. Approval of [Draft Minutes from the April 21 meeting](#) and the [May 5 meeting](#) ACTION
(2:35-2:40)**

Edit for May 5 Minutes: Lauren Handley and Leandro Castillo talked with us about the Scheduling/Enrollment Management (under Old Business, B.), their names will be added to that portion of the minutes.

ACTION:

HC moves to approve minutes from both April 21 and May 5th with the edit to May 5th as described above.

SW seconds

Unanimous approval of both minutes with 4 abstentions: RS, CK, AD, MC

II. Reports

A. President's Report [Notes](#)

[Summary of LAC Recommendations for the Institution](#)

Please note: The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate considered placing this topic on the May 19th Academic Senate agenda, but decided that consideration of other topics were more urgently needed at this meeting.

A. Flex Day Report ACTION

[Fall 2016 Draft Schedule](#)

Discussion: Would like to have time for questions after the administrator's addresses and build in the time for Q&A into the schedule. Can a "Launchboard" session be added to the schedule especially for CTE faculty? The CTE faculty have planned a meeting during the Flex that is not on the schedule. For Spring Flex, would like to see something about growing FTE's and empowering staff to think of that issue. Please send these ideas to HC.

Need to change the name of the ASMPAC President on the schedule because there will be a new president then.

ACTION:

JE moves to approve the Flex Day Schedule

RS seconds

Unanimous approval with no abstentions

B. ASCCC Report

[Spring Plenary Resolutions](#)

Written report posted here and the senators are asked to look over the document for more information on these resolutions.

III. Old Business

A. Recommendations from CBT on **Institutional Decision-making Processes** - AH and Diane Boynton

10+1 #6: District and college governance structures as related to faculty roles

Resource Guide for Institutional Decision Making -- Final Draft for Review

Response to Campus Feedback on Earlier Drafts

Summary of Recommendations from the Institutional Decision-making team

Discussion: Descriptions of the committees have come from the MPC handbook and some need updating. Current College Council is acting outside of their Bylaws and another group needs to take over some of these activities that the College Council does not have the authority to decide. The new group, The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness committee, will help to ensure the practical application of institutional policies.

It would be co-chaired by an administrator with a faculty. The ultimate goal is to have administrative accountability. Concern over how to ensure participation in this new group? The norms will still be followed and good representation will be sought out. College Council currently follows the Brown Act but it does not need to, and it will change its name to the President's Advisory Committee and create a new group to take over some of the current purview of the College Council. What is the AS being asked to do? Endorse this document? This document is still in progress, are we going to approve a document that is not finalized?

The AS is being asked to approve what is there so far, but more work needs to be done. And the Handbook should be reviewed and revised on a regular basis. If we wait until the document is perfect, we will not have a working document for some time. So the better question is, does the AS endorse the changes as listed on page.

Suggested Edits:

- *Page 10 - mention of the board policy under "Staff" has incorrect information*
- *Page 7 - Duties of the Board of Trustees, number 9 - is that accurate? Yes*
- *Page 9 and 10 - when talking about faculty, would bring up idea of primacy. The board policy is referenced here and it details faculty primacy. Suggest that this idea be more explicit than a mention of the policy.*
- *Page 12 -Number 2 - "institution-wide perspective" - not clear about what this means, need diverse perspectives. Change "perspective" with "perspectives"*

- *Page 12 – Number 8 – “5 minutes of comments”, would suggest not designating a time limit. Change to “a period of time”. Robert’s Rules of Order gives a chairperson the authority to decide on a time limit.*

Don’t feel comfortable approving the content of the entire document. Description is still being discussed, need more time to familiarize themselves with the changes. What is the urgency?

Frustration expressed about the slow movement of decisions in committees at the expense of making necessary changes.

Response: A part of the problem is not being able to have a discussion before making a decision.

The document has a more clear description and should alleviate some of the distrust senators are feeling with institutional decisions.

The worry about accreditation is misplaced, and rushing through changes may look bad to accreditors.

What we are doing now is not working, this is an attempt to make College Council work better. This discussion has come to AS three times, why does this decision feel rushed? Our job is to make sure we have clear processes and designations of authority.

Can we narrow down the document for approval or craft a statement that reflects our concerns?

ACTION

HC moves to approve the changes #1 - #8 on page _____

AH seconds the motion

Further discussion: PG urge senators to vote “no” on the motion because there are two many questionable details. Need to clarify terms used for changes to the college council: renaming needs to replace the word reframing.

3 aye – AH, HC, LK

7 nea – RS, JE, CK, AD, MD, PG, SW

2 abstentions – GT and JL

Frustration expressed with the lack of a decision and delayed movement on many issues, including this one. This issue has been on the AS agenda for the past three meetings. Response: What is the problem with waiting?

Would like to have a decision on this document before the end of the year. Suggestion: read over the document and think of edits or points of clarification, then meet for a single agenda item meeting of the AS next Thursday to approve of the document.

Would like a statement from AH and Diane Boynton that clarifies what is College Council now and the proposed changes and why. Suggestion: the senators could vote on the approval via email.

ACTION

MD moves to approve this statement:

The draft document (*Resource Guide to Institutional Decision Making at MPC 2016*) has been reviewed, and the AS would like more clarity on #7 and #8 (from the “Recommendations” handout, provided by the Decision-making Review Team) prior to approval. We feel there is a need for further campus wide discussion.

Aye - 6 - MD, CK, AD, PG, MC, LK

Nea - 4 - AH, GT, SW, HC

Abstaining - 2 JE and JL

Motion carries

Single agenda meeting next week to make a decision was proposed. Could send out an all campus email with information on this proposed change. This is a busy time of year, it will be hard for faculty to attend to this issue. Consensus: will defer a decision until next year.

B. Update on the Scheduling/Enrollment Management efforts of the CBT Working Group - deferred due to long discussion about Institutional Decision Making Process

Presentation to College Council, May 10, 2016

Proposed Block Schedule

Schedule Building Timeline

Two possible responses:

Resolution -- Fred

Resolution -- Paola

Both resolutions side by side

C. 2015-2016 Annual Report ACTION (3:35-3:40)

Draft annual report

Discussion: Would like clarity about the renaming instead of reframing of College Council. Also propose change with terminology: "purported structural deficit". Will not change that verbage. Few edits for typos will be sent to AH by MD.

ACTION

MD moves to approve with the above edits

HC seconds

Unanimous approval with one abstention: JL

IV. New Business

A. Report on the ASCCC CTE Leadership Academy - deferred due to long discussion about Institutional Decision Making Process

B. Equivalency Processes - deferred due to long discussion about Institutional Decision Making Process

Academic Senate Equivalency Page

MPC full-time Faculty Hiring Process (includes equivalency process)

Equivalency Form

Guidelines for determining equivalency in CTE disciplines when the applicant does not have an associate degree

(Approved February 5, 2015)

V. Future Agenda Items

A. MPC Policy on visits from non-campus groups

MPC Board Policy 2215: Time, Place, and Manner

MPC Administrative Procedure 6700: Civic Center and Other Facilities Use

Brochure about free speech on the Santa Rosa Junior College campus

Meeting adjourned at 4:17pm