

**MISSION COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE**

**Approved Meeting Minutes**

**Date: Thursday, May 17, 2012**

**Time: 2:15 PM – 4:15 P.M.**

**Place: CC 219-220**

**I. Call to Order & Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order by President Dianne Dorian at 2:20 pm.

<b>Senators</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>Senators</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>P</b>
Abdeljabbar (Ext. 5250) B&T		X	Piekarski M&S		X
Beggs (Ext. 5188 ) AS		X	Retterath (Ext. 5328) M&S		X
Brown (Ext. 5315) LA		X	Rettus AF	X	
Dorian (Ext. 5312) President		X	Student Senator Nguyen/Peters		X
Glaser (Ext. 5093) LA		X	Sun (Ext.5570) B&T		X
Guardino (Ext. 5398) SS/Tran		X	Thickpenny (Ext. 5287) LS		X
Johnston (Ext. 5305) LS		X	Trang (Ext.5081) SS	X	
Jones AF/B&T	X		Winsome (Ext.5217) M&S		X
Morgan (Ext. 5397)		X	Zilg (Ext. 5835) AF/B&T		X
O’Neill (Ext 5082) LA		X			
Guests: C Cox, N Ambriz-Galaviz, S Kashima, C Pembrook, M Jahan, S Zeisler, S Sullivan		X			

**II. Order of the Agenda**

The order of the agenda was approved by the Senate. (M/S/U – Abdeljabbar, Retterath)

**III. Approval of Minutes from May 10, 2012**

The meeting minutes from May 10, 2012 were not ready for senate approval.

**IV. Oral Communication from the Public**

There were no oral communications from the public.

**V. Information & Announcements (College & District)**

A thank you card for Haze and the HM students was sent around for the senators to sign.

President Dianne Dorian passed out a survey to the senators to assess their satisfaction with the conduct of senate meetings.

There is a Classified Recognition Event on May 22<sup>nd</sup> from 3-4:30, all faculty are invited.

Commencement will be next Thursday. If there is a finals conflict, faculty can contact John Spencer and he will proctor an exam for you on another day.

**VI. Administrative Business/Actions/Appointments**

**A. President’s Report**

The President’s Report will be sent out electronically with these meeting minutes which will go out to all users.

In addition to the printed President's report, Dianne mentioned the following items:

- She would like a faculty presence in faculty development and would like to make it a priority for the AS for next year.
- She shared the chart from FACCC that calculates the effect on the WVMCCD budget if the governor's tax initiative fails.
- Worku Negash's last CBAC meeting is this week as he's retiring. People are encouraged to go to the meeting to say good-bye to him.
- Faculty are still needed to lead lines for commencement. Please let Dianne know if you're interested.
- West Valley did not approve the local minimum qualifications at their last meeting. This issue will be revisited in the fall with the WV senators discussing where the local minimum qualifications revert back to should the two departments not agree. The proposed local minimum qualifications state that if the two colleges don't agree the local minimum qualifications will revert back to the state minimum qualifications. They would like to talk about having the local minimum qualifications revert back to the original local minimum qualifications, not the state minimum qualifications.
- There were no volunteers for the Evaluation Task Force so another call will go out in the fall.
- A call will go out in the fall for a volunteer to serve on GAP.
- Sara Rettus was the only person who volunteered to serve as the adjunct faculty senator on the Academic Senate. Since there was only one volunteer, as per the bylaws, the AS can appoint her without a vote from the adjunct faculty.

Motion: to approve Sara Rettus as the new associate faculty senator (M/S/U – Trang, Zilg)

### C. Other Reports

A spreadsheet was sent around for senators to verify and/or change their term information, as well as give their personal information should they need to be contacted during the summer.

- E. **Recognition**: A resolution for classified staff was brought to the Senate to show appreciation for all of their hard work. (M/S/U – Thickpenny/Piekarski)

### A Resolution of the Mission College Academic Senate in Appreciation of All Our Classified Staff

Whereas, there would be no students in classes, no students in activities and no students, period, without classified staff,

Whereas, the facilities including buildings, computers, and utilities would fail to function without classified staff,

Whereas, the grounds would not be as beautiful as they are without classified staff,

Whereas the services for students including libraries, counseling, tutoring, and labs could not be sustained without classified staff,

Whereas, the classified staff at Mission College are such wonderful people, who give 200% to their jobs,

Whereas, we, the faculty of Mission College, would all be extra stressed and confused without the support of classified staff,

Whereas, let's face it, Mission College would have to close without the support provided by classified staff,

Whereas we don't say THANK YOU enough to our classified staff for all their contributions to the operation of the college and the success of our students,

Resolved, that the Mission College faculty appreciate, esteem and love our classified staff,

Resolved, were it in our power we would give you all 100% pay raises and even then you would only be paid half of what you're worth!

Resolved that we wish our classified staff happiness and joy every day, but especially on this, their Classified Appreciation Day!

## **VII. Old Business**

### **A. Consider Approval of Work Experience Policy and Procedure**

Last week Stephanie Kashima brought a work experience document that she found out had a printing error on page 16. She redistributed the document including the corrected page 16. Stephanie also told the senate that both colleges will ensure that the faculty assigned to work experience classes will have the appropriate minimum qualifications. The West Valley Academic Senate approved this on Tuesday, May 15<sup>th</sup>. Stephanie does think that the senate needs to look at work experience as to how can it serve the college and AS's involvement.

Motion: to approve the Work Experience Policy and Procedures (M/S/U – Winsome, Retterath)

## **VIII. New Business**

### **A. Enrollment Priority**

Vice President of Student Services, Penny Johnson reported to the Senate on Enrollment priorities that are being considered for fall 2012. She shared a chart which indicates three levels of enrollment priority. The first are priorities set in Education Code: Current and former foster youth, military and veterans in good standing. Second priority is set in Title 5: New and continuing fully matriculated EOPS & DSPS students in good standing. Third priority is continuing students in good standing and new, fully matriculated students who have an education goal of transfer, degree/certificate, or career advancement. Finally, then registration is open to all others. These priorities are being influenced by the Student Success Task Force (SSTF) recommendations which appear to be being fast tracked through the legislature. These recommendations do affect student services directly. One big change may be level 3 of continuing students and the 100 unit threshold, with ESL & Basic Skills not being included in this 100 unit threshold.

Academic standing is other controversial issue. A student who ends the semester on academic probation may have already enrolled for the next semester. How should that student be handled? Please let them know if you have concerns about how this will affect your students. This item is information only, no action necessary.

### **B. Report Out of BSI Coordinators to Senate**

Linda Retterath, Sue Zeisler and Sarah Sullivan represented BSI and reported to the senate. Every fall each community college in California files a Basic Skills Initiative plan. It's a contract with the state that tells how California money will be spent on basic skills. The coordinators came to the senate to report on the progress of their plan. The first thing in the BSI plan was to form a Basic Skills committee separate from the BSI that would concern itself with the issues of

basic skills students separate from funding. They also held Staff Development workshops, including one entitled “Everything You Always Wanted to Know About What Counselors Do But Were Afraid of Ask.” The statewide BSI provides webinars on various topics and the campuses are encouraged to participate in them. They also conducted a workshop for counselors and faculty, which was well received. They have a lot of ideas for next year and many have to do with staff development.

C. Review Draft of MC Decision Making Process

Daniel Peck reported that GAP is talking about having a written form of their decision making process to show what they already do in practice so they have more transparency. Daniel shared the draft decision making plan and asked for the Senate’s approval. Discussion ensued and changes to the plan were suggested including the direction of communication arrows such that they show feedback loops between constituent groups. Senate President Dianne Dorian is encouraging people to be on GAP.

This is the model for overall college decision making and does not supersede any processes specifically delegated to constituent groups like the senate, such as the faculty hiring process. This decision making process will be part of the participatory governance handbook. In the fall, the Senate would like Daniel to come back with a final model for approval.

Motion: to approve the model as presented with the addition of the feedback loop  
(M/S/U – Trang/Thickpenny)

D. Consider New Funding Model to Prioritize Resource Requests

Heather Rothenberg, Chair of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) and Daniel Peck, Director of Institutional Research brought to the Senate the concept for a new funding model to prioritize resource requests that come out of Program Review. They presented the process to the Senate and asked for the Senate’s approval. In the model there will be a formula for base funding & base plus which can account for needs over and above the base. The actual funding formulas have not yet been determined and it is not the purview of the Institutional Effectiveness committee to determine the formulas. That is the work of CBAC. Their goal is to provide the overall concept and structure. Once the structure is approved, CBAC will work on providing the formulas and will return to the Senate for approval, as processes for budget are a part of the Senate’s 10 + 1 areas. Further discussion ensued concerning the historical nature of determining our current funding model through rollover funding. Other concerns were raised over whether this constituted zero based budgeting and whether this recommended process is an improvement over current practice. Daniel feels that the college lacked a tool as their starting point and that this process will help. There are departments who don’t know how much their courses cost, so this would aid them in helping them understand the costs involved and that budgets will be rebased periodically. The IEC feels that how often the budgets are rebased is up to CBAC. Concerns were raised on how each department will be allocated their base budget and how the model would work if a department is asked to add a section while another will be removing a section. A question was raised regarding whether the department that adds the new section(s) also gets more money. In addition, other questions were raised as to whether the model only covers fund 100, or does it include categoricals such as Perkins funds, as well as how the model would apply to non-instructional departments. The approval process was further explained. Once the Senate approves the model, it will go to GAP so the concept can be approved there, then it will go to CBAC for further elaboration. The Senate will allow President Dianne Dorian to represent AS in GAP to approve the concept so CBAC can work out the details.

A motion was made to extend discussion for an additional five minutes (M/S/U - Trang/Thickpenny)

There are some concerns over when the rebase will happen as programs increase and decrease. Stephanie Kashima said that the monies could be based on previous year enrollments to reflect an increase in the program. There is some discussion if this is actually different as it seems like it's the same as it always was.

Time ran out on this discussion and the Senate moved on to the next item, with the intent to come back to this item with time remaining at the end of the meeting. Ultimately, a motion was made:

Motion: That the MCAS approve the new funding model in concept and that the concept be flushed out by task force that includes CBAC, the senate, & institutional effectiveness representatives and brought back for final approval. (M/S/U – Trang/ O’Neill)

E. Consider Changes to the Curriculum Review Process Recommended by CRC

Cathy Cox, CRC Chair, brought to the Senate a recommendation for two major changes to the new course and the course revision approval processes. The first recommendation is to insert an optional review for division chairs with the major goal of catching any issues with course overlap according to the MCAS approved course overlap policy. This review is optional and the opportunity for review would end after five days, whereupon the course would automatically move on in the approval process to the next level sign off. The second recommendation is to add a review for the deans who work with the requesting disciplines to look at the curriculum and make comments. The intention of this change is to provide the VPI with the deans' comments prior to the VPI approval.

Motion to approve changes (M/S- Winsome/Retterath)

Discussion ensued over concerns related to adding the deans as another level of approval. It was made clear that the deans' review would only be advisory and not an approval and was intended to assist the VPI in her approval process.

M/S Winsome/Abdeljabbar to extend meeting until 4:30pm.

President Dorian clarified that normally the Senate accepts the recommendations of their subcommittees and doesn't differentially approve them, however, it is clear that the Senate felt strongly about the deans' review being inserted into the process. Questions were also raised over whether the division chairs could get more training and provide their comments during their review to aid the VPI, rather than having deans do it. The senate was concerned that it would look like deans are approving curriculum. Further concerns were raised over the appearance of marginalizing the role of the faculty division chairs in recent decisions regarding the meetings of the Division Chair Council. Cathy Cox stated that this recommendation would be a one year trial.

The discussion veered to issues of using Curricunet to track program deletions. Cathy Cox indicated that there is no corresponding process in Curricunet to allow for program deletion.

M/S Winsome/Sun to extend meeting by 15 minutes to 4:45pm.

Further discussion ensued on the SLO revision process, but ultimately a motion was made.

Motion: That the MCAS approve the changes to the Curriculum approval to include an optional review by Division Chairs and to eliminate the review by Deans.

(M/S/U – Abdeljabbar/Thickpenny)

F. Update on Faculty Recognition Program

This item will be discussed at the first meeting in the fall.

**IX. Future Agenda Items**

- A. Consider Amendment to MCAS Constitution re: Academic Freedom (Senate)
- B. Review Draft Revisions to the MC Faculty Handbook (Kashima) (Fall 12)
- C. Discuss and Establish Senate Goals for 2012/13 (Fall 12)
- D. Consider Recommendation of the Academic Directions Committee re: Engineering Program (Fall 12)
- E. Revisit the Idea of Plus and Minus Grades (Retterath/Senate) (Fall 12)
- F. Consider Course Substitution Policy (Coleman) (I/A) (Fall 12)
- G. Discuss Date of Graduation Conflicting with Finals (Fall 12)
- H. New Pre-Requisite/Challenge Process by Dan Sanidad (Fall 12)

**XII. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn by acclamation at 4:43pm (Winsome/Piekarski/U)

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Jennifer French, Senior Administrative Assistant to the Academic Senate.