



**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
MARCH 5, 2015**

Members Present: James Todd (President), Curtis Martin (Vice President), Steve Amador, Chad Redwing, Deborah Laffranchini, Allan McKissick, Allen Boyer, Belen Robinson, Bob Droual, David Chapman, Elizabeth David, Ellen Dambrosio, Linda Kropp (sub for Eva Mo), James Dorn, Jim Howen, Kevin Alavezos, Layla Spain, Luis Rebolledo (ASMJC President), Mike Adams, Nancy Wonder, Paul Berger

Members Absent: Adrienne Peek, Jim Stevens

Guests Present: Lee Kooler, Jim Sahlman, Ross McKenzie, Christine Groth, Barbara St. Urbain, Catherine Rasmussen, Barbara Adams, Todd Guy, Leslie Collins, Kim Gyuran, John Kropp, Greg Hausmann, Steve Choi, Pamela Crittenden, Tina Giron, Leticia Cavazos, Alida Garcia, Lisa Riggs, Flora Carter, Bill Anelli

I. MINI-LESSON

II. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

M. Adams would like to move A. Math Department Position on Course Unit Values under the Informational Items to below A1. of the Action/Discussion Items under Division Reorganization Discussion and become A2.

M/S/C (J. Dorn, J. Howen) Move to approve the amendment of the Order of Agenda Items to move V.A. under Informational Items to below VI.A1 of the Action/Discussion Items to become A2.

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

A. McKissick wanted to move to discuss a Resolution called "Collegiality in Design for Success" at a time of 5:00 pm, unless we have gotten to it sooner during an agendaized discussion.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (January 22, 2015, February 5, 2015)

M/S/C (J. Dorn, L. Spain) Move to approve the minutes of January 22, 2015 with a minor correction and the minutes of February 5, 2015.

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approve Hiring Committee Appointments
(see attachment dated March 5, 2015)
2. Opening Doors to Transferable Courses – Adjustments to Assessment

All in favor of approving the Consent Agenda.

19 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

V. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – item moved to Action/Discussion Items #2.

VI. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. New Business
 1. Division Reorganization Discussion

J. Todd wanted people to be able to openly discuss their issues, to talk about what might look right for us, and to think about ways we could collaborate. There are a couple of deans leaving, a dean position that is open in BBSS, another dean coming in in terms of Student Equity. There are changes in terms of some of the makeup of our courses and offerings and the personnel around

them. He believes this is one question about dean load and how are deans able to manage the amount of loads they have in their divisions. What would it look like to be successful in our divisions? What is the best designed for students? For faculty? That is the message to be told, as well as things that make sense, and other suggestions or thoughts.

J. Todd briefly went over the colored chart of the Proposal for Discussion that was presented at a campus wide meeting on February 27, 2015.

R. McKenzie provided a statement from YFA. A reorganization will cause some areas to rewrite their shared governance documents and make workload equity trickier to achieve and those are contractual items and does not seem to be the main focus of the proposed reorganization.

YFA provided some suggestions to help overburdened deans and senior faculty. They could be negotiated and could work out ways to make some of the suggestions take place if the District was interested.

One of the goals of the Board of Trustees is to grow our own local administrators. Having area or department chairs provides a stepping stone for faculty to explore the possibility of taking an administrative position at a later date.

YFA asked the Academic Senate to request the District and YFA to explore negotiable items that reduce dean workload.

J. Sahlman from Communication Studies made a statement. After a division discussion they understand and agreed there needs to be a discussion about the reorganization. There were concerns about the possible resistance to change but he wanted to make it clear that the Communications Studies Department is *open to change*. They think it is acceptable to talk about the possibility of staying in the division they are currently in or going elsewhere.

J. Sahlman briefly went over the history of Communication Studies and how other colleges and universities promote the same position. He mentioned in the CSU system almost every Communication Studies department is housed in Arts or Communications Divisions. A large majority of our cohort colleges place the Communication Studies Departments in an Arts Division. He brought up how they measure success with retention and success rate at the end of the semester. For that area the retention is 84%, Theatre is 85% and the college average is 80%. For the success rate the college is 62%, Theatre is 72% and their area is 73%. If they move their question is can they maintain or improve their current retention and success rate.

J. Sahlman requested that everyone read the handout and take it to meetings and councils and to remember that they are open to change and ask whether they stay in their current division or move to a new division to remember and respect Art History of their discipline and please help them continue the success of the Communications Department and the continued success in whatever division they reside in for the success of the students.

S. Amador talked on behalf of the Ag Department and his colleagues. After hearing the original proposal it brought back memories. Ag used to be with Tech Ed who had their own director which was P. Mendez. At some point the work load for the Ag dean and the Tech Ed dean was excessive and it was decided to take Workforce Development and Community Ed and put them with Tech Ed and they were their own division with P. Mendez. Now Ag having been by itself for a while it was difficult on the nature of Tech Ed and Ag being two of the most expensive programs on campus so resource allocation is always difficult. At that time when it would come to resource allocation voting the Tech Ed and Ag teachers in attendance were counted. He thinks it is not collegial and believes that is unacceptable. The two divisions are too big and too expensive, and taking Workforce Training out of Tech Ed makes no sense and possibly putting Workforce Training with Tech Ed and putting Ag and Community Ed together, that is something that could be debated. It has come up that Speech and Ag have a lot in common. They will be hosting 150 students in MSR tomorrow in a public speaking event. He believes they have similar goals and similar interests. They focus on being able to speak. One of the last things Ag students want to do is speak. One of the most important things students can do for success in life is speak. They compete in different areas and with universities. It is very difficult and they work hard and strive to keep up talking technically with Land Grant Engineering Departments and at

that contest no one out talks the MJC students. That is where they make up ground. They think that is important and is a good fit. They talk about retention rates and have similar numbers with the Speech Department. They are putting that out for consideration.

J. Howen had received email feedback from his group. Corrections on the chart are Contract Ed and Workforce is one and the same in Barbados area. In the Tahiti area it is misleading; it shows Ag as a small area, and Ag is a large area. It has eight areas and 24 awards and to show it as a small box is misleading. It is just like Tech Ed as one box and it has eight areas and a number of awards. The general idea when they worked with Ag is they were two different families which did not mix very well. It didn't work out as well as they had hoped. Ag would slow us down and Ag is one of the finest and most successful divisions at the college. They are just different.

Tech Ed is one of the few groups on campus where 90 – 95% of students do not transfer to other institutions and have no intention of doing so. The students go from school to a job. It makes a lot of sense to have Contract Ed, which is part of Workforce Training, Community Ed and all of ELTEC together as one group because the focus is getting them a job within a year or two. More certificates are given out than degrees. The number of students transferring out is about 5 – 7%. Keeping the dark blue boxes together in Barbados and Tahiti makes sense. Common sense says putting Administration of Justice with Fire Science makes a lot of sense because they periodically work together. Fire Science is okay with the idea but most of the students with Administration of Justice transfer on to other programs. The combination could happen but the Fire Science building is overcommitted and there is no room for them physically, so that is an option. One thing discussed is the Transfer and Career Center; the Transfer portion is mainly for Transfer of students and Career Center takes the second seat and would love to have the Career Center as part of Tech Ed because that is what Tech Ed does. They teach students, help them get degrees, certificates or a couple of classes for skill enhancement and the Career Center would be a great addition to their group.

L. Riggs from Allied Health said her question is what is not working and what is pushing us for that need for change. She doesn't feel anyone has had the time to gather evidence to make any intelligent decisions or get together with people in their department in such a short time. Her table was able to bring forth things that could be brought forth that made sense if we were to go forward with change, but it takes time. They didn't see a problem with Hawaii, but agrees with R. McKenzie about some areas could have department chairs. They do not have department chairs, but they do have department chairs. It is not recognized by the college and it is a problem. It is a problem for their areas and they are surprised the college does not have a description for the director of those programs and it will be one of the recommendations of the state. The deans are overworked in some of these areas, but maybe having a department chair would help. If working at student success, it was mentioned at their table having counselors in these areas that can help. It would be good to have the Career Center affiliated with them and speech classes affiliated with their programs for all divisions. The reality is sometimes students just need help navigating through the maze.

L. Spain said they were wondered why Counseling did not have an island under Student Services for Counseling. EOPS, DSPS, Counseling and Transfer are under the same model. They would to bring back International Students, Veterans, Trio and if they want to integrate Student Services in Instruction they should have Sociology, Psychology, Anthropology, Human Services, and World Studies. Counseling believes under the Support & Student Learning area they do not like the Support part of the title would like to have part of the title to include Counseling Department and Social Sciences. Due to the fact they deal a lot with Evaluations they think it should also be a part of the Counseling area. She also mentioned there are directors under EOPS, Transfer and International Students.

L. Cavazos said the Career Center is an extension of the Counseling program because that is where the students come in to do research for their guidance classes. Sometimes there is some confusion between Career Center which is career exploration, the assessment, the testing and job placement because they have all three; in the Career and Transfer Center there is the Career Center, job development and transfer.

S. Choi from Administration of Justice said it is historically a new degree. It is logic, philosophy, history, political science, and social sciences. It covers psychology, sociology, anthropology and

to have them in the Barbados does disservice to their students. When looking at the overall goal, which he believes is student success, the qualitative and quantitative analysis would show a better fit in a different island. S. Choi said their students do not get certificates, some go to work but the majority of their students are for transfer. Administration of Justice is probably in the top 10% of the college in transfer students. Their students want to be able to work up the ladder toward the higher positions.

L. Kropp (substitute for Eva Mo) said given the short turnaround time they did not hear from the whole division but heard from the diverse part of the division. Throughout the responses there were repeated things. A lot of people in their division are open to change, not that they feel they really need change, but are not against it for change itself. They were lacking the information necessary for making an informed decision to know if this change was good or not. Some think the restructuring could lead to synergies as disciplines interact and mingle with other people in hallways which could be a good thing. Others are concerned that a lot of Measure E money has been used and a lot of time and energy to redesign our physical space along the lines of their division. Most of them are very reluctant to relocate physically due to reorganization. It seems to be an effort to break up the strong voice of BBSS and put the power areas into silos to be silenced. There is no data to support how it would increase student success and most feel we need to be convinced there is merit for restructuring. We have not heard anything that tells us that it should be done and many of them are not convinced. This big room was booked and they did not come so maybe that tells you something. Several agreed with the thought of offloading duties to senior faculty for pay and it could be funded with the savings of the two deans that were eliminated in the last few years and those positions eliminated and those funds should be available to pay for some of the people that are overworked. We do need to do something to eliminate that burden but there are other ways to do that other than moving areas around that does not seem to change the overall workload. She hears today a lot of people suggesting where other people should move and it bothers her. She believes the people moving should have the most say.

K. Alavezos said this reminds him of Engaging All Voices. He does not feel it is right for constant rewrite. Then there is turmoil and another rewrite after rewrite when there is not a clear goal that was set at the beginning. It was not clear at the Friday meeting and it is not clear now. The two areas that were defined was student success but there was no data and the other was Dean's workload, but it was not defined and it is hard to grab onto and run with it without a clear vision. His suggestion to administration is to lead the change, sell it to everyone so they can get on board and move towards that direction otherwise it leads to chaos among everyone.

J. Todd said his interpretation of what happened was he didn't think the only issue was there was a Dean opening and a Dean left but one of the big issues is that it was very hard for J. Daly to handle both Lit/Lang and the Library. That was a historic issue to handle those. One of the things that happened was that it became something they struggled with, they moved the Library out, what do they do to try to balance that out and what kinds of things make sense academically and geographically. He was not trying to sell this but was reporting what he thinks happened. He briefly went over the chart and gave his opinion.

B. Anelli said this has nothing to do with student success and Academic Senate should have a statement about what happened in student success. When administration comes forward they need to give a 200 word justification/reasoning or rationale behind it. The Senate can ask for that or some evidence. The burden of proof is on Administration to show us that this will increase student success.

A. McKissick wanted to be open minded, and wanted all to take time to look at the beige position paper from their department, Communication Studies. It would be very disruptive to their department. What is the reason? It is not clear. One of the rationales he heard was we have to consider the impact of student success. In their department they are concerned about how student success will be affected in a negative way. One positive thing he heard was balancing dean load. The proposal as it is would mean there would be 26 people in the new Arts division while there would be 44 in Lit/Lang creating additional imbalance.

A. McKissick wanted to introduce a resolution as a first reading and he wanted to move that and if necessary to suspend the rules to consider he would make that motion.

M/S (A. McKissick, M. Adams) Move to approve Resolution SP15-A, Collegiality in Design for Success for a 1st Reading.

Curtis had a concern regarding Roberts Rules and the Brown Act. He said there was no reason why at the next meeting we can both introduce that and try to suspend the rules and pass it in one reading.

A. McKissick, due to the concern regarding Roberts Rules and the Brown Act, said he would make the Therefore of the Resolution a motion. This will no longer be considered as a resolution, but as a motion.

M/S (A. McKissick, R. Stevenson) Move that the Academic Senate will make all necessary arrangements for timely and thorough discussion of the initial draft, and all subsequent drafts, of the Design for Success, and

The Academic Senate requests that any Academic department significantly affected by the proposal submit a statement expressing concerns or recommendations directly to the Academic Senate, and

The Academic Senate directs its Executive committee to work in close communication with the MJC Administration to facilitate a final formulation of the Design for success supported by the MJC faculty and the entire college community.

A. McKissick said this is the way to express our position without the resolution. Time is of the essence and we need to say we want a thorough discussion and want the Senate involved because of the implications for things like student success. We are looking at a potential massive disruption and would like to say slow down. He is hearing lots of alternatives. There was no consultation with the experts in each department. There was discussion in their division that if they had to move it would make more sense to go with Ag or Social Sciences for various reasons.

L. Riggs wanted to add a Therefore because she heard people asking Administration for evidence relating to student success or would like something in there asking for evidence.

A. McKissick was open to additions. Discussion took place regarding revising the motion to include asking for evidence-based rationale and with friendly amendments.

M/S/C (A. McKissick, R. Stevenson) Move that the Academic Senate will request an evidence-based rationale for the initial draft, and all subsequent drafts, of the Design for Success, and make all necessary arrangement for timely and thorough discussion for the proposal in the Senate, and

The Academic Senate requests that any Academic department significantly affected by the proposal submit a statement expressing concerns or recommendations directly to the Academic Senate, and

The Academic Senate directs its Executive Committee to work in close communication with the MJC Administration to facilitate a final formulation of the Design for Success supported by the MJC faculty and the entire college community, should such a plan be implemented.

18 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 0 Abstentions

It was noted that K. Alavezos left prior to this motion being made.

E. Dambrosio said as an Academic department affected by the proposal submit a statement expressing concerns or recommendations to Academic Senate, it was proposed the Library & Learning Centers be removed from the academic divisions and assigned to a division as Equity & Student Learning. There would be success coaches, BSI and an instructional designer and the college would hire a new dean for that division.

E. Dambrosio made comments that this new dean would have a smaller portfolio which is good for them and hopefully allow that person enough time to administer and lead their area. Synergy

could be seen among those four areas, and they would like to have a timeline for the dean search.

The concerns were more date/information about the administrative structure is needed to make an informed decision. Concerns about possibly making a name change that would be something descriptive of what they do rather than a belief.

Recommendations were made to make a Master of Library and Information Science degree (MLIS) at least a desired qualification for that dean, and would be good to have MLIS and STEM/Learning Center Manager with tutoring and BSI experience. E. Dambrosio said one library faculty member would be desirable on the dean search committee.

M. Adams had two issues for the moving of Math. One of the issues is the scheduling of the Math classes with some science classes. There are students in certain majors that have to take certain math classes with certain Physic classes and that is a challenge to get those students to be able to take those at the same time. If they split the two areas he foresees that it would not work well for the student.

The other issue has to do with Engineering. If Math and Physics are not in the same division we will no longer have a champion to bring Engineering back to the college.

There was a further discussion about going back to the divisions and have discussions, the way this has been handled will hinder student success. There has not been clear guidelines and how this is going to help. It was mentioned that this does not have to be done by the Fall.

Adjourned at 5:39 pm

2. Math Department Position on Course Unit Values
3. YCCD Core Values

B. Continuing Business

VII. REPORTS

- A. ASMJC Senate – Luis E. Rebolledo
- B. President’s Report – James Todd
- C. Legislative Analyst Report – Deborah Laffranchini
- D. Accreditation Council – Brian Greene
- E. Instruction Council – Deborah Laffranchini
- F. Facilities Council – Jim Howen
- G. Resource Allocation Council – Kevin Alavezos
- H. College Council – Curtis Martin
- I. Faculty Representative to the Board – Bill Anelli
- J. Curriculum Committee – Curtis Martin or Barbara Adams
- K. Distance Education Committee – Eva Mo
- L. Student Services Council – Ross McKenzie
- M. Faculty Professional Development Coordinating Committee and PDCC
- N. Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW) – Eileen Kerr
- O. District Advisory Technology Committee – John Zamora

A. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

C. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

D. OPEN COMMENTS FROM SENATORS

E. ADJOURNMENT Adjourned at 5:40 pm

In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act and SB 751, minutes of the MJC Academic Senate records the votes of all committee members as follows. (1) Members recorded as absent are presumed not to have voted; (2) the names of members voting in the minority or abstaining are recorded; (3) all other members are presumed to have voted in the majority."

YFA Statement

The YFA is in a delicate position regarding any proposed reorganization, because the contract doesn't specify who your dean should be, or who your colleagues are, or even who has the office next to yours. Now, a reorganization *will* cause some areas to need to rewrite their shared governance documents, and it will make workload equity a bit trickier to achieve. Those *are* contractual items, but they do not seem to be the main focus of the currently proposed reorganization.

Rhetoric aside, the only effect of the proposed reorganization that the YFA could *clearly* identify was an attempt to rebalance dean workload. Well, there are other ways to help relieve our poor, overburdened deans. Some districts pay senior faculty to conduct adjunct evaluations. Some districts give reassigned time to faculty to serve as area or department chairs. We don't currently do these things here at MJC, but they *are* negotiable items, and if the district is interested, we could work out a way to make this happen.

Furthermore, one of the stated goals of the Board of Trustees is to grow our own local administrators. Having area or department chairs provides a stepping stone for faculty to explore the possibility of later taking an administrative position. And it's not like we haven't done this in the past; both Brian and Cece did area scheduling work while they were still faculty.

So, formally, the YFA asks MJC's Academic Senate to add a bit to whatever resolution you eventually craft. Could you ask the District and the YFA to explore negotiable items that reduce dean workload? Since we're currently in the middle of a negotiations cycle, it's...awkward...for the YFA to ask for this directly. Furthermore, exploring options doesn't mean we'll find any that are mutually satisfactory, but it really can't hurt to look.

MJC Communication Studies Department Position on the Proposed Design for Success

We want to be clear. Our goal is to foster student success. Like all of you, we work tirelessly to ensure that students have the best opportunities at MJC to reach their goals and their dreams. We understand the need for reorganization, and we believe the Design for Success proposal includes some very good ideas.

We are not opposed to change that fosters a more collaborative culture at the college and creates new opportunities to support student success. However, we believe that to achieve these objectives, students would be best served at MJC if the Communication Studies Department stayed in the Arts, Humanities, and Communications Division. Here are the reasons why:

History: The history and development of the modern field of Communication Studies supports our department's location in the Arts, Humanities, and Communications Division.

In 1914, our national organization, NCA, was created when our discipline formally departed from the discipline of English, and since then, there has been a substantial difference in the directions of theory, scholarship, and pedagogy. The split between disciplines was caused by a fundamental disagreement about the value of the oral tradition. Communication Studies emphasizes performance and teaches communication as a practical art, with a firm basis in rhetorical theory and modern social science.

Other Colleges: Other colleges and universities around our state advocate the same position.

In the CSU system, almost every Communication Studies department is housed in Arts or Communications Divisions. Additionally, the great majority of our cohort colleges (referenced in our YFA contract) place the Communication Studies Department in an Arts Division.

Cross-listed Courses: Cross-listed Communication Studies should be supported.

The Communication Studies Department has cross-listed classes with the Theatre Department (Readers Theatre, Oral Interpretation, and Storytelling). The faculty and division dean work to coordinate classes so students can complete their performing arts degrees following the "15 units in two years" model promoted by the college. Managing cross-listed classes is easier when the departments are housed in the same division. This is critical to ensure that classes offered once a year or once a semester are not scheduled against each other or otherwise in a way that would undermine student access.

Collaborative Endeavors: Well-established collaborative efforts in our division should be continued.

The Communication Studies Department and the rest of the Arts Division have a long history of collaborating on projects. Some of these endeavors include: the Beyond Tolerance Initiative, a Bi-Annual Storytelling Festival, the Humanities Contest, and crafting readers' theatre performances for numerous community events. The Communication Studies faculty also provides speakers to narrate and participate in various performance events.

Online Education Initiative: The current placement of our department supports OEI initiatives.

As we all know, the Online Education Initiative (OEI) will be a critical part of MJC's future. The centerpiece of this initiative is for a student to earn a fully transferable Associates Degree online. One major hurdle is creation of an online oral communication course. To develop something this groundbreaking is going to require collaboration with performance based disciplines faculty who are most familiar with the challenges of offering performance-based courses online.

Forensics: Continued success of the MJC's Forensics Team is most facilitated in our current division.

The MJC Forensics Team has a history of national recognition and is currently ranked first in Northern California. This is due, in no small part, to students who we have been able to recruit from Theatre. Our department is striving to continue a long-standing close relationship with Theatre to build robust programs, in order to recruit more students to our campus and create additional cross collaborative opportunities for those students. Being in the same division, working together, and seeing each other at division meetings help us to connect with each other during our busy semesters. We need that time at division meetings to take a breath, sit with our colleague and say, "hey, I was thinking about..." This collaboration would be much more difficult in divisions less focused on performance.

Division Size: The current proposal would place our department in a much larger division.

The reorganization plan has 44 full time faculty members in the Literature and Language Arts Division. There are currently 26 full time faculty members in the Arts Division. If the Communication Studies Department stayed in the Arts Division, and the additional departments proposed to move to our division did so, it would raise the number of full time faculty in our division to 33, with 37 remaining in Literature and Language Arts. This is a more equitable distribution of full time faculty, with more access to a dean for faculty and students. (As proposed, the ratio will be 26 to 44.) Additionally, the formulas for representation on Senate, Curriculum, and other campus-wide committees would create greater equity.

Sociability: The highly successful professional relationships in our division are an asset to our college.

An important dimension of organizational culture is "sociability." People who collaborate and enjoy working together is an important component for the health of an organization. The Communication Studies Department has worked for years to build strong, collaborative working relationship with faculty in the Arts Division. These relationships help us build and maintain a strong retention and success rate for our students. We have the data to prove this statement.

The anticipated addition of departments into the Arts Division excites us. We are looking forward to supporting future collaborations like the National Endowment for the Humanities Grant secured this year by a team lead by Chad Redwing.

During the loss of academic programs in 2010, the Arts Division was severely disrupted. Another major disruption will create hardships on a division with a strong record of student success. Given what is outlined above, there should be a very compelling case to justify its discontinuance.

What are the compelling reasons, based on student success, to move our department from the Arts, Humanities, and Communications Division into another division?

We are asking for your support so that we can continue building the success of our department and the Arts Division, and most importantly, continue striving for student success.

Library and Learning Center Statement

Academic Senate requests that any Academic department significantly affected by the proposal submit a statement expressing concerns or recommendations directly to the Academic Senate.

It has been proposed that the Library & Learning Centers be removed from the academic divisions and assigned to a division identified as Equity & Student Learning. Also in this division will be success coaches, BSI, and an instructional designer. As it stands currently, the college would hire a new dean for this division.

Comments:

- This new dean appears to have a much smaller portfolio than Jillian currently does (L & LCs and Lit & Lang), which is good for us and hopefully will allow that person enough time to properly administer and lead our area.
- We can see synergy among those four areas.
- We would like to hear a stated timeline for the dean search.

Concerns:

- A need exists for more data/information about the administrative structure in order to make an informed decision. In our proposed division, specifically, we would like to know the role of the STEM/Learning Center Manager in the new structure; this position currently oversees the daily operations of both the East and West L & LC. Would this position be retained? Eliminated when STEM grant funding runs out in 2016?
- Is there any chance of changing the division name? We'd prefer something descriptive of what we do rather than a belief. Equity doesn't tell us anything and feels faddish.

Recommendations:

- Make a Master of Library and Information Science degree (MLIS) **at least** a desired qualification for this dean. If we had a dean with an MLIS and STEM/Learning Center Manager with tutoring and BSI experience, that could be powerful.
- At least one library faculty member serve on the dean search committee.