



**ACADEMIC SENATE
APPROVED MINUTES
APRIL 12, 2012**

Senators Present: Kevin Alavezos, David Boley, Paul Cripe, Ellen Dambrosio, Bob Droual, Catherine Greene, Jennifer Hamilton, Jim Howen, Allan McKissick, Eva Mo, Mike Morales, Estella Nanez, Adrienne Peek, Chad Redwing, Lisa Riggs, Dorothy Scully, Burt Shook, Brian Sinclair, Jim Stevens, Rob Stevenson, Theresa Stovall, James Todd, Layla Yousif, John Zamora

Senators Absent: Bruce Anders, Debbie Laffranchini, Mark Smith

Guests Present: Steve Stroud, Faculty Consultant to the Board/District Council, Douglas Dyrssen, ASMJC, Kevin Sabo, ASMJC, Michael Guerra, Vice President of College Administrative Services, James Fay, Interim Vice President of Instruction, Nancy Wonder, Allied Health, Beth Bailey, Allied Health, Bonnie Hunt, Allied Health, Teryl M. Ward, Allied Health

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

The amended order of the agenda items was approved without objection.

Allan McKissick requested the New Business information item B1, Faculty Assessment Coordinator, be moved in front of item A. Continuing Business.

M/S/C (Allan McKissick, Chad Redwing)

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the March 29, 2012, Academic Senate meeting were approved without objection.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Ratification of Stephen Stroud's nomination to serve as Faculty Consultant to the Board

B. Fall Institute Day Theme: "Staying Alive—Commitment to Wellness, Growth, and Stability"

The Consent Agenda was approved without objection.

IV. GUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

A. Michael Guerra, Vice President of College Administrative Services, came to speak to Academic Senate members about the budget decisions that have been made at the

Planning and Budget Committee meeting recently. Michael distributed a document displaying the following budget information:

- Academic and Classified Salaries
- Employee Benefits
- Supplies Materials
- Other Operating Expenses/Services
- Other Outgo

Mr. Guerra reported that Planning and Budget has been kept informed about the budget, but most of the work has really been done by the academic deans. The Planning and Budget Committee was informed of the part-time overload (PTOL) allocation on April 11, 2012. Mr. Guerra reported that there will be some challenges and opportunities with the PTOL allocation. After two weeks of working on the PTOL allocation, a decision was finally reached between Dr. Fay and Mr. Guerra. The PTOL allocation is \$6,750,000. Mr. Guerra reported that there was a sweeping of some accounts because the money was needed. Michael said that the College does have some obligations this year and next year. The obligations that Michael will take care of this year are as follows:

1. Dell Lease Payment (\$232, 000 for next year, taken care of this year)
2. Discontinued Printing Program (We owe \$75,000 on close out, and this will be paid this year)

Michael Guerra stated that he will look into seeing if there are any other reductions that can be made in the operational area. The projected operating budget for next year is \$1,200,000. Michael stated that this is probably bare bones for a college of this size. Due to this low amount, Michael stated that he will try to mitigate any reductions in terms of support. Michael said that it's the year 13-14 budget that puts us against the wall right now. A lot is dependent on what the legislature does.

Theresa Stovall asked Mr. Guerra about the recent Board Agenda announcement regarding an Executive Secretary position for the Vice President of College Administrative Services. Theresa asked Mr. Guerra about where the decision was made to proceed with this hire above the other hires that are listed in the hiring prioritization list. Theresa also asked, "In what way will filling this hire guarantee that some of the classified staff will not be let go as a result of this, or will that not affect them?" Michael stated that he cannot speak to the classified positions. The position that was approved by the Board is a management position and each of the Vice Presidents has administrative support. Mr. Guerra stated that it is necessary that he have that support as well, in order to carry on his duties. Michael also said that we have talked about the essential filling of pertinent positions, and the Executive Secretary position is one. Mr. Guerra stated that this position did come to the Senate, and the position was also discussed in President's cabinet. Adrienne Peek stated that it was not discussed. Adrienne stated, "A list of positions came every Monday to President's Cabinet, but we did not talk about them. We did not make any decisions or recommendations about what to do with them. I can tell

you also what other positions are on that list, and apparently decisions have been made about those positions also without any discussion. Michael Guerra stated that the decision was made long before he came to the college. Michael Guerra said that it is an essential position for college operations. Adrienne Peek agreed that it is essential but asked, "Where was it decided to go ahead with that hire in a deep hiring frost, because as far as anyone can tell there has been no input from Planning and Budget, President's Cabinet, or College Council. It is a new position and it is kind of hard to argue that you can't get by without it, since you've been getting by without it. I think Vice Presidents ought to have Executive Secretaries. I understand the need, but there's a lot of need all over the College, and so the question then is, how is it determined that this one rises to the level of top need, when others don't? Where does that decision get made?" Michael answered, "It is a process issue and being new and learning that process, I don't have a response for that."

Bob Droual suggested that the process be more transparent. Bob said that we are spending a lot of money terminating administration positions. Bob said that we are hiring interim positions, and we don't know how much this is costing us. Bob suggested that it would be good if we all knew what was being spent on these administrator positions. Michael stated that he has been as open and transparent as he can. Bob said that there needs to be more transparency with numbers. Bob stated that the administrator salaries were being mixed with the academic salaries. Bob would like for that information to be separated out. Michael said that he could do that.

Jennifer Hamilton stated that a document was handed out to the Senators when Michael last spoke to the group. The document looked pretty similar to this one that Bob is asking about. Jennifer stated that she had also asked for clarification on administration salaries, and Michael had told her that the salaries are there but rolled in with the academic salaries. Jennifer asked then if the group could get that information clarified by Michael returning with a document separating the information out. Jennifer said that since it has been asked for before, and has not been clarified as of yet, how much of that 27 million is actually in managing the administrative turnover? Jennifer thinks that any planning/cuts that we do is not as fully informed as they should be. Jennifer said that it is highly possible that we are covering things to the detriment of our students that probably shouldn't be covered out of academics.

Jennifer Hamilton felt that Theresa's question of how the Executive Secretary position made it to the Board Agenda was not fully answered. Michael Guerra said that it was the Chancellor's decision. Allan noted that Michael did say that the decision was made before he got here, but Allan was wondering why in the last six months nobody has had a serious discussion to reconsider the position. Michael said that the discussion took place with Mary Retterer. Mr. Guerra stated that Mary affirmed and supported it, but the decision was made by the Chancellor prior to Michael working at the College.

The conversation moved to discussion on the tier ranking system. Ellen Dambrosio asked "Is all the tier rankings that the deans' submitted to you been taken from here, or is that

where you are looking to find the additional cuts?” Mr. Guerra stated that they were just looking at the mandated column and there is overage. Michael is still working with the deans to get more information on it. Ellen asked for more clarification. Ellen said, “So are you saying, only something that is mandated? Michael said that mandated and essential (the first two columns of the tier system) were considered. Everything else was not considered to be included in the budget.

James Todd discussed the point made about transparency and the budget. James said that it would be helpful for everyone to see where our money is going. James said that we need to have as much public access to this information as possible, and this should be the goal for us.

Eva Mo added that it is difficult for us to buy in on what is moving forward. Eva said that what we wanted to see was some sort of collaboration afterwards. Eva stated “It sounds like we are just automatically going to lop off the two bottom rows and if that is the case, it feels like it’s an awfully easy answer without losing our smarts in really sort of looking at are they adjusted appropriately to one another. Despite the faith that I have in our administrators, there are so many other smart people here who would help with adjusting.” Eva continued to say, “The frustration that you are feeling from us is also the frustration that we are feeling. We know we need to do something. We know your job is hard. We know everybody’s job is hard. At the same time, there is a great deal of frustration with the information. If it is not specific enough, I can’t read it. I can’t make an informed decision. I can’t participate. I can’t buy in. That is something that administrators can get a lot of power from. If you get our buy in, things would move so quickly with us.”

Stephen Stroud stated that his concern came about after reading the Planning and Budget Report. Stephen stated that the report only discussed mandated items and not mandated and essential. Stephen is concerned about the number of students that will be affected by this and ultimately the funding for the institution.

Michael Guerra added that the budget is not final until September, when the board approves it.

V. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. The Academic Senate discussed the Faculty Assessment Coordinator position. Adrienne Peek distributed two documents displaying the following information:

- Discussion of Academic Senate’s Faculty Assessment Coordinator Position (Research data from Dr. Joseph J. Bielanski)
- ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

Adrienne reported that the average release time given for the Assessment Coordinator position is 56.6%. Adrienne reported that the ACCJC Rubric proficiency row is relative to this particular conversation. Adrienne reported that we are expected to be at proficiency

by 2012. Adrienne stated that at this moment, we do not have an Assessment Coordinator because the College offered the person who applied 20% reassigned time. Quite a few Assessment Work Group members were in attendance to speak on the issue. Charles Mullins stated that the job of the Assessment Coordinator is intense. Charles said that it is far beyond probably even 60% reassigned time. Dr. Fay stated that he had discussed with Mary the reassigned time for the position. Dr. Fay said that Mary agreed to move it up to 40%.

Chad asked what the amount of reassigned time has been traditionally. Adrienne answered, "It has kind of been all over the map. It has been as high as 100%. When I first took it I had 40%, but I kept reducing, not the College. I did not want to be over 100%. When I became President-Elect, I reduced it to keep myself from being over 100%."

Chad Redwing stated that he has been part of the Assessment Work Group for two years. Chad said that he is not an assessment fanatic, and does not enjoy doing SLO Rubrics at 2 in the morning, but for those who have never seen the group or have been a part of it, Chad noted that there is something unique about the effort to have a faculty assessment driven entity. Chad was concerned about assessment at the college. Chad emphasized that assessment needs to be faculty driven authentic assessment.

Adrienne Peek read the definition of authentic assessment. Adrienne said that authentic assessment means direct observation of student-produced work. Adrienne stated that she does not know who should do the authentic assessment other than faculty. Dr. Fay said that he thought there is more authentic buying in to the process. Dr. Fay also said that cultural contribution is very important.

James Todd asked what the solution is, since we do not have anyone appointed for this position now. Dr. Fay stated that he did not have a Plan B. James asked if Dr. Fay was planning on advertising the position again soon. Dr. Fay stated, "I hope that faculty would step-up. It's going to be faculty driven that's what has to happen."

Paul Cripe pointed out how easy it was to not follow our own advice. Paul said, "We just raked somebody over the coals for hiring a secretary without really letting anybody, as far as I can tell, participate in the discussion on relative merits of that hire versus other possible hires. While I am saying nothing negative at all about SLO Coordinators and their reassigned time, we are participating in discussion that is completely lacking the overview of how this compares to other priorities. We are doing the same thing here as a group."

Allan McKissick agreed with part of Paul's statement but said, "I find the analogy troubling. I think the critical difference is a new position versus a position that has already been established as essential here. I think that a faculty Assessment Coordinator is vital to the Senate's responsibility in this area. Allan motioned to make a recommendation as follows:

The Senate strongly recommends that MJC Administration adequately support assessment activities, including adequate reassigned time for a faculty Assessment Coordinator.

Discussion ensued and some people spoke to putting a percentage for reassigned time in the recommendation at 60%. Chad Redwing added the following amendment:

In order to ensure authentic faculty-driven reflections on student success and pedagogical improvement.

The Academic Senate approved to amend Allan's motion for a recommendation. The amended recommendation reads as follows:

The Senate strongly recommends that MJC Administration adequately support assessment activities, including adequate reassigned time for a faculty Assessment Coordinator in order to ensure authentic faculty-driven reflection on student success and pedagogical improvement.

M/S/C (Allan McKissick, Brian Sinclair) to approve the motion for a recommendation to the MJC Administration. 12 Ayes and 10 Nays: therefore the motion carries.

VI. REPORTS

ASMJC

NO REPORT

College Council

NO REPORT

Professional Development

NO REPORT

Faculty Consultant to the Board/District Council

NO REPORT

Legislative Analyst

From Area A Meeting: Important Notice

Spring 2013 Term: Eight CSU campuses will accept applications only for community college transfer students who complete the Associate Degree for Transfer, which was made possible through Senate Bill 1440. The 8 campuses include Channel Islands, Chico, East Bay, Fullerton, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, San Francisco, and Sonoma. The priority application filing period for spring 2013 will be August 1, 2012 through August 31, 2012. Other applications will not be considered.

Fall 2013 Term: The priority application filing period for fall 2013 will be October 1, 2012 through November 30, 2012. While CSU campuses will receive applications, no notifications of admissions decisions will occur until after the priority application filing period. Enrollment capacity for fall 2013 will be dependent upon the outcomes from the California general election on November 6, 2012.

State support for the CSU has been cut by almost \$1 billion or 33% during the past four years, and could be reduced by an additional \$200 million. If the CSU budget is cut further, the system plans to reduce enrollment for 2013-2014 by 20,000 to 25,000 students. For more information, see www.calstate.edu/pa/News/2012/Release/enrollment.shtml.

above from <http://www.csumentor.edu/>

Legislation:

SB1456 matriculation and counseling

SB1062 Redesigning the chancellor's office

AB 2591 (Furutani): Community Colleges: Property Tax Revenues

Summary:

AB 2591 will create an automatic backfill funding mechanism for community colleges when property tax and fee revenues fall short of the amounts estimated in the annual Budget Act. This bill requires the Controller to transfer funds from the General Fund to the State School Fund to resolve the deficit created by the shortfall. AB 2591 removes funding uncertainty and prevents the destructive mid-year cuts to California's community colleges, allowing them to maintain essential educational services to students.

This statutory change provides funding protections to community colleges that are similar to those in place for K-12 districts.

AB1741 (Fong) Student Success Infrastructure Act of 2012

Description:

The Student Success Infrastructure Act tackles one of the major concerns with the Student Success Task Force report, the lack of faculty infrastructure needed to assist students through their college experience. Since the first time the Student Success Task Force report was unveiled, FACCC has been raising concerns about its implementation without dealing with the issue of infrastructure. The measure would require the State to establish a fund, subject to available resources, to support the following needs: 1) Increased faculty counselors 2) Restoration of student support services 3) Increased ratio of full- to part-time faculty 4) Professionalization of part-time faculty, beginning with expansion of office hours If properly funded, the measure would increase the capacity of the California Community Colleges to help students succeed in their college experience.

SB1550 (Wright)
Community College Extension

Description:

This measure would allow districts to create a parallel track of credit courses labeled "extension." These courses would be offered to students at the full cost of instruction, setting up a two-tier system of "state supported instruction" and "extension."

Curriculum Committee

NO REPORT

IAC/AIE

NO REPORT

Planning and Budget Committee

There have been two P&B meetings since my last report. Michael Guerra ran both meetings.

During the March 30 meeting, the committee spent the first 85 minutes looking at the voluntary cuts made to operational budgets by each division. While looking at the numbers in a spreadsheet, each dean was invited to spend no more than 3 minutes "explaining" their numbers. Many of the deans expressed disappointment that apparently next year's operational funds will be distributed based solely on the "mandated" column.

The remainder of the meeting was supposed to consist of the deans detailing the cuts they had made in sections, which mostly concerned cuts to the PTOL budget. The deans presentations didn't get very far because the discussion for the remainder of the meeting focused solely on the PTOL budget. Both Michael Guerra and Dr. Retterer stated clearly that even though President Lowenstein had "told the deans to reduce this year's PTOL budget from 7.5 million to 6.75 million, they had not done so." The deans are being told that next year's PTOL budget will be 6.75 million and that their current

proposed reductions will reduce that number further. Brian Sanders disagreed. His main argument was that thoughtlessly cutting an already anemic PTOL could make it impossible to meet our FTES requirements. Dr. Retterer mentioned twice that in her experience cutting sections seldom led to decrease in FTES.

One more important note: Dr. Retterer informed the deans that she had learned in a Senate meeting that MJC has a program viability process. She then told the deans and everyone else in the room, that we should start the process now. A year from now will be too late.

During the April 6 meeting, the committee was supposed to continue looking at proposed cuts to sections (as Dr. Retterer had stated in the March 29 Senate meeting), but that did not happen. Instead, we heard how one dean had “found money” in his budget, which he generously “donated” to another dean. In fact, this meeting was much less of a “committee meeting” than a session in which the committee was “informed” of decisions that had been or were in the process of being made. THE P&B COMMITTEE MADE NO RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE BUDGET PLANNING, NOR WAS IT ASKED TO.

There was additional discussion regarding the PTOL budget. Michael Guerra again stated that the PTOL budget for the '12-'13 year would be \$6.75 million. THIS DECISION INCLUDED NO INPUT FROM THE P&B COMMITTEE, NOR WAS THE COMMITTEE ASKED TO TAKE ANY FORMAL ACTION ON IT.

The deans do not believe that a 10% cut to the PTOL budget is a good idea. Brian Sanders explained that it takes about \$1000 of PTOL to generate one FTES. Thus, a reduction of \$750,000 in PTOL will lead to an FTES loss of about 750, far exceeding the 100 we need to cut to make our known workload reduction. Such a loss of FTES would send the district into “decline” when it comes to base apportionment, which would dramatically increase our budget woes going into the future.

Brian pointed out that it might be possible to have just a couple extra students on CENSUS day per class, which would generate more FTES for the same PTOL dollars. He also mentioned that if each class costs less (via negotiated salary reduction) we could offer more sections for the same PTOL dollars.

Three motions were made at the P&B meeting; two carried, and one failed.

1. Jenni Abbott moved that the rationale for the operational decisions made in each division be collected into narratives for P&B members. After brief discussion, the motion was voted on and passed.
2. Michael Guerra moved that Senate Resolution SP11-D be enacted and acted upon. Resolution SP11-D called for, among other things, the Planning & Budget Committee to initiate the Program Viability Process for all remaining programs. After brief discussion, the motion was voted on and passed.

3. Kevin Alavezos moved that the P&B Committee recommend to College Council and the president that a college-wide enrollment management committee be established. After brief discussion, the motion was voted on but failed to pass.

President's Report

Faculty Assessment Coordinator – In response to the announcement regarding the open position of Faculty Assessment Coordinator, one application was turned in. Although I expected Jennifer Hamilton's name to be on the Consent Agenda for today's meeting, no agreement has been reached regarding sufficient reassigned time for the position.

President Search – The President Search Committee selected 13 candidates to interview, but four have withdrawn. Interviews will take place on Friday, April 13, and Monday, April 16. Candidate Forums for the finalists are for Tuesday, April 17, and Wednesday April 18. Interviews with the Board will take place on Thursday, April 19.

On Course Workshop, May 8, 9, & 10, 2012 – Save the date for this fantastic, Senate-sponsored (in conjunction with Title V) professional development opportunity. The On Course Workshop is designed to provide instructors with dozens of active-learning activities that empower students in in any discipline, to become active, responsible, and successful learners. The 3-day workshop will take place from 8:30 – 4:30 in the Mary Stuart Rogers Student Center on West Campus. Space is limited, and participants are accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. If you haven't yet signed up, don't miss your opportunity to experience some of the very best professional development available!

VII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

- A. Burt Shook reported that counseling was very concerned about the release of the fall schedule. Burt stated that the fall schedule, as of this date, has not been released. Burt said that the Counselors are currently advising students for fall, and we have to guess for the students. Burt said that at least a tentative schedule would be appreciated. Dr. Fay stated that he would look into it tomorrow morning, and will try to get it out.
- B. The Academic Senate recognized Adrienne Peek for her outstanding service as Modesto Junior College Academic Senate President. Adrienne was presented with a cake and a gift certificate for all of her hard work. John Zamora said, "Adrienne has been willing to serve not only as Academic Senate President, but various roles in terms of Assessment Coordinator and other things that she has done. These are thankless tasks that she has taken on."

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:46 p.m.