



**ACADEMIC SENATE
APPROVED MINUTES
May 17, 2012**

Senators Present: Greg Hausmann in place of Kevin Alavezos, Bruce Anders, , Paul Cripe, Ellen Dambrosio, Bob Droual, Jennifer Hamilton, Allan McKissick, Eva Mo, Estella Nanez, Adrienne Peek, Chad Redwing, Lisa Riggs, Burt Shook, Brian Sinclair, Rob Stevenson, James Todd, Layla Yousif, John Zamora

Senators Absent: David Boley, Catherine Greene, Jim Howen, Debbie Laffranchini, Mike Morales, Dorothy Scully, Mark Smith, Jim Stevens, Theresa Stovall

Guests Present: Steve Stroud, Faculty Consultant to the Board/District Council, Mike Sharif, ASMJC, Dr. James Fay, Interim Vice President of Instruction,

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

The order of the agenda items was approved without objection.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Layla Yousif noted that there was a discrepancy on the Senators present and Senators absent section of the meeting minutes.

M/S/C (James Todd, Adrienne Peek) to approve the April 12, 2012 meeting minutes as amended.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Appoint Layla Yousif, Donna Louie, and Hector Duarte to serve on the Administrative Secretary, Special Programs search committee.

The Consent Agenda was approved without objection.

IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. The Academic Senate discussed adopting electronic elections for future Academic Senate elections. Currently the process is completed on paper. Adrienne added that the electronic process will still be anonymous; you can only vote once, it is very secure, and the system does the counting for you. The Senators reviewed the secret ballot template created by Heather Townsend using the Class Climate Survey software. Eva asked if a vote could be easily retracted. Eva stated that it has been easy to accidentally select the wrong person on paper, but one is able to correct that quickly in pen. Heather Townsend said that she would

examine and test the software, and then report back to the group. A question was raised regarding which elections would be processed electronically. Allan McKissick wondered if this process will require a modification of the rules. Rob Stevenson stated that the election of the president is different than the other officers. Rob will research the rules, and report back to the group.

M/S/C (Adrienne Peek, Jennifer Hamilton) to adopt an electronic election process for the entire Academic Senate campus elections.

- B. At the last Academic Senate meeting, the Planning and Budget Committee Actions were postponed definitely to this meeting. Allan McKissick moved to add the following modification to the Faculty Hiring Prioritization List for 2012-2013 Academic Year:

In consideration of the current financial situation facing the YCCD, the MJC Academic Senate is adamantly opposed to any hiring of new permanent faculty until such time that it is clear that financial exigencies will not be used to justify the elimination of academic programs and faculty positions. Any exceptions should be very compelling and supported by the Academic Senate (e.g., relating to accreditation issues).

Also, the Academic Senate reaffirms its position that the current hiring prioritization process and program review process are inherently inadequate to consideration of restoration of viable academic programs recently eliminated on a rationale of financial exigency.

The Academic Senate commends the IAC and the Senate Planning and Budget Committee for their work in the hiring prioritization process, and approves the recommendations for the 2012-2013 academic year submitted to the Senate, as modified by the following:

Consistent with MJC Academic Senate Resolutions SP11-C and FL11-C, the Academic Senate recommends that highest priority in Faculty hiring be given to first, restoration of the position eliminated from the MJC Library, second, restoration of the position eliminated from the MJC Art Department and third, restoration of the MJC Industrial Technology Program.

Allan stated that the modification is an attempt to synthesize the various concerns that were addressed in the last Academic Senate meeting. Chad stated the sentiment that if programs are eliminated in the future, the Academic Senate should strongly urge that there be a clear program revitalization process involved. Chad said that this process should be completed before a hiring prioritization list is proposed.

Rob Stevenson spoke in favor of the motion. Rob reiterated that one of the reasons for specifically naming Library, Art and Industrial Technology programs is because the District is currently involved in a lawsuit with YFA, and these three named positions are the same that are part of the lawsuit. Rob said that his understanding is that this wording would allow us to empower our administration to put faculty back in the positions from which they were

rified as opposed to having them bump into three different areas, which the preliminary ruling would allow.

Jennifer Hamilton was concerned about the crafting of the language. Jennifer said, "If we speak very unequivocally about not cutting programs, we are de facto, without actually having a very philosophical discussion about this, saying that we think cuts across the board is the way to go. Strategically for the betterment of the student, I personally am not sure that I agree with that. I think as we craft language, we always need to remember what posture that language forces us to adopt. We need to always remember that while we are collegial and concerned for our peers, the Union's job is to advocate 100% for jobs. We are the Academic Senate, and we are here to advocate for curriculum in the best interest for our students."

Brian Sinclair said that this may serve in the long run as a solution to problems that could occur if the lawsuit results are put into effect.

Burt Shook stated that we need to also mention that we want the individual positions back for each of the three positions listed, not just the program.

Paul Cripe asked if the second paragraph could be made applicable to possible future elimination of programs. Paul stated that it is correct that we do not have any valid way of bringing back programs. Paul asked if there was a way to state this without diluting the message about the past.

Chad and Allan discussed with the Senators additional wording to amend the motion. The amended motion is as follows:

In consideration of the current financial situation facing the YCCD, the MJC Academic Senate is adamantly opposed to any hiring of new permanent faculty until such time that it is clear that financial exigencies will not be used to justify the elimination of academic programs and faculty positions. Any exceptions should be very compelling and supported by the Academic Senate (e.g., relating to accreditation issues).

Also, the Academic Senate reaffirms its position that the current hiring prioritization process and program review process are inherently inadequate to consideration of restoration of viable academic programs recently eliminated on a rationale of financial exigency, and that the faculty hiring prioritization process will remain inherently inadequate until this concern is effectively addressed. Furthermore, the Senate believes those programs recently eliminated on a rationale of financial exigency should be put through a program viability review, and that any academic program elimination proposed in the future for reasons of fiscal exigency should be put through such a review before subsequent faculty hiring prioritization lists are formulated.

The Academic Senate commends the IAC and the Senate Planning and Budget Committee for their work in the hiring prioritization process, and approves the recommendations for the 2012-2013 academic year submitted to the Senate, as modified by the following:

Consistent with MJC Academic Senate Resolutions Sp11-C and FL11-C, the Academic Senate recommends that highest priority in Faculty hiring be given to first, restoration of the position eliminated from the MJC Library, second, restoration of the position eliminated from the MJC Art Department and third, restoration of the MJC Industrial Technology Program position.

Rob Stevenson added that he supports the amendment but this still may rise to the level of requiring the Senate to do a full resolution. The creation of a new process would have to be agreed to with the District. Brian Sinclair agreed that this is heading in “resolution direction.” Brian mentioned that we may also want to go back and amend the program viability process that we already have in place as well to include language that would also address this same issue.

Jennifer Hamilton added that Jim Clarke will be retiring, and his position will be opening up soon. Jennifer said that as a Senate we need to advocate that certain hires be advertised ~~as~~ internally first. If someone has an expertise in computers, distance education, etc., we could potentially save jobs by filling needs from within.

***M/S/C (Allan McKissick, James Todd) to approve the motion to amend the motion.
15 Ayes, 1 Nay: therefore the motion carried.***

M/S/U (Allan McKissick, Brian Sinclair) to approve the Faculty Hiring Prioritization List for 2012-2013 Academic Year as Modified.

Burt Shook asked about the rules regarding abstentions and if we are required to ask for abstentions. John Zamora will work with Rob Stevenson to look at Robert’s Rules and bring back possible language on abstentions.

- C. John Zamora gave an update on the Participatory Decision-Making Handbook progress. John said that the taskforce that is working on this will be holding another meeting soon to continue creation of a Participatory Decision-Making Handbook. Allan McKissick stated that there has been some progress on details such as adding some positions to College Council, language here and there, and a definition of good-faith effort for persons to come to agreements. Allan mentioned that some of the philosophical discussions/disagreements are on the basic concept of how bureaucratic or collegial/democratic an organization like this should even be. Also, a related issue is how 10+1 fits into the process. Allan stated, “It’s amazing to me the number of people that haven’t heard of it. If they do hear about 10+1 they are pretty much in avoidance or denial, and can’t seem to register it in terms of their perception set. They simply want to argue against its very existence or importance. It is very helpful that the Senate passed the Model Language document.” Burt Shook asked, “Are the people that are unaware of the 10+1, do they fall more in the administrative category or

classified?" John Zamora said, "I think it's across the board. I think that it is a matter of education all constituencies regarding everyone's roles." John pointed out that a first draft should be available by July 1, 2012.

- D. John Zamora announced that the Planning and Budget Committee has voted and passed a motion to initiate the program viability process for all programs. John mentioned that we do have a program viability process that was voted and passed by the Academic Senate known as Resolution SP-11D. Adrienne added that the Planning and Budget Committee also passed a motion to implement Resolution SP-11D. Eva Mo asked for clarification, "Is every single program going to go through a program viability assessment as if every single program is up for elimination?" John Zamora answered, "That could be one interpretation." Adrienne said that the Senate resolution that was passed in the spring (SP-11D), did not recommend nor did the Planning and Budget Committee, that every program go through the entire process, just the first step of collecting all the data to identify programs that may be at risk. Adrienne said that the reason we are doing this is so that when we are talking about cutting programs, we can look to programs that may not be viable first before cutting viable problems. Adrienne also said that this has never been done. Dr. Fay stated that basically they just wanted to get the data together so that people could look at this issue from as many data points they reasonably have available. Dr. Fay said he spoke with the Deans to come up with a list of criteria (relating to hard and soft data). Dr. Fay informed the Senators that Brian Sanders has been collecting some of the harder data that is now on a pivot table, which can be viewed by anyone at the College with Microsoft Office 10 software on SharePoint at:

<https://sp-portal.yosemite.edu/MJC/insoffice/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx>

Dr. Fay said that he welcomed suggestions. Rob Stevenson said, "Looking over this new list of criteria for viability, it doesn't look all too familiar on what was agreed with the District." Robert said that this list has not been ratified by the Senate. Dr. Fay stated that these suggestions are just in draft form. Jennifer Hamilton said that some of these could be interpreted as prejudicial data points. Adrienne said that she is troubled by this list, because we are talking about the possibility of eliminating viable programs. Adrienne said the criteria should be more about college priorities and community needs, when looking at viable programs. Adrienne said there is a big confusion, because we have a program viability process that includes most of the data points on this list. Adrienne said that this list looks like what we might cut that is already viable and wouldn't come through the viability process.

Allan McKissick said he appreciated that Dr. Fay was trying to approach this in the right spirit however; Allan noted that we must communicate very closely and carefully about this. Allan mentioned that on page 58 of the Self-Study Evaluation Report, it states:

"The self-study describes a source of contention between the Academic Senate and the administration originating with a failure to agree on program elimination. While Board Policy 6020 states that faculty will have appropriate involvement "in the

development and review of all curricular offerings ...including modification or discontinuance."

Allan said it is a 10+1 issue to modify the curriculum, which is program elimination by definition. Allan read related unapproved College Council minutes as well. Allan stated that the Senate has a set of criteria already in place in the program viability document. Allan said that if we need to modify it, we should do it carefully, and come together in agreement.

John Zamora asked about the process that was developed, when the program viability document was created. Adrienne stated that a taskforce of Senators and Deans was created to work a whole semester on the document. Adrienne said the document we are discussing is a document that came from IAC. Eva asked, "What is it that we are being asked to do with this draft in regards to this process that we already have in place created by the taskforce? How may we proceed as a body in light of everything that we have talked about, considering that this is a first reading?"

Dr. Fay said that it was very clear to him and to the Deans that using the campus mission and goals should be the key driver to drive this whole process. Dr. Fay said we need to approach this in a mutually respectful fashion. Dr. Fay stated that he would like for the Senate to use its criteria and to come up with recommendations. Dr. Fay said that we have to come up with tentative recommendations this summer for campus committees to consider, so that during fall the recommendations can be considered to make decisions. The decisions will be made at the January Board of Trustees meeting. Dr. Fay stated that we have to do this evaluation now so that we can slice, dice, consider, and incorporate values or soft measures, etc., we want to use to come up with a range of recommendations.

Eva said she sees two different documents, which are trying to achieve the same thing. Eva mentioned that the Senate document is already ratified, and in place. Eva asked, "Could someone tell me what it is that is being asked of us in regards to the document that is in front of us?" Dr. Fay said that he is hoping that we can share information back and forth this summer.

Chad Redwing briefly mentioned that he is heartened by hearing that what should really drive decisions around here are transparent visions and values. Chad said he is also worried, because we don't have them. Chad was at Tuesday's Strategic Plan meeting, where we started their development. Chad said that it is very dangerous to talk about these specific items. Chad stated that the gun to our head is a gun to develop our Strategic Plan. Chad said that what you are measuring depends entirely on vision and values, and proposed the Senate spend the summer to get behind the engine to help determine the Strategic Plan.

From Chad's statement, Adrienne Peek made a motion:

Senate to spend the summer driving the establishment of values by which we can measure these things through Strategic Planning.

Ellen was curious of how many people from Senate will be on the committee. Chad stated that everyone in the room is invited to this open discussion. James Todd said that he liked the idea but stated that we have problems time wise. James said that we are waiting on Jill Stearns, our new Modesto Junior College President, to be here for the conversation. James said that the process on strategic planning seemed to go well at Tuesday's meeting, but we have not critically looked at what happens when colleges build Strategic Plans, and why some of them fail. James said that this is important stuff to look at. James said that it would be worthwhile for us to look at this process. James said that he does not want to be three months behind in this process.

Adrienne Peek stated that we are already more than three months behind. Adrienne said that there is the data gathering, strategic planning, and development of a clear articulated vision and priorities. Adrienne said that we need to spend the summer developing the clear vision and articulated priorities. Adrienne said that we do not need to wait for the president to develop our vision, values and articulated priorities. Adrienne stated that somebody has got to be the driving force behind this to make it happen. Adrienne rephrased her motion to state:

The Senate will step-up and become the driving force in ensuring that Modesto Junior College clearly establishes and articulates its values and priorities.

Bob Droual said that the motion is meaningless, if we do not say what we are going to do. Paul said that this process has finally started, and anyone interested should get involved. Paul said the way to do this is to make a motion. Chad said the motion is important because it shifts the conversation.

The Senate Exec board will come up with a timeline to help move this process along, and will bring that information back to the Senators for discussion.

M/S/C (Adrienne Peek, Chad Redwing) to approve the motion as amended.

The conversation on program viability continued after the motion was approved. Ellen asked Dr. Fay for clarification, "I was not clear on the recommendations you have asked for the Senate to come up with over summer. Are these recommendations for program cuts, or faculty layoffs?" Dr. Fay said, "Yes, for the whole program viability recommendations, because the information out of Sacramento this week talked about a 300 million dollar cut from community colleges. The MJC budget is 2.6 million dollars. Either it's across the board cuts, which are somewhat irrational, or you try to keep the core of the college together. Keep your good programs viable, and put a few programs on dry ice for a few years." Allan asked, "Are those cuts happening even if the November Ballot passes?" Dr. Fay said, "Probably, because even if the measure passes in

November, it's already been neutralized by the increase in deficit. They raised less money in taxes than they ever hoped to get. Next year is going to be very, very difficult."

Allan asked more directly, "Are you postulating or describing to us a process by which the Division Deans, the IAC, will come up with a proposal for cuts, and then it is discussed further from there, or do we come to an agreement on the processes not necessarily the IAC comes up with for a program for cuts?" Dr. Fay said that he would hope that there are mutual suggestions going back and forth during the summer. Allan said, "That's fine but then someone decides." Dr. Fay answered, "Well, ultimately it's going to be the President, the Chancellor, and the Board. We are all going to be players in this." The conversation ensued between Dr. Fay and Allan regarding who are the ultimate decision makers on the criteria used for program viability.

Eva Mo suggested that the communications continue outside of the Senate meeting. Eva made the following motion:

To direct Senate Exec to finish communications with Administration to clarify the goal of the Senate and goal of the Administration, and where we come together.

M/S/C (Eva Mo, Layla Yousif) to approve the motion.

- E. Dr. Fay said that the accreditation teams are being specifically trained to go in and look at online courses on campuses. Dr. Fay said that it is critical we have a replacement for the Instructional Design Coordinator position. Dr. Fay stated the stakes have been raised by the Commission. Dr. Fay stated that he recently watched a webinar outlining new online regulations which can be viewed at the following link:

<http://www.onefortraining.org/accicwebinar>

Rob Stevenson asked if we could possibly do an internal search first. Dr. Fay said that he agreed. Dr. Fay said only as a last result would we go off campus for a search. It was noted, as a friendly amendment, to add the internal search language into the motion.

M/S/C (Eva Mo, James Todd) to approve the request to announce internally the Instructional Design Coordinator position.

VI. REPORTS

ASMJC

Thanked the Faculty for allowing the Student Senate to use the Faculty Lounge as a meeting space. Thanked the Faculty for hosting the AIE Workshop; the information was insightful and appreciative. Thanked John Zamora and Allan McKissick for meeting with ASMJC members.

Student Senators will be volunteering in divisions to assist with labor shortages.

Elected ASMJC Officers for 2012-2013 are:

- President Kevin Sabo
- Executive Vice President Mike Sharif
- VP of Legislation James Varble
- VP of Finance Shayne Cooley
- VP of Operations Erik Vorsatz
- VP of Communications Laura Dyrssen
- VP of Activities Amanda Vicente
- Student Trustee Douglas Dyrssen

The Student Senate approved funds to purchase a Foucault's Pendulum for the new SME building on the West Campus. This will make MJC the 5th out of 112 California Community Colleges to have one.

ASMJC will like to work with faculty to provide students with incentives to attend our film festivals

College Council

NO REPORT

Professional Development

NO REPORT

Faculty Consultant to the Board/District Council

Stephen Stroud stated that we all have the right to freedom of speech. Stephen said that with that right there are sometimes responsibilities. Stephen said that he has good dialogue with the Board, and the Chancellor. Every time a letter is written, Stephen is contacted. Stephen mentioned that when people attend conferences at the District's expense, and then they pan the college where we get paid to teach at, it comes back immediately to our Chancellor. Stephen wanted to make everyone aware of this.

Mr. Stroud said that people have used the accreditation process in the past to unload baggage and discontent. Stephen said that in continuing to do this we may lose accreditation, and have our courses verified under Columbia accreditation. Stephen said that we should get our friends who are constantly under sadness to go home for the day, or take them out to lunch off campus.

Mr. Stroud said that we need to dress up, and show the accreditation team what is happening this summer. Stephen said we are not opposed to each other. We come because we have a desire to make this place better. Some people enjoy being happy, some enjoy being too happy, and some people enjoy being miserable. Stephen said that we have got to take our miserable people off campus that day. We need to put on our Sunday best to get through this process. We want to say welcome to our new president, and give the president a good chance.

Legislative Analyst

NO REPORT

Curriculum Committee

NO REPORT

IAC/AIE

NO REPORT

Planning and Budget Committee

NO REPORT

President's Report

The announcements for Faculty Co-Chair of Accreditation and for Outcomes Assessment Coordinator were out last week. These announcements were sent to all full-time faculty. Hopefully, the successful candidate for each position will be placed on the consent agenda for the June 7th meeting.

I will be sending an announcement out to faculty today regarding the need for three faculty members to be part of the VPI search committee. I have already received communications from faculty who are interested (since the position was posted). Again, hopefully these faculty members can be placed on the consent agenda for the June 7th meeting as well.

VII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

John Zamora reported that the next Senate meeting will be June 7, 2012. The summer schedule, if meetings are scheduled, will be the first and third Thursday of each month.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.