



**ACADEMIC SENATE
APPROVED SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 27, 2012**

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

Senators Absent: Bruce Anders, Estella Nanez, Jim Stevens

Guests Present: Susan Kincade, (Vice President of Instruction), Michelle Christopherson (Lit and Lang), Curtis Martin (BBSS)

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

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

Allan McKissick moved that the delegation to the College Council begin before item 2. B. with remarks about the Academic Senate proposals that were discussed in Monday's College Council meeting and a report out is given from John Zamora regarding the recent meeting with President Jill Stearns.

M/S/C (Jennifer Hamilton, Rob Stevenson) to approve the order of the agenda as amended.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/S/C (Ellen Dambrosio, Theresa Stovall) to approve the September 20, 2012 meeting minutes.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

NO CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS TO DISCUSS

IV. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Continuing Business

1. Resolution FL12-A:

Resolution FL12-A: The Naming of the Planetarium of the Science Community Center for a 2nd reading was discussed. Rob Stevenson spoke in support of what he said was a fantastic idea. Allan McKissick shared the same sentiment. Jim Howen said that he objects to naming anything

that we have after living people. Jim also said that his other objection is because the planetarium was added to the Measure E process and should never have been. Paul Cripe stated that the math department was unanimously for this.

***M/S/C (Paul Cripe, Bob Droual) to approve a motion to call the question.
19 ayes, 0 nays, 0 abstentions***

***M/S/C (Rob Stevenson, Allan McKissick) to approve Resolution FL12-A: The Naming of the Planetarium of the Science Community Center for a 2nd Reading.
18 ayes, 1 nay, 0 abstentions***

2. A. Mission Statement

John Zamora announced that College Council has not yet discussed the motion approved by the Senate at the last meeting. John said that there have not been any changes at this time. College Council is set to meet and discuss this item on October 1, 2012.

The proposed draft can be viewed at the following link:

<http://www.mjc.edu/general/president/governance/index.html>

B. Participatory Decision-Making Handbook:

John Zamora announced that Jill Stearns posted the most recent draft of the *Participatory Decision-Making Handbook* right before the start of today's Academic Senate meeting. Allan McKissick reported out from College Council. Allan reminded the Senators of the motion passed at the last Senate meeting stating the following:

The Academic Senate accepts and endorses comments by President Zamora on the September 14, 2012 draft of the MJC Participatory Decision-Making Handbook. The Academic Senate directs the executive committee to continue developing language for the handbook that reflects the Academic Senate position as stated in SB12-B, and in discussion with other constituencies at MJC, create a MJC Governance Handbook for ratification by the Academic Senate.

Allan went through the recommendations made to the document by the Senate's delegation to College Council. Allan noted that the College Technology Committee had written a letter to the College Council requesting that the committee remain the way it is. Paul Cripe asked what the response was from the College Council. Allan stated the recommendation was not accepted and he was unclear of the council's rationale. Paul said that the College Technology Committee (CTC) is the one thing that we have done effectively, and wondered why the change was made to its role. He added there must be a reason for the change and wanted to know what it is.

John reported that Monday's College Council meeting regarding the Participatory Decision-Making Handbook was very difficult. Jill had requested a meeting with him this morning regarding the document. John said that the meeting was a good-faith effort between the

president and himself to address certain issues regarding the document and the Senate's position. Jill had said that the councils and the proposed structures are supposed to support the Academic Senate in terms of "10+1." He added that the president is trying to look at this document in terms of all constituencies not just the Academic Senate. John had proposed to Jill that he would like to see language that supports the legal responsibilities of all constituency groups. Jill honored this request and, while it was not as strong, added similar language to the document.

John continued by saying that the charges of the various councils still need to be fleshed out. He explained that suggested a "sunset clause" on the *Participatory Decision-Making Document* to Jill. James Todd stated that since we need to be constantly working and updating this document, a sunset clause will hold us accountable to assessing ourselves. John had asked Jill how the college can operationalize 10+1, if we do not incorporate the language suggested by the Senate within the decision-making document? Jill told him that this would be the Senate's responsibility. John agreed, but reminded Jill that established Senate processes have been disregarded in past years. John also informed Jill that accreditation, program review and assessment, requires the support of the twelve-month Administrative Secretary position in the Academic Senate.

John reported that he made many more suggestions to Jill, and nearly all were taken. He suggested a name change, *Engaging all Voices* to the August 26, 2012 version of the Participatory Decision-Making Handbook. John said that Jill did use his suggested name of *Engaging All Voices*, but Jill used the name as part of the title of the current document and changed the name of the August 26th document to *MJC Past Practice of Participatory Decision-Making*. John said that the meeting with Jill was an attempt to try to reach some type of middle ground.

Bob Droual encouraged everyone who is interested in the discussions on the decision-making document to attend the College Council meetings. Bob said that it is fair to say that there was not harmony at the recent College Council meeting. Bob said "if you really want to know what is going on, then attend the [college council] meeting." He said that a document was presented and characterized as a revision. Bob said that other constituencies were aghast that the Senate was re-writing this as a new revision. Bob said that the other constituencies there felt that they were not given the equal opportunity to provide input in the same manner and that they were very unhappy with this. Bob reiterated that he thinks that the accreditation team is looking to see harmony in terms of shared governance. Bob stated, "At the Technical Assistance visit their main point was that we have to meet the accreditation standard. The standard for accreditation will override and are not abrogated by any local laws like Title V. The main point is that all the constituencies have a role in shared governance. The faculty does have its role but its role is in academic and professional matters."

Allan McKissick said that there has been lots of collegial consultation. Allan stated that what has made it difficult is that the previous document that was worked on for so long has now been pretty much replaced. Allan said that the new document is significantly different from the previous one.

James Todd made a motion to revise the paragraph listed under the title; Decision-Making on Academic and Professional Matters on page 16 of the Engaging All Voices MJC Participatory Decision-Making Handbook dated September 27, 2012:

Decision-making on academic and professional issues at Modesto Junior College is articulated in YCCD Board Policy 4103 and Title 5, §53200. The YCCD Board of Trustees delineates academic and professional matters as subject to mutual agreement or as areas where the Board will rely primarily on the recommendation of the Academic Senate. These policies and regulations, as well as other related documents, can be found in the appendix and in the document MJC Past Practice of Participatory Decision-Making.

Discussion on the motion ensued. Susan Kincade asked for clarification on what the motion is. James Todd stated that this experience has not been happy go lucky and a lot of work has been put into this document and all recommendations put forth by the Senate. Bob Droual stated that he thinks that Jill Stearns is making a good faith effort. Bob said that he sees that Jill has made the compromise and we should remain vigilant but move forward. Michelle Christopherson, a past Academic Senate President and current English Professor, stated that she disagreed with almost everything she has heard so far. Michelle particularly disagreed with comments made about trying hard, giving a good faith effort, and we have to move forward. Michelle said that the only thing that counts is what is on paper. Michelle said this is the moment right now. Michelle urged the senate to vote down the motion on the table and go with the original motion made where the Senate voted to accept John's edits at the last Academic Senate meeting.

Bill Anelli stated that he is not sure exactly what he is voting on. Bill said that we shouldn't be rushed into things and should not support this document. Bill agrees with Michelle that just because people worked very hard on this, this is not a reason to vote for this. Curtis Martin said that he agrees with Bill and Michelle as well. Curtis said that either you vote for the document or not. Curtis said that we don't want this to go into an accreditation nightmare. Nobody wants that! Curtis said that you are the ones that have been going through contortions. Curtis said we have been slapped around for the past ten years and we always have the same discussion at the last moment in every Academic Senate meeting.

Chad Redwing said that he thinks the Senate Executive Board is wonderful but given the language here, he does not even know what he is voting on. Chad said he cannot ignore the history of three past presidents stating to not vote for this.

Eva Mo said that she has heard rumors that there is a lot of anger towards the Senate from other constituencies but said that you should be angry too because you have been undermined in terms of your role as senate representatives. Eva said that you did bring a good faith effort. Groups worked eight months on the document and that has been dumped.

Susan Kincade, Vice President of Instruction, clarified that the reason the Senate has seen several revised documents is because the president has had open forums where she has tried to incorporate all of the voices into the document. Susan said that a date was given for each revision. Susan said that the document has not been without a sincere attempt to educate

people to why this document is the way it is. Susan said the open forums were open to everyone. Susan said the requests made at College Council were also incorporated into the document. Susan stated that revisions were based on the input from the College and the shared governance process. Susan said, "You ask about the Academic Senate's role and how is it operationalized? I can tell you what I have seen at other Senates and that is that you have so much work to do. Have you presented a list of what you want to see happen? Do you have any recommendations that you are bringing forward proactively to say that you see a huge gap in an area or something that is not addressing your 10+1 needs and we want you College Council, madam president to address these." Susan said that these are the discussions that she sees at other institutions. Susan said that it is important to understand why there is a representative from each division. Susan stated this is so there is broad representation.

James Todd moved to amend the original motion. An amendment to the original motion was made to also append additional comments to the document:

1. *To place a Faculty Co-Chair on the Instruction Council.*
2. *To place a Faculty Co-Chair on the Resource Allocation Council.*
3. *The Student Learning Outcomes that are listed need to have language saying:*
 - *The MJC Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator is appointed by the Academic Senate.*

***M/S/C (Jennifer Hamilton, Bob Droual) to call the question on the discussion.
9 ayes, 9 nays, 0 abstentions***

***M/S/C (James Todd, Paul Cripe) to approve the amendment to the motion.
10 ayes, 3 nays, 3 abstentions***

***M/S/F (James Todd, Bob Droual) to approve the amended motion.
5 ayes, 8 nays, 3 abstentions***

V. REPORTS

STUDENT SENATE

NO REPORT

FACULTY CONSULTANT TO THE BOARD/DISTRICT COUNCIL

NO REPORT

INSTRUCTIONAL ADMINISTRATOR'S COUNCIL (IAC)

NO REPORT

ACCREDITATION/INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (AIE)

NO REPORT

ASSESSMENT WORK GROUP

NO REPORT

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

NO REPORT

COLLEGE COUNCIL

NO REPORT

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

NO REPORT

VI. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:02 p.m.