

Mendocino College Academic Senate
MINUTES
Thursday, January 26, 2017
12:30p.m. – 2:00p.m., Room 4210

- Call to order* President Edington called the meeting to order at 12:32p.m.
- Present* Jordan Anderson, Maria Cetto, Jessica Crofoot, Jason Davis, Jason Edington, Catherine Indermill, Conan McKay, Tascha Whetzel, Vivian Varela
- Absent* Doug Browe
- Others* Debra Polak
- Recorder* Catherine Indermill
- Agenda Approval* **M/S/C (Varela / Whetzel) to approve the agenda as amended:**
- Change “12:30a.m. to 12:30p.m.
 - Remove November 29 and December 9 Minutes from the list, they are not ready --- Edington noted the minutes for November 29 and December 6 are not available and this is an ongoing issue because we do not have adequate clerical/administrative support to complete this function of the Academic Senate in a timelier manner.
 - Remove “First Reading” on Discussion Items New Business #1 Accreditation Midterm Report
- Minutes Approval* **M/S/C (Indermill/Davis) to approve the minutes of November 18, 2016, as amended.**
The correct spelling for Dennis Aseltyne and James Mockel names were noted. Yeas: unanimous
M/S/C (Varela/Davis) to approve the minutes of December 6, 2016, as amended.
It was noted that Catherine McKay expressed gratitude to both John Koetzner and Vivian Varela for their willingness to serve as Co-Chairs of the Curriculum Committee. This will be included on page 3. Yeas: unanimous.
- Public Comment* Maria Cetto announced the Equity Committee (of which she is a member) as part of their work following up on the Master Plan and Equity Plan are considering conducting a Campus Climate Survey and Student Engagement Survey that might address the Academic Senate’s interest in a campus-wide survey.
- Reports* **President’s Report:** Edington provided and discussed a written report (attachment #1).

1. In-Service: Edington noted the In-Service Meeting for the Part-Time Faculty was different this semester in that only one was held (on the Ukiah campus) in the evening and dinner was provided. One suggestion is to consider mileage re-imburement for those coming from out of the area. Additionally, he mentioned about half of the Full-Time Faculty attended the Faculty meeting held on Friday, 1/20 during In-Service. The VP Reorganization was discussed, as was a new Administrative Procedure coming through PPAC. There was considerable discussion and opposition about the AP and it's changing of current practice for admitting K-12 students.

2. VP Reorganization Plan: Edington said he received a "tremendous" number of comments about the proposed reorganization. Two main themes of the comments and ensuing Senate discussion were *timing* and *process*.

- The initial proposal was presented to PBC during Finals Week and the vote was scheduled for before classes began again in January, both of which limited any faculty involvement in the decision making process
- A list of questions raised by faculty at the Faculty Meeting during In-Service have been forwarded to President Reyes (by Edington) with the request that they be answered in writing,
- In a private meeting with Reyes, Edington asked for additional time to allow for faculty involvement. Reyes agreed to hold a forum on Tuesday, January 24 at 12:30-1:30. He then added two additional forums on the same day at 9:30 and 4:00. Edington and Indermill both attended meetings, as did a few other faculty.
- Edington spoke to the concerns of the Classified Staff and Faculty outlined in his report (see attachment #1), indicating that these, the points made at the In-Service Faculty Meeting and those he receive via email have been summarized and forwarded to Reyes. Interim VP ESS Polak asked where these questions were, as she had not seen them. Edington answered that he had emailed them directly to Reyes (with cc to Indermill). Crofoot and other senators asked what questions were asked and that they be sent to the Full- and Part-time faculty (with a cc to Reyes and Polak). Edington said he would do this by the end of the week.
- Edington again mentioned the forums and that Reyes' scrutiny of how few faculty attended them. Edington told Reyes there were most likely a number of reasons, including: the thought by many that the decision to reorganize was a "done deal" so there was no need to participate; they did not see the benefit of attending the forums and

there is too much going on the first week of the semester for extra meetings.

- Other comments and questions were discussed about the “process” were raised, including:
 - How does PBC make decisions?
 - Where does Program Review fit into PBCs decisions
 - PBC used to have the core members vote, but now Reyes wants to establish “consensus” – a concern with this was raised in that there are many managers on the committee
 - Even some of the committee members are not clear as to their role and if they can “vote” or not
 - It was pointed out by Polak that PBC is “advisory” to the President

Additional Verbal Report: Edington added to his written report a response to the question about what has happened with Senate Resolutions F16-01 and F16-02. Edington answered our resolutions have been forwarded to Reyes and Polak and he was waiting to hear about a meeting to discuss with them (Mutual Agreement process).

Senator’s Report:

Part-Time Faculty: Crofoot reported the following concerns on behalf of the Part-Time Faculty:

- Concern that positions that come open are not announced “campus-wide”
- Decreased hours of the Fitness Lab
- That the full time counselor position for Disabilities Resource Center is not being advertised

Distance Education Committee: Varela announced the DE Committee conducted a survey of participants in the Canvas training and the “overwhelming” responses said mandatory training was not necessary for face-two-face instruction. Indermill, as a member of the DE Committee, questioned the “overwhelming” response and thought any interpretation of the survey and recommendations should be made by the DE Committee members.

*Action Items /
Old Business*

1. Hiring Committee Appointments: Edington announced the need for faculty to serve on the Biology Lab Tech hiring committee and the Counseling hiring committee. Rachel Donham volunteered for Biology Lab Tech and Cintya Da Cruz volunteered for Counseling.

M/S/C (Varela/Whetzel) to approve appointment of Rachel Donham to the Biology Lab Tech hiring committee and Cintya Da Cruz to the Counseling hiring committee.

*Discussion Items /
New Business*

1. Accreditation Midterm Report – Overview: Interim VPES Polak introduced the agenda item. She asked the Senators to do several things to prepare for the “first reading:

- Review the Table of Contents,
- Identify various recommendations in the Institutional Follow Up Report many of which have already been addressed,
- Notice that some of the Data Trend Analysis sections are incomplete (e.g., SLOs and Fiscal Reports),
- In each section, there is reference to “Self-Identified Improvement Plan”. Numerous specific plans were developed and most have been addressed and are completed, except some of the specific evidence has not been inserted yet. Currently there are only a few that have not been addressed. She still needs to develop a chart of the Plan/Progress which serves a summary of the text and detail provided in the report,

2. Campus Climate Survey Discussion: Edington introduced the topic indicating that nothing about this has come back to the Academic Senate in a “formal” manner, but that he put it on the agenda because he was asked to. He noted that this idea was also discussed at the January Board of Trustee Meeting. The BOT and Reyes noted this should come up through participatory governance process. The Equity Committee has funds to support a campus climate survey. Discussion and questions included:

- What is meant by bring this up through participatory governance?
Edington answered he thought it implied how the process was designed, not necessarily who conducts the survey
- It is important for faculty and staff to feel “safe” and anonymous or the tool is irrelevant,
- Frustration was expressed that this was brought up last spring (May 2016) and has not been addressed. Edington commented the idea of a Climate Survey came out of the discussion of the survey at the summer Academic Senate meeting, and while it has not been on the agenda there has been work being done on this issue.
- Edington mentioned the Public Comment made by Cetto at the beginning of this meeting and that Equity funds may be available to pay for a survey. Cetto added most of the companies that the committee have been looking at have their own instruments and some will be easier to “tweak” than others to meet our needs. Both were asked about the separation of the campus climate (employee’s views, concerns, etc.) verses “student engagement”. Noting that these are two very different things. They answered that that it is possible to separate them,
- What happens to the results?
- Who will benefit from a survey?

3. 2016-2017 Goals – Updates: not addressed due to lack of time.

Open Forum None, due to lack of time

Meeting adjourned at 2:08pm.

Attachment #1

ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

January 26, 2017

Respectfully submitted by Jason Edington, Academic Senate President

1. Inservice

I attended both the Part Time Orientation/Inservice on Thursday, 1/19, and of course the Friday Inservice on 1/20. Thursday night seemed to be very well attended and I heard a lot of great comments from those in attendance. I know that administration is interested in any feedback on this.

2. VP Reorganization Plan

On Friday at the faculty meeting, there was discussion about the VP Reorganization Plan presented by administration during the last week of the fall semester. I had gathered many questions about this from faculty during the last week and during the break. I also took gathered questions from the meeting. As I was asked to, I delivered the set of questions to Arturo and asked that he respond in writing.

Also, during the break, I met with Arturo to ask him to postpone the PBC meeting that was planned for the week before school started. My concern was that the plan came out during finals week and the decision was going to be made before faculty had returned, unable to engage in the process. I was asking for the decision to be pushed back into February, but for reasons that are spelled out below, Arturo wanted to have the meeting the upcoming job fairs, and agreed to push the meeting back a week, as well as make himself available during college hour on Tuesday, 1/24. When the faculty was informed of this, there was some concern that this time during the first week would not work out well. Arturo added two more times on 1/24 to allow more to join in the discussion.

On Wednesday, 1/25, PBC met. What follows is a breakdown of the discussion at PBC, as well as some information obtained from the meetings the day before:

• Classified Concerns

- Using grant funding for administrative positions
 - If funding disappeared, would we keep the positions, putting greater stress on our general fund
- Lack of planning for staff in proposal
 - Does this mean that duties will be increased for staff?
- How does this affect the 50% law?

Eileen addressed the 50% law, stating that the categorical funds do not count on either side.

Arturo had addressed the other concerns with Lois the previous day, assuring her that:

- If the funding disappears, we will have to decide them whether to keep the positions or change them.

- SSSP dollars are as close to 'general fund' dollars as you can get. That is, the funds are more or less guaranteed to continue – with a maximum reduction of 5% per year *by law*.
- Arturo did state that 'of course, nothing is absolutely guaranteed'. He stated that should the economy crash, the SSSP dollars, just like the General fund, could be cut.
- Arturo also stated that nobody is going to be asked to work more than 40 hours a week.
- Until the reorganization is complete it will be hard to know every finite detail of what is needed. However, there seemed to be some confidence that job duties may shift and this would allow adequate coverage.

- **Faculty Concerns**

The following are statements made by me at PBC:

- Faculty have asked questions that have not been answered yet.
 - Arturo is working on answers to the questions that have been raised.
- Many faculty feel that this is a done deal, and thus did not come to discuss this on Tuesday.
- Process and timing are still central issues.

There was a long discussion between many in the room on these issues, specifically on process and timing. Arturo included in the agenda (which time did not allow us to get to) a discussion on Campus Communication – discussion of how best to approach college-wide communication. This item was added after the discussions with the faculty and staff that did come to speak with administration on Tuesday.

Many of the managers discussed the importance of the new structure, and why it was important to move forward now. Sabrina discussed a need to be open to, and even embrace, the opportunity that the college has. Specifically, the following facts were discussed:

- It is difficult to find one person who is highly qualified and trained in both Instruction and Student Services.
 - In the past we have hired a VP of Instruction, and then asked them to take on the Student Services side of the house as well.
 - This has been detrimental to both Instruction and Student Services as neither have had adequate support to meet the needs of the students in their respective areas.
 - For example, recent student services initiatives have had a significant impact on the responsibilities required of student services administration.
- The job that we have been asking the VP/ESS to do has expanded into two full positions, on both the Instruction side and on the Student Services side.
 - This was a key piece of information that many of us felt was not really explained well prior to this meeting.
 - There was a Proposed VP of Student Services chart handed out (see attachment).
 - This outlines the things we've been asking the Dean of Student Services to do.

- More is coming to the Student Services side of the house still and instruction'
- Instruction has more coming as well, including 12 programs CTE is trying to implement
- In order to be able to go after the best of the candidates and to have the most highly qualified individuals for each position, it is important that we go out for the positions now.

After much discussion, the faculty and classified at PBC began to feel as though this discussion really shed the light on the need for this reorganization. However, Faculty still felt as though there may be things that we're not considering, and that some amount of time for dissemination and input was still needed.

In the end, a compromise was reached which allows HR to advertise for both VP positions, pending board approval (the job fair is this weekend and next weekend), which allows for additional discussion, input, and consensus at next month's PBC meeting.

Further, we are planning to have a special faculty meeting next Thursday to present this information.