

Mendocino College Academic Senate
MINUTES
Thursday, March 30, 2017
1:30p.m. – 3:00p.m., Room 5310

- Call to order* President Edington called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.
- Present* Jordan Anderson, Maria Cetto, Jason Davis, Jason Edington, Catherine Indermill, Conan McKay, Vivian Varela, Tascha Whetzel
- Absent* Doug Browe, Jessica Crofoot
- Recorder* Jason Edington
- Agenda Approval* **M/S/C (Anderson / McKay) to approve the agenda**
No discussion. Yeas: Unanimous
- Minutes Approval* **M/S/C (McKay / Davis) to approve the minutes of March 9, 2017**
No discussion. Yeas: unanimous
- Public Comment* Julie Finnegan came to speak about the Equity Committee and concerns that there are needs for which no program review exists. An example was given on needs for Foster Youth – funds are needed for staffing, but when this was brought up the comment in Equity was that ‘staffing needs to go into Program Review’ – though it is not clear which Program Review this would go into. Julie suggested that a new Program Review process is necessary to allow for situations such as these, as well as a need to have feedback from our Program Reviews.
- Julie also mentioned that she feels that this is an institutional problem, and that this is going to be troublesome for accreditation. Further, she stated that the information utilized in our most recent PAT for athletics is different than the information we use for Program Review, and that this is causing a heightened anxiety for everyone writing Program Reviews – wondering if our programs will be evaluated for things such as profitability when this is not something that we generally track in our own departments.
- Indermill asked a follow up question, “Was the request [in Equity for foster youth] made through the existing equity request process?” Julie stated that it was.
- Reports* **President’s Report** (attachment #1): Indermill stated that Co-Chairing Enrollment Management is not codified in our Bylaws and she questioned why it was still stated on the President’s report that she was going to continue doing this. Edington responded that at the time the report was

written, this was not decided yet, and that it was not placed there in any effort to require Indermill to continue in this capacity.

Whetzel asked about the changing of our Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals every year, bringing up the concern that in Part 2 of our program reviews, which occur every 6 years, we are asked to measure ourselves against these. Since they are changing, it is a bit like trying to hit a moving target. Discussion ensued that was supportive of this concern, and Edington stated that he will carry this concern forward to administration.

Senator's Report: Catherine Indermill gave two reports
ASCCC Minimum Qualifications Regional Meeting October 2016.
(Attachment 2)

Catherine attended the regional meeting in October, 2016. In general, in regards to our Minimum Qualifications Equivalence Process and comparing it to others presented at the meeting, she felt that some things are working well and some things need to be clarified.

Indermill highlighted certain aspects of her report, including:

- Equivalency means 'Equal to'.
 - Not only equal to subject matter, but also equal to breadth of education to a Baccalaureate or Master's degree.
 - The applicant needs to be equivalent at the time of hire.
- Equivalency Committees should be made up of tenured (non-provisional) faculty.
- The Equivalency Process should be a faculty driven process and a faculty committee that reviews all applications, rather than have HR perform the screening.
- The Equivalency Committee should be screening the applications prior to the hiring committee seeing them.
- The Equivalency Committee processes should be scheduled in to the timeline for the hiring committees.

Whetzel pointed out that in practice, there are two ways that Equivalencies occur; the applicant fills out the application, or HR tells them they don't meet minimum qualifications and tells them they need to fill out an equivalency application.

There was further discussion about the Equivalency Process and the fact that the President of the college should not 'approve' equivalency, but rather accept the decision of the faculty committee, and then present the equivalency to the board. If the President objects to the equivalency, that would be something they would share with the board.

McKay asked if we have asked for a written response for any equivalencies that the district had not accepted. Edington stated that he was only familiar with two instances. One happened prior to his tenure as President and he did not know the status of that one, but one has happened during his tenure and he did ask for, and received, a written response from the district.

Curriculum Committee Current Process and Criteria for Selecting a Chair (Attachment 3)

Catherine presented on a meeting that she had with Tascha and Rebecca to discuss the process and criteria for selecting a Curriculum Committee Chair. The Ad Hoc committee came up with a few thoughts.

1. Process should be looked at not by the senate, but the curriculum committee itself.
2. The criteria needs to be updated to more accurately reflect the current responsibilities of the chair, and the common practices.
3. The details of the chairs' job need to be updated as the current details are outdated.

The Ad Hoc committee agreed to have the Curriculum Committee look at the process and criteria with these things in mind, and Rebecca is going to contact the members of Curriculum to get their input quickly so that we can hopefully have a new process in place in time for us to select a chair this semester.

*Action Items /
Old Business*

1. Elections for 2017-2018

Edington stated that the committee for the 2017-2018 elections would be handled by he and Indermill (as suggested in the bylaws). He also reminded the senate that the open positions are for Social Sciences, Learning Skills & Support Services, and Part Time.

2. Hiring Committee Appointments

Indermill would like to have a Nursing Department representative on the committee. Dan Jenkins also made this suggestion to both Edington and Indermill. Edington stated that he has contacted HR about this and is working on it.

(M/S/C Varela/Davis) to appoint Dan Jenkins and Catherine Indermill to the Nursing Faculty and Director Hiring Committee

Yeas: Unanimous

Discussion Items /
New Business

1. Professional Development/Professional Development Leave/Flex Committee:

Edington presented his idea to combine these three committees, including showing a projection of the committee structure (Attachment 4). Some history was given on the effort to combine these committees over at least the last decade. Edington discussed the idea that there is a common thread between the three committees revolving around professional development. He gave the example that a faculty members' flex activity could evolve into a professional development activity for many, or that a project worked on during a sabbatical could come back as a professional development activity.

Edington suggested that the Professional Development Leave and Flex committees become sub-committees of the Professional Development committee. In this design, Flex and Leave sub-committees would be chaired by the two faculty members who serve on the Professional Development Leave Committee and two at-large faculty members. The two at-large faculty members would serve on both Flex and Leave sub-committees.

Indermill stated agrees with the common thread among the three committees, but the work of the Professional Development Leave is much different than the work of the Flex Committee. Edington agreed, but suggested that the work of the Flex Committee is done at the beginning and end of the year, and the work of the Professional Development Leave is done more towards the middle of the year. He also suggested that if this reorganization were to be completed, it would make sense to recruit faculty for the Professional Development Leave committee and then ask them to handle Flex as well.

Edington and Indermill both indicated that there has been discussion with administration about this suggested change and that VP Polak and HR Director Meyer are both open to the suggestions, but more conversation is needed.

2. Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency Process

Edington indicated that the faculty and Senators need to review our Board Policy (7211) and Administrative Procedures (7211.1) related to Minimum Qualifications (particularly the AP):

- The language in the AP is not clear,
- The Application isn't clear,
- The AP leaves some question as to if the applicant meets less than equivalency how is it addressed,

Edington asked the Senators to take this issue to their constituents for feedback, specifically asking them what experiences have they had (positive and negative) and to review the BP and AP for understanding and clarity.

3. April ASCCC Plenary Resolutions

Edington stated that he had sent out the link for the resolutions faculty wide and wanted to allow time for discussion on any of the resolutions. Davis stated that he would like Edington to vote to approve the Resolution in support of helping campuses to become Sanctuary Campuses. Edington indicated it was his intention to do so. Edington also stated that if anyone else would like to know more about the resolutions that they could speak to him directly, including if they would like, up to the minute texting from the floor of Plenary.

4. Review of August Retreat

Due to time constraints, this item will be placed on the next agenda.

5. Discussion of BP 7120 and AP 701.1

Due to time constraints, this item will be placed on the next agenda.

6. Electronic Voting for Academic Senate Elections

Edington made a brief announcement, stating that in order for us to hold electronic elections we would need to amend our constitution. With this in mind, we will not be able to change this procedure likely until next year.

Open Forum

- Maria discussed the fact that Minimum Qualifications in Spanish requires an MA in Spanish and wanted to know how it is possible to change the Minimum Qualifications. Edington stated that he would discuss the process with her after the meeting, but did indicate that this is a process that is handled at the state level by the ASCCC.

Meeting adjourned at 3:01pm

ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

March 23, 2017

Respectfully submitted by Jason Edington, Academic Senate President

1. Professional Development/Professional Development Leave/Flex Committee consolidation

At today's meeting, I will be discussing my proposal to combine these three committees into one. The idea is something that at least the past three Senate Presidents have discussed and worked on. It is my hope that after the discussion we can move this towards being a reality for next semester.

2. Academic Senate Vice President Indermill on Sabbatical next semester

Catherine will be taking a sabbatical in the fall, but she will still be active as the VP. At this time, the plan is that she will continue to co-chair Enrollment Management, and she will serve on EAP and PBC, as well as attending Senate meetings. She will not continue to serve on PPAC – I have discussed with Phil Warf the possibility of him filling in next year for PPAC. I will present this to PPAC at our next meeting, and then bring it to the Senate to ask you to formally accept this.

There are some other committees that Catherine sits on that we will need to cover. I had asked her to sit on the Professional Development Committee, but this is not outlined in our Constitution at this time. Thus, I will be asking for someone else to sit on this committee.

3. PBC 3-14-17

Strategic Retreat Follow up – In the April PBC meeting we will do a check in on the Fall retreat.

Campus Communication – President Reyes began the conversation by stating that this seems to be an issue at every institution – the need to increase communications. “How do we communicate things out from PBC and allow for feedback?” He went on to discuss the recent VP position and questioned how we get a proposal from communication out to communication back in a way that is agreeable, appropriate, and effective.

Interim Vice President Polak suggested that it would be important to understand which things are important to make sure that groups are aware of. She stated that it would be good if we were intentional and that part of PBC's responsibility is to anticipate questions.

President Reyes stated that he prefers that questions about information that goes out are directed to the person that sent out the information, or the person that is the lead or 'expert' on the information in the question. He stated that the link to the PBC Agendas will continue to be sent out, including (whenever possible) background documentation.

International Students - President Reyes, under 'campus communication' gave us a couple of updates, including one that our application to serve International Students came back over five months early, and more importantly that it was approved.

Funding for new Applied Academic Programs - Further, he discussed that we had received funds from the region to move forward with a Physical Therapy Assistant Program, as well as a Fire Science Program. These programs are being reviewed in the PAT process and will be coming forward to EAP when appropriate.

Possibly hiring two math instructors - He also stated that there has been an issue over the last two years of finding math instructors to teach for our college, and that he has been discussing with Assistant Superintendent/Vice President Cichocki about the possibility of hiring two math instructors

this year. The budget would need to support it, but he pointed out that math was ranked two of the top ten positions from Staffing committee, and that was before Staffing knew that last year's math hiring was a failed search.

2016/17 April Revise Budget -Cichocki let us know that our apportionment went up from 3,045 to 3185 FTES due to our agreement with the Chancellor's Office to receive the Coast Center and to bring with it it's 140 FTES.

This budget also includes our final apportionment from 2015/16.

Projections of FTES and revenue for inclusion in 2017/18 Tentative Budget – Cichocki stated that next year is a stability year at 3185. When asked if we are on track to make that this year she stated that it looked as though we would.

Review Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals for possible revision – Reyes proposed that a number of volunteers from PBC form an ad hoc committee to propose changes for next years Mission and Vision, which have not recently been changed (strategic goals were changed in November.) Debra Polak, Minerva Flores, Pat Thygesen, and Jason Edington volunteered.

Football Program – There was some discussion about the Equity Committee discussion, including it being noted that we have not fully been able to see what the initiatives funded by the Equity Committee have been able to do.

It was also noted that if the football program is suspended, that there would be continuing services for the students including counseling and help with transferring.

PBC agreed to suggest to the Board to suspend the Football Program.

Educational Master Plan Update – Polak discussed that EAP is looking at the Educational Master Plan with the intention of updating it this year. She also brought us a document from the 2014 revision that featured the 2012 planning priorities and the 2014 additions to ongoing planning priorities. Highlights included in the 2014 revision include:

- Addressing professional development needs as related to student equity and for SSSP
- Develop a Dual Enrollment/Middle College/Early College Program
- Maximize DE Classroom Technology
- Meet the needs of Veterans, Foster Youth, Native American, African American, and other special populations as determined by the institution
- Continue to grow and expand Coast area
- Maintain HSI status
- Address the changing demographics of our district
- Implement SSSP and Student Equity plan mandates
- Maximize completed Measure W projects
- Utilize the four-semester sequence and student ed plans to inform scheduling
- Link instruction to Student Services.

Student Equity Funding Proposals – Student Equity set aside \$75,000 for the entire district to propose programs. There were 28 proposals requesting \$160,306. Proposals were reviewed and ranked by seven members of the Student Equity Committee, including 3 classified, 3 faculty, and 1

administrator. The top ranked proposals were for lending library, cultural events, and providing guidance and support to foster youth.


Of the 28 proposals, 19 were fully or partially funded, including:

- Allocating \$22,000 to the lending library
- \$5,000 for cultural events
- \$8,500 to provide guidance or support for foster youth

In addition, the committee is working to identify alternative funding and strategies for 6 unfunded proposals.

4. **Federal Work Study update:** The senate is not being asked to do this again next year.
5. **Program Review:** The senate has not done a program review in the past two years, and is not required to do one. If we are interested in doing a program review, I will work with whomever would like to complete one and we will bring it to the senate for approval at the next senate meeting.

To: Mendocino College Academic Senate

From: Catherine Indermill 
Academic Senate Vice-President

Date: March 23, 2017

Report: ASCCC Minimum Qualifications Workshop (October 2016)

The following is a brief summary of points I learned from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Workshop on Minimum Qualifications (MQ) that I attended last Fall.

Overall the workshop was informative and highlighted that our local Board Policy¹ and Administrative Procedure² governing MQs are good, compared to other colleges, but may need some revisions.

Minimum Qualifications are determined by faculty and published in the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*³ published by the Chancellor's Office. Education Code 87359 and 87360 allow faculty to be hired if they possess "qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications". Further the District must have an equivalency process which is in the purview of the Academic Senate (Board Policy 7211 and Administrative Procedure 7211.1).

Some noteworthy points regarding Equivalency include:

- Equivalency means "equal to" – not almost the same as
- Local control is important, but *must be consistent*
 - *all processes* must be consistent
 - process must be mutually agree upon
 - process must be *faculty driven*
- Faculty are hired to teach in the *entire discipline* not a single or specific course
- MQ Equivalency is at the *point of hire*
 - it is not provisional
 - it is not "pending"
 - it is not a previous consideration
- MQ should be determined *before consideration to interview* (prior to "paper screening" – by an MQE Committee, *not* HR nor the hiring committee members

- Job Announcements should include reference to ASCCC MQs, local BP and AP, as well as be developed by faculty in the department/discipline,
 - Job announcements should indicate date that a degree must be obtained by (so someone who has “all-but-degree” *will* have earned the degree by the actual time of hire, not when the class begins)
- It is the responsibility of the applicant, *not* HR or other faculty in the department/discipline to provide documentation of equivalence
- Generally, there are three ways to demonstrate equivalency:
 1. Course work
 2. Work experience
 3. Eminence
 - however the applicant should demonstrate their experiences are equal to the general education component of an earned degree
- Faculty on equivalency committees should all have tenure
- The role of HR is to assist the applicant navigate the process to apply for equivalency (BP, AP and application):
 - Collect and forward equivalency application materials to the Academic Senate (and/or MQE Committee)
 - Ensure the process of reviewing equivalency applications is noted and the outcomes are recorded (both for granting and not granting)
- There are a few things equivalency committee members should keep in mind:
 - if you are “not sure”, “uncomfortable”, feeling “pressured” – you should **not** sign
 - there is no such thing as a “course level” equivalency, an applicant must meet the qualifications to teach the entire breadth of the discipline

I have sent each Senator (via email) a copy of this report and the ASCCC paper regarding Minimum Qualification Equivalencies adopted in Spring of 2016.

Resources:

1. <https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/bp7211.pdf>
2. <https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/ap7211.1.pdf>
3. <http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/2014MinimumQualifications.pdf>

To: Mendocino College Academic Senate.

From: Catherine Indermill
Academic Senate Vice-President

Date: March 23, 2017

Report: Criteria for the Curriculum Committee Chair Report

Per direction of the Academic Senate (March 9, 2017), Senator Whetzel arranged a meeting with me and Rebecca Montes (both as former Curriculum Committee Chairs) to discuss the current process and criteria for the selection of the Curriculum Committee Chair (pasted below) and determine if up-dates were needed. We met on Monday, March 20, 2017 to complete this task.

We agreed that a specific process and criteria were, indeed, necessary. Further, that revisions should be made to make the criteria less restrictive and to more clearly represent the role of the chair. We developed a draft criteria to be used by the Academic Senate when appointing a Curriculum Committee Chair for 2017-2019 term. This draft more clearly reflects the knowledge base and skills necessary to chair this important committee.

After our discussion it was clear the Academic Senate could do one of two things in terms of appointing the next Curriculum Committee Chair:

1. Use the existing criteria, or
2. Wait for the Curriculum Committee members to review these suggestions and approve it's criteria

It is out recommendation, the Academic Senate give the Curriculum Committee a little time to review and make a determination about the criteria based on our recommendations. Rebecca has agreed to communicate these suggested revisions with the voting member of the Curriculum Committee for input and potential agreement. We agreed, it was appropriate for Rebecca to be responsible for this communication because as her role as Vice-Chair by virtue of her administrative position.

Curriculum Committee Handbook (August 2014)

SELECTION PROCESS FOR FACULTY CHAIR:

1. The Academic Senate will select the Faculty Chair from among interested and eligible Faculty.
2. In the event there is no member eligible based on adopted criteria, the Academic Senate will consult with the Vice Chair and at least one past Faculty Chair or the appointment of a new Faculty Chair.
3. Faculty Chair will serve a two-year term with no term limitation.
4. Faculty Chair appointment by the Academic Senate will take place in May for the following year.

CRITERIA FOR FACULTY CHAIR:

1. A full-time faculty member who has previous service of at least two (2) terms on the Curriculum Committee.
2. Experience as primary faculty member in the development of at least three (3) course proposals to Curriculum Committee during the last five years; or experience in the development of the departmental Program Review reports for at least two of the last five years.
3. Familiarity with institutional requirements for graduation, general education requirements, pre-and co- requisites and related college regulations and procedures.
4. Familiarity with parliamentary procedures (Robert's Rules of Order).

**Professional Development
Committee**
President and Vice President of AS serve on this committee, or President and
Chair of either Flex or PDL Committee

Flex
CoChaired by P or VP of AS
Three faculty members serve

**Professional Development
Leave**
CoChaired by VP or P of AS and has same three members as Flex Committee