

MINUTES

Mendocino College Academic Senate
Thursday, February 23, 2006
Room 1200

- Call to Order*** Leslie Saxon West called the meeting to order at 12:30pm.
- Present*** John Koetzner Mike Glenn
Nancy McLelland Steve Crossman
Jessica Morris Jean Stirling
Charles Poteet
- Absent*** Kurt Combs
- Guests*** Alan West
- Agenda Approval*** M/S/C (Stirling/Koetzner) to approve the agenda of February 23, 2006
- Minutes Approval*** M/S/C (Stirling/Morris) to approve minutes of February 9, 2006
- Public Comments*** None
- President's Report*** Leslie Saxon West announced that she had received a request from the science faculty related to office space for new science faculty. Senate members agreed to forward this report directly to the Faculty Office Space Committee.
- Leslie announced that she had received word from Lynda Myers advising her that Steve Frick had completed the faculty emeritus email set up. Lynda will notify emeritus faculty members and let them know.
- To serve as a public acknowledgement, Leslie advised Senate members that the discussion about Evaluation Form C at the February 9, 2006 Academic Senate meeting was not on the agenda, and that it should not have been discussed. The February 9, '06 agenda did list "Faculty Evaluation Tool – Form A" as a topic under old business. Senate members were reminded that Senate meetings are governed by the Brown Act and that items on the agenda are the only items that may be discussed.
- Leslie read a letter she had drafted to Academic Senate members regarding her deep concerns related to the current relationship between the Academic Senate and the FT Faculty Union. In summary, she stated that one of the 2005-06 Academic Senate Objectives was to develop a protocol that would insure that both entities work together in a cooperative spirit and communicate directly and respectfully with each other to better serve the faculty. Although she feels that Senate officers have tried to initiate activities to bring Senate and union together, she stated that to her dismay, she does not feel positive strides have been made in this area. (*Note: This*

letter was not distributed as a handout). Leslie stressed the importance of developing a clearer and more positive relationship with our union. She enlisted the help of the Senate as a whole, and expressed her wish for their assistance in making this happen. She will place this item on the next Senate agenda for further discussion.

New Business

1. Report on Accreditation Meeting:

Nancy McLelland and John Koetzner reported that they attended a comprehensive accreditation workshop that was very informative and helpful. Helpful guidelines to help prepare us for the new accreditation standards were introduced at this meeting. One key point made was that all faculty must be involved and demonstrate they are working on and carrying out Student Learning Outcomes. It is also important that the college is prepared and can show progress on the seven major recommendations made during our last accreditation. Both Nancy and John felt that the 2005-06 Academic Senate Objectives fit in well with the accreditation standards, and that we are progressing in the right direction.

2. Mendocino College Academic Senate Procedures Manual

(Handout previously emailed to members and distributed at meeting.)

Senate members acknowledged that they reviewed the current draft. Jean felt it was helpful to have ancillary comments in the manual to help future Senates. Charles suggested that the manual be kept as generic and procedural as possible to have a more solid and factual document to be used in future years. Nancy McLelland volunteered to grammatically edit the manual. She asked that senate members advise her if there are any more suggested changes. Once Nancy completes her editing, review of the draft will be placed on a future agenda for approval.

Old Business

1. Campus Cleanliness – mutual agreement update

(Handouts distributed: Campus Cleanliness Resolution addressing Point Arena Field Station; Cleanliness, Maintenance and Safety Issues Reported by College Personnel, Spring 2006)

Leslie and Nancy (*Academic Senate reps*), Liz Linton & Leslie Humphrey (*Classified Senate reps*), Kathy Lehner, Meridith Randall and Tom Kesey met to review and discuss both resolutions on campus cleanliness, their similarities, and how to proceed with dealing with this issue. Leslie compiled a list of issues from correspondence she received from both PT & FT faculty. She and Kathy walked the campus and went through each item on the list. Leslie feels this resolution will be dealt with in a timely manner. She will be sending the compiled list along with the minutes to all faculty for review and faculty will have an opportunity to identify any additional problems not yet addressed.

2. Integrated Institutional Timeline (*handout distributed*)

Leslie would like to send this to faculty. It was agreed to allow time for one more review prior to distribution.

3. Faculty Evaluation Tool

After a summary was given of the last Academic Senate meeting regarding the call from union reps for an immediate revised Form C Evaluation tool for union contract negotiation purposes, Leslie Saxon West made the following motion:

“...that the Academic Senate accept for consideration the revised Form C evaluation tool, brought to us and recommended by our union representatives at our February 9, 2006 meeting, and that this tool be forwarded to our Academic Senate Faculty Evaluation sub-committee for consideration. The Academic Senate also requests that the union select one union representative to participate on this sub-committee.

The sub-committee will meet to discuss this new Form C, consider the work they (the Senate sub-committee) have already done and the recommendations they have already made on Form C, and will work to synthesize the two documents as deemed necessary. This will be completed by March 7, 2006.

The sub-committee will forward their recommendations to the Senate who will review it at its meeting on March 9, 2006. After this review, the Academic Senate President will then e-mail this document to the faculty at large to solicit feedback. The faculty will be given until March 16 to respond. The sub-committee will meet again to discuss faculty feedback and make final revisions and recommendations. This final document will be forwarded to the union by March 31, 2006.”

Motion seconded by Charles Poteet and unanimously approved.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 1:35pm