

MINUTES
Mendocino College Academic Senate
Friday, September 23, 2016
11:30a.m. – 1:00p.m., Room 4210

- Call to order* Edington called the meeting to order at 11:44a.m.
- Present* Jordan Anderson, Jessica Crofoot, Jason Davis, Jason Edington, Catherine Indermill, Tascha Whetzel
- Absent* Doug Browe, Maria Cetto, Conan McKay, Vivian Varela
- Recorder* Amy Nelson
- Agenda Approval* **M/S/C (Anderson/Indermill) to approve the agenda with corrections.**
Indermill requested item #3 on Consent Calendar be removed for discussion. Item was moved to Action Item #3.
- Minutes Approval* **M/S/C (Whetzel/Crofoot) to approve the minutes of September 9, 2016 as corrected.**
Page 4, under Federal Work Study, Anderson suggested that the minutes include the comment he made about proportionally allocating the funds. The following statement was added to the minutes: "one method we could choose would be to proportionally allocate to all the requestors".
- Consent Calendar* **M/S/C (Whetzel/Anderson) to approve the Consent Calendar as amended.**
- Public Comment* None
- Reports* **Presidents Report:** Edington reported that PBC is continuing to work on ranking staffing requests and reviewed the approved budget. Edington also included that the CAMP and HEP programs presented at the last Board of Trustee meeting. Edington commented that he learned a lot about these programs and felt it would be valuable to have a presentation at a future faculty meeting.
- Senators' Report:** No reports given, but Crofoot asked if anyone knew the colleges stance on whether ACCJC should continue as the accrediting agency. Crofoot stated that CCA, the Community College Association, a faculty driven association, has asked chapter presidents to report because the president of the CCA, who also serves on the Board of Governors, needs to report to the Chancellor's Office

regarding this issue. Edington didn't recall the college's stance on this issue, but Indermill recollected that the college was waiting to see what was going to happen with the lawsuit with San Francisco City College as well as the internal changes at ACCJC. Crofoot added that 85-90% of the responses to CCA were not in support of ACCJC continuing as the accrediting agency. Crofoot asked to have this issue on the agenda for the October 7 meeting.

Committee Reports: None

Action Items

1. M/S/C (Indermill/Crofoot) to approve allocating the Federal Work Study funds proportionally based on an \$11 an hour wage, after guidance from the Director of Financial Aid, Ulises Velasco, regarding allocating all funds or holding a reserve of \$150.

Edington displayed the results of the Senators' ranking. (Attachment 1) He noted that McKay and Varela didn't participate in the ranking. McKay told him he chose not to since he wasn't present at the meeting, Varela did not specify her reason for opting out of participating. Crofoot, Anderson, and Davis did not specifically rank (1-7) the requests because they felt the money should be split up amongst all those requesting funding. Cetto, Whetzel, Indermill and Browe ranked the requests numerically.

All funding requests equaled \$8921, but the budget allows for \$4250. Edington noted if the first four ranked requests were funded, we would then be only able to partially fund the fifth ranked request. If the funds were distributed proportionally amongst all requests, each would receive a little more than half of the amount they are requesting, after Cetto rescinded her request for federal work study, as reported by Edington and Wetzell.

Indermill reminded everyone that it was agreed upon at the previous meeting to rank all requests individually. Whetzel added that she did not rank requests for tutors as she wasn't sure if they could be funded due to certain constraints. Edington stated that it was not the duty of the Senate to decide what can be funded or who can be hired as it is out of the senate's purview, rather it is the senate's duty to simply fund requests. Indermill added that she also did not rank the tutors as there are many other avenues of funding for tutor support. Edington also reminded everyone that this was still in discussion and anyone can still change their ranking.

The discussion shifted to the hourly rate and how some requests had a higher hourly rate than others. Crofoot suggested that if all requests were considered using \$11 an hour that they might be able to fund more requests. Whetzel questioned if the hourly rate was set by

federal law. Edington said he had previously asked Director Velasco and he said it was not, rather some jobs may demand a higher hourly rate due to the skills required for that particular job.

As the Senators worked on moving forward with deciding what requests to fund, it was also noted that Finnegan's request stated that she would appreciate some funding, but other requests could be considered before hers. The discussion then turned towards allocating the entire budget or holding back a reserve of \$150 in case of overages. Crofoot stated she felt the full \$4250 should be allocated as that was the budget they were given to work with. Indermill added that she agreed with Crofoot and that it was their job to allocate the budgeted amount not enforce the budget. Edington stated it was his duty to work with faculty to make sure they do not exceed their budget and that he feels it is prudent to have a reserve since there is no process in place regarding allocating federal work study funds, and he isn't sure what would happen if they overspent. Anderson noted that as the process is developed it should be possible to allocate all funds. Whetzel questioned whether Director Velasco holds funds back to cover overages. Edington stated that due to his conversation with Director Velasco, he was under the impression that overspending might be an issue. Indermill added that if Director Velasco did indeed request Edington to monitor the budget, then that is a different scenario. Edington also added that he didn't want to hold back funds to simply hold back funds and that he would follow-up with Velasco regarding the need to have a reserve.

The discussion again turned to whom to fund and whether funding should be based off of ranking or proportionally. Davis stated he felt funding proportionally was best, and Anderson added that he also felt funding proportionally would be best until there is more direction given regarding how requests are ranked and what other funds are available for certain requests. It was concluded that the federal work study funds would be allocated proportionally to all requestors, except for Spanish due to the tutor no longer being available, based on an \$11 an hour rate, and after guidance from Director Velasco regarding allocating the whole budget or reserving \$150.

2. Distance Education Committee Recommendation for Canvas

Edington referenced the Distance Education Committee report from the September 9 meeting regarding the recommendation on training for Canvas. Edington stated that the Distance Education Committee, which is a subcommittee of Academic Senate and therefore report to the Academic Senate, is suggesting that all faculty members should be required to complete training before using Canvas. The training options are either two-week training for those who have used Etudes

in the past or four-week training for those new to online instruction. Edington added that he feels that training should not be a requirement for faculty using Canvas for a face-to-face course, but rather it should be a recommendation. Whetzel asked which training is for face-to-face courses. Edington stated the two-week training is for face-to-face courses, as well as for people that have been previously trained on Etudes to be able to teach online courses. Indermill stated that the two-week training covered the basics of the program including technology, grading, how to accept assignments, the nuts and bolts if you will, and that the training is 10 hours spread over two weeks. Indermill added that the four-week training covered a lot of the same material but included more depth of the technology available including pedagogy, accessibility, etc. Edington interjected that the issue at hand is regarding the Distance Education Committee setting policies for courses that are not being taught online but merely want a 'shell' in Canvas. Edington noted that these courses are using an online tool, Canvas, but is it really the responsibility of the Distance Education Committee to decide if training is required for face-to-face courses. Anderson stated that this was his thought as well. Edington stated that this is more likely an academic freedom issue and thus it is an Academic Senate issue. Indermill added that although it was not in Varela's report, the Distance Education Committee is not mandating anything but had keen understanding that there is always an exception and noted that without some training, other departments, such as IT and Admissions and Records, would be affected and burdened with extra work. It was concluded that this discussion will continue at the next meeting and that Varela will be asked to come to that meeting with a recommendation from the Distance Education Committee. It was further recommended that Edington attend the next Distance Education Committee meeting to discuss the topic of the recommendation.

3. M/S/C (Anderson/Davis) to appoint Rodney Grisanti, Conan McKay, and Alicia Mendoza to the Foundation Skills Committee.

Indermill explained that she asked for this item to be pulled off of the Consent Calendar for discussion because assigning a first year faculty member to committees is contrary to the Academic Senate's normal practice and MCFT supports this position. Edington explained the he spoke with Alicia Mendoza and her supervisor and that they were both in agreement that this assignment is positive and added that Mendoza is not new to the college. Based on the faculty member's desire to be on the committee, he was okay making an exception. Indermill concluded that she does support Mendoza being assigned to the Foundation Skills Committee but wanted to point out that although Mendoza is not new to the campus, she is in a different role on the campus.

Discussion Items

1. Spring Meeting Days

Edington began the discussion noting that moving the spring meetings back to college hour on Thursday works for Cetto, McKay, and Varela. Anderson asked when the decision needed to be made regarding scheduling meeting dates. Edington said the sooner the better. Anderson added that college hour on Thursdays would probably work, but he would not know his schedule until the following week. Edington recognized that there are more people on campus on Thursdays but believes keeping meetings on Fridays may be necessary. Whetzel added that she often has to be gone on Fridays for work related travel and that college hour on Thursdays is best. Crofoot also supports moving the meetings back to college hour on Thursday. It was concluded that the discussion would continue at a future meeting.

2. Updating Committees

Edington reminded all committee chairs that it is very important to get your forms to Minerva Flores. Edington added that he is not clear on what committees still have vacancies and is working on the committee handbook as well as staggering and will bring results to the Senate for recommendations and suggestions. Whetzel stated she felt the Committee Description form was confusing and needed some clarification. Edington explained that the form reflects the make-up of the committee. Whetzel noted that there are now more administrators on the Student Equity Committee, which she co-chairs, and wasn't sure of their responsibility to the committee. Edington explained that if Whetzel is concerned with the make-up of her committee that they should discuss her concerns.

3. Senate Operations/Senators Roles

No discussion due to lack of time.

4. Academic Calendar

Edington briefly discussed the academic calendar. Edington said the intention is to have a general discussion on future Academic Calendars, not necessarily about the 2017-2018 Calendar. The reason he put this on the agenda is because it was one of the items left over from the previous year and he wanted to be sure that we had a chance to discuss it. The previous discussions included the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and the concept of a compact calendar, which would require time to be added to the schedule. Crofoot stated that if progress is moving forward, by the end of March/April, we would in fact be able to adjust the 2017-18 calendar to reflect the Wednesday prior to Thanksgiving off. Edington stated that since the Academic

Calendar is a negotiated item, he was unsure of the dates that Crofoot mentioned.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:06p.m.

Next Meeting

Friday, October 7, 2016 from 11:30a.m. – 1:00p.m.
Location: LLRC, room 4210

Federal Work Study Rankings Worksheet

	Catherine	Doug	Jordan	Jessica	Jason	Tascha	Vivian	Maria	Conan	Request	Suggested	Proportional
Computer Science Social Media	1	1	x	x	x	2				482	\$ 482	\$ 323.41
Computer Science Dept Workload Org.	3	1	x	x	x	1				482	\$ 482	\$ 323.41
Physics	2	3	x	x	x	3		4		690	\$ 690	\$ 462.98
Computer Science Mentor/Tutor	7	1	x	x	x	6		1		1300	\$ 1,300	\$ 872.28
Theater	4	5	x	x	x	4		3		2000	\$ 1,296	\$ 1,341.96
Business/Accounting	7	2	x	x	x	7		2		1380	\$ -	\$ 925.96
											\$ 4,250	\$ 4,250.00
Total of all requests										\$ 6,334		
Pennies per \$ Proportional										0.670982002		

Attachment 1