

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

DRAFT Minutes

April 7, 2011

I. Opening Business

A. Call to order and roll call

- Alfred Hochstaedter, President
- Heather Faust, Vice President
- Anita Johnson, ASCCC
- Mark Clements, COC - ABSENT
- Kathleen Clark - ABSENT
- Steve Albert
- Mila MacBain
- Chris Calima
- Nancy Bingaman
- Susan Joplin
- Brian Brady
- Susan Walter
- **Alexis Copeland**

B. Approval of Minutes from the Mar. 3, 2011 – ST requested clarification of the following statement in the minutes: “It was determined that the issue of Program Discontinuance versus program “hiatus” will not continue to be discussed by the AS at this time.” FH stated that to invoke program discontinuance was to “call baloney” on “hiatus” and there was consensus that this was not a path the AS wished to explore.

- Motion to approve (SJ)
- Second (SW)
- Approval – unanimous with three abstentions: ST, AJ, CC.

II. Reports

A. President/SLO Committee Report (FH)

Communication: Fred distributed a letter addressed to Co-chairs of College Council Alan Haffa and Brenda Kalina, copied to him as Senate President and to Dr. Garrison. The letter reads as follows:

“Dear Colleagues: The following individuals wish to express their strong disapproval of hiring new faculty while reductions in force notices have been distributed.”

It was signed by the following: John Anderson, Lyndon Schutzler, Tom Logan, Gail Fail, Tracie Catania, LaRon Johnson, Diane Boynton, Leandro Castillo and Stephanie Tetter.

B. COC - No report

Stephanie Tetter, Senate Secretary

v. 1 4/8/11

v.2 4/11/11

page 1

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

DRAFT Minutes

April 7, 2011

C. Flex Day Committee Report (HF)

- HF shared the following information re planning for fall flex:
 - No theme as yet
 - Coffee and tea only in the morning, followed by general sessions, lunch, more general sessions (including program reflections). There are no breakout sessions planned. Working draft schedule for morning and afternoon sessions of Fall Flex Day.
 - Santa Rosa training was discussed. It was agreed the Tech Committee should discuss how the college could address the issue for needed training. AJ discouraged FH from asking the committee to do something; rather the Senate members on the committee (AC and ST) will raise the question at the next meeting. FH will also attend.
 - We want to approve the schedule tentatively within 2 weeks (at the next Senate meeting)

D. ASCCC Report (AJ)

- AJ attended the Area B meeting at DeAnza 3/25.
 - Statewide concerns were discussed, including approaches being taken to budget issues (e.g. one college reported pink slips being given to Deans).
 - Plus and minus grading was discussed. Most schools have had discussions or are talking about it. FHDA (Foothill-DeAnza) provided information that AJ shared with SA. Senates are fighting to have this option.
 - Shared governance is “stretched” at some institutions.
 - Private for-profit colleges were discussed, with a negative resolution proposed.
 - Some of the resolutions that were discussed:
 - Repeatability:
 - Title 5 changes limit repeatability. LAO has significant pull on the legislature.
 - 9.05 focused on PE. Faculty at the statewide level would have more say, rather than being written into Title 5. (Statewide Board of Professional PE Educators). Neither version is liked by PE faculty.
 - 9.06 would distinguish between majors and non-majors (majors might be able to repeat courses where non-majors would not be allowed to do so).

Stephanie Tetter, Senate Secretary

v. 1 4/8/11

v.2 4/11/11

page 2

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

DRAFT Minutes

April 7, 2011

- 9.07 came from the Area C meeting, and would bring in more people, with PE faculty being involved in resolutions affecting PE. AJ thinks this will pass at the fall plenary.
- AJ feels it is important to change Title 5 rather than have it go through the legislature (things are easier to change later if they are not written into law).
- Lyndon Schutzler, PE Division Chair, spoke about meetings in Sacramento and San Mateo he attended. There is a focus by the LAO on PE as a budget saving area. Changes that are not thought through can wreak havoc on curriculum. Cookie cutter solutions are problematic as small colleges often don't offer multiple sections and it is challenging for students to move forward.
- AJ noted that discussions with LS described courses in Dance being in PE at some schools, in Art at others. How courses are coded can have impact.
- FH: received a request to review Board policy on repeatability, and we should look at the administrative procedure as well. Next discuss it with CAC and bring it back to Senate for discussion. SW, MM and AJ have been asked to be point persons. MM has agreed; other responses pending.
- AJ will present the MPC position on repeatability, and welcomes feedback on other resolutions.
- 5.1 and 5.02 focus on student success, responding to the mandate in SB 1143, with 5.02 including "academically sound incentives."
- CC: important to include students in discussions as to what constitutes student success.
- 6.05 and 6.7 relate to "pay for service" model, sometimes called "community education or "fee for service." Resolution indicates these need to be supplemental, and not replace regular courses.
- 9.10 is one of 2 conflicting resolutions related to "accelerated basic skills."
- 13.03 involves "democracy commitment" which AJ thinks the plenary will not want to address (neither AJ nor DG have knowledge of what this is about)
- 18.02 will move up the drop date to 50% point of semester. Metropolitan areas have problems if various colleges have different drop dates. It was suggested research be done on the relationship between drop dates and success.

Stephanie Tetter, Senate Secretary

v. 1 4/8/11

v.2 4/11/11

page 3

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

DRAFT Minutes

April 7, 2011

- Senators asked to forward question and recommendations to AJ.
- FH reminded Senators an opportunity exists for someone to be represent MPC to the ASCCC.

III Old Business

A. Plus-minus Grading System (SA)

- SA requested this be taken off the agenda for now.

IV New Business

A. College Council resolution (FH)

- Resolution introduced two weeks ago. The third version was drafted by Alan Haffa after the College Council meeting Tuesday. FH proposed discussion to prompt thought and dialogue, not to sway our opinions on the matter
- FH met with Dr. Garrison who agreed to respond to questions from Fred at this meeting. Following that, FH wants us to go around the room and each have the opportunity to speak on this issue, and then each senator asked to in writing their recommendation for Fred's vote on the resolution, with a brief written statement about the reason for their recommendation. This will tell FH how Senate would like him to vote.
- Andres Durstenfeld stated that the letter from Division Chairs was from them as individuals, and they were not representing Divisions. ST noted that those who signed are not identified as Division Chairs, and read the letter (see President's report above for content and names of those who signed).

NOTE: The following section notes reflect direct statements from the speakers indicated

- FH: RIF notices (12) were sent, how did you decide to whom to send them?
- DG: Ed Code 87743 guides this. There was a focus on FSAs. Process began with a compilation of all full-time faculty listed by FSA, then date of hire. College cannot have adjuncts performing duties that full time faculty would have performed, so the number of adjuncts in an FSA is an issue.
 - Other criteria:
 - enrollment trends in CTE areas
 - job placement

Stephanie Tetter, Senate Secretary

v.1 4/8/11

v.2 4/11/11

page 4

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

DRAFT Minutes

April 7, 2011

- legislative guidance (2009-10 budgets directed focus on general ed/transfer, basic skills and CTE)
- ability of the college to fulfill function (possibly in an alternative way) in the absence of staffing
- the criteria could be viewed as a “menu,” since the criteria and weight are not the same for each case (they vary by circumstance)
- every full time faculty member was examined to see what possibilities existed
- There may be more, but this is what he recalled at this time.
- FH: can you tell us which criteria were used for individual decisions?
- DG: no, letters have been issued, administrative hearings are underway. An administrative law judge is now involved,
- FH: so there are issues of confidentiality?
- DG: yes
- SA: in the end, is the process is that you (DG) get recommendations from places on campus, but hiring and firing are your responsibility?
- DG: yes, the final decision (recommendation to the Board) is mine. I don't say these twelve are the “right” ones, as they are all wrong and different people could come to different conclusions. None of the positions were identified because they were of no value to the institution. There is a financial challenge with a date (mandated by the Ed Code) that forces hard choices. My “extraordinary” document included the available options, and if you take away any one, it increases the pressure on the others:
 - Cut benefits
 - Cut number of sections
 - Cost factors to support programs
 - Use one-time funds
 - Pay concessions
 - layoffs

Stephanie Tetter, Senate Secretary

v.1 4/8/11

v.2 4/11/11

page 5

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

DRAFT Minutes

April 7, 2011

- We are planning for the worst-case scenario. The March 15 date meant decisions had to be made by March 8th. I ran multiple scenarios to come up with 5.4 million dollars, and couldn't find any without having this option be on the table. Compensation and program size are considerations, and if you eliminate all adjuncts then you could just close the doors. All are "wrong" answers.
- SA: so these recommendations that you get from various places on campus are just recommendations.
- FH: important to consider how we define "recommendations"

NOTE: end of direct statements. Following section reflects Senators' comments about the resolution

- FH: now speaking as Fred, not as AS president, spoke of concern that this resolution interferes with the union, and sets a bad precedent. The institution has to decide what it is going to do. This is emotion vs. objectivity.
- HF: stated it is difficult to talk about and she isn't convinced the resolution would serve any useful purpose. She feels we have to trust our administrators and our union, and there is not enough money, so we need to let them make difficult decisions. We need to look at where to put our priorities.
- CC: TRIO supports the resolution. Aware Senate deals only with faculty issues, but feels this is not the time to be drawing lines between faculty and the classified staff. Would hate for us to continue separation, we should be a campus community.
- AC: spoke his personal opinion as there was not a chance to discuss at his division. Timelines are involved, and he wonders if this is more distraction. Are we missing something that might affect us down the road? Will this have much impact? Maybe we are missing the bigger picture.
- SA: SS Division supports the resolution. If you look at the edits in the resolution, what is left is to hold the employment offers until the budget situation is clear. There is an issue called morale, perhaps the value there goes beyond other things.
- SW: Feedback from counseling is that the iterations of the resolution take care of the issues, except for the Microbiology position, which has so much impact on programs such as nursing. Supports the 12, but emotional might not be the best interest of the college. MPCTA proposal is for equal sharing of cuts, wonders where that is and what impact it may have on the 12?
- AJ: unsure of the Humanities division options, but finds the language problematic. AS it is constructed it could say we recommend going forward with the hires, as all the "whereases" support hiring. Perhaps new hires would not meet need in the same way as current faculty. It is unclear whether the resolution as written restricts the ability to be flexible.

Stephanie Tetter, Senate Secretary

v. 1 4/8/11

v.2 4/11/11

page 6

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

DRAFT Minutes

April 7, 2011

- BB: at first felt bad, then thought to not hire new people might hamstring us. We should trust that administrators have given careful consideration, and he would not vote for this
- MM: cannot speak for the division, but is student-centered, overriding other concerns
- SJ: Humanities division felt the CC should do what they want (took no position on the resolution). One person spoke saying right thing is to trust in the best decision being made for the college, and to trust the process. What does it mean that CC says this? (FH: it is a recommendation, the President can take it or make adjustments)
- NB: looking at the shared governance process, having AAAG prioritize the vacant positions is one way to see priorities in a functional sense. Nursing is saddened by loss, echoes HF re trusting Admin knowing what they are doing. Has been at MPC a long time, thinks Doug has done a fabulous job so far and hopes he continues to guide us.
- ST: very emotional issue. Working at library reference desk, we have had many faculty staff and students come with questions. Students ask "how can they do this?" In discussion at division among staff re the earlier version of the resolution, there was support. Have not had discussion of latest version, but is quite sure division would still support. Agree with CC re classified staff.
- FH reported that Doug Garrison stated that these programs will be on "hiatus" not "discontinued" if these faculty members' contracts are not renewed this fall.
- Program Discontinuance provides metrics to determine whether programs are failing. However, the metrics for program "hiatus" were different and not revealed when the faculty received their "pink slips."
- Andres Durstenfeld comments:
 - Senate represents academic core, focus on academic mission
 - Reference to tradition rather than academic mission
 - We promote student success, transfer, basic skills, and career/technical education.
 - The 400 who spoke to the Board were just the vocal minority; students in auto tech are not going to show up and speak out. These were people who are enjoying MPC services, and who have the leisure to come and make their feelings known.
 - State is telling us we have to shrink
 - Vacancies are not new faculty (just serendipity that Gail Fail is retiring this year)

Stephanie Tetter, Senate Secretary

v. 1 4/8/11

v.2 4/11/11

page 7

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

DRAFT Minutes

April 7, 2011

- Our task is to say do we save the family and allow programs to be defined by arbitrary age of faculty?
- The resolution is emotional, deals with morale on some level
- Re saying pink slips break morale of the faculty: morale is based on security (looking down the road a long way, we will be able to do what we do successfully) and our ability to deliver
- Saddening to see people leave but the reality is created by the state at voters and we are responding
- Lyndon Schutzler commented
 - MPC philosophy has always been to keep the campus family whole, insuring student success, focus on how people work together
 - Have not been hamstrung
 - We have made multiple concessions to insure student success (benefits, positions, etc., in some cases salaries)
 - Always collegial, not adversarial
 - Recalls when Division Chairs gave up 33% of discretionary funds to hire a French instructor
 - Kind of takes offense to the idea that this philosophy isn't about student success, this is a rich tradition
- FH: thanked Lyndon and Andres, both were eloquent and this is heart-wrenching to all of us.
- Vote followed. Result:
 - For the resolution: 4
 - Against the resolution: 6
 - Abstain from making recommendation to Fred: 1
 - Recommend Fred abstain: 1
- Doug said he will be at AAAG Wednesday. Regardless of RIF, we are reducing. The apportionment revenue will be less; a 14% reduction is equal to 900 FTES, which translates to 100-120 sections per term. We need to make decisions about what goes away and what stays. Schedule management will be by cancellation at start of semester. Hard choices are the reality.

Stephanie Tetter, Senate Secretary

v.1 4/8/11

v.2 4/11/11

page 8

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

DRAFT Minutes

April 7, 2011

- DG: Re AB 515 and “community services: : While AB 515 proposes to allow community colleges to offer credit courses on an extension, fee-based basis, community services courses are not-for-credit, they are intended for the experience rather than for the attainment of specific learning outcomes. MPC had a program of this type several years ago and we need to re-examine this option to acknowledge the interests of a portion of our community. (Has received dozens of calls on this.) These classes would not require certificated faculty, and would involve no general fund dollars. Will likely talk to AAAG about a pilot program for fall. Gavilan has a successful program of community education, sees these as for enrichment, and there is a role in our community for that.

Stephanie Tetter, Senate Secretary

v.1 4/8/11

v.2 4/11/11

page 9