Faculty Senate

Monroe Community College

PRESENT: R. Babcock, S. Broberg, L. Carson, M. Dorsey, M. Ernsthausen, S. Farrington, R. Fisher, A. Flatley, B. Gizzi, B. Grindle, M. Heel, J. Hill, R. Horwitz, A. Hughes, K. Farrell, A. Knebel, D. Lawrence, T. Leuzzi, G. Lynch, J. Mahar, J. McPhee, H. Murphy, L. Pierce, E. Putnam, M. Redlo, K. Rodriguez, R. Rodriguez, J. Salsburg-Taylor, J. Scanlon, T. Schichler, C. Shanahan, T. Vinci, R. Wagoner, J. Wilson, A. Zamiara, L. Zion-Stratton
ABSENT: E. Baxter, J. Chakravathy, A. Colosimo, A. Conte, T. Custodio, P. Emerick, H. Fox, D. Gasbarre, S. Kinel, D. Mueller, P. Oettinger, R. Pearl, D. Rivers, J. Santos, G. Thompson, M. Timmons, J. Waasdrop, R. Watson
STUDENT REPRESENATIVE: C. Chapman
GUESTS: M. Bates, N. Christensen, A. Greer, C. Fogal, A. Leopard, L. Moses, H. Wheeler, H. Williams, M. Witz

Meeting called to order at 3:34 p.m.

1. **Guest Speakers: Heather Williams and Christy Fogal – Education Initiatives and Advocacy Committee (EIAC)**
    H. Williams began by explaining EIAC was formed to get a better understanding of what is happening in SUNY and the many new initiatives. She provided the following:
    Significance?
    - This has all happened within three years (2012-2015)
    - This is all now part of SUNY Excels
    - SUNY Excels now falls under The Power of SUNY 2020, the standing SUNY Strategic Plan
    Why it matters?
    - Due to its tie to the standing strategic plan, the policies and practices tied to SUNY Excels will influence curriculum for at least the next four years
    What should we do?
    - The Faculty Senate Education Initiatives and Advocacy (EIA) Committee is compiling all related info to determine what the impact of these interrelated policies/practices will have at MCC, and to anticipate any necessary efforts to ensure the integrity of our academic community – please support the effort
    - The Faculty Senate EIA Committee is also working actively on additional policy issues (new required Statement of Ethics, researching potential Social Media Policy, etc.), and collaborating with appropriate MCC community members as needed/appropriate to offer best recommendations to the Faculty Senate - please support the effort

    H. Williams summarized SUNY Excels, which is "Harnessing the power of SUNY through Performance Aid" which essentially is harnessing the power of the strategic plan through performance initiatives. A coordination of multiple aspects to ensure SUNY schools act "as a system" that adopts "evidence-based best practices through access, completion, success, inquiry and engagement. She stated EAIC looked into one area first, the completion agenda, which includes, the following initiatives: Open SUNY, SUNY Applied Learning, Degree Works, SUNY Pathway to Success, TeachNY and SUNY Seamless Transfer, in addition to the MCC level General Education and Academy Model. She further explained

how the completion agenda fits into the following SUNY initiative (in chronological order by date initiated) SUNY Excels, SUNY Completion Agenda, SUNY Seamless Transfer, Open SUNY, SUNY Applied Learning, MCC General Education, MCC Academy Model. She provided a chart outlining more specific information about each (information was pulled from SUNY and FCCC documents and websites).

The following are the contacts for the Completion Agenda initiatives at MCC:
MCC Academy Model - Karen McCarthy
MCC General Education- Mark Ernsthausen & MaryJo Witz
Open SUNY- Lawrence Dugan
SUNY Applied Learning- Andrew Freeman
SUNY Excels- Andrea Wade
SUNY Seamless Transfer- MaryJo Witz

C. Fogal explained the biggest initiative is SUNY Excel, which is the precursor to Performance Funding. FCCC is currently working on a resolution asking for more time when initiatives are released. She reviewed each initiative outlined on the chart. She stated a new initiative coming up is Community College Councils, which will be a committee for each region. One of the charges will be to review and make recommendations regarding programs offered in the regions.

2. **Announcements (M. Ernsthausen)**
M. Ernsthausen made the following announcements:
a) Board of Trustees Meeting
- Attended the Enrollment Workshop given by President Kress before the Board meeting along with several other Faculty members
- Attended the Board of Trustees meeting
Commented on the Technology Policies that went before the Board of Trustees for a first read
b) SUNY/ACT Student Opinion Survey for Community Colleges
- A version of the ACT Student Opinion Survey designed specifically for SUNY institutions
- Purpose of the survey is to assess current students' opinions of satisfaction with various aspects of their MCC experience
- Last done during the Spring 2013 semester (Report is on website at http://www.monroecc.edu/depts/research/staffonly/sunysossurvey.htm)
- A random selection of classes are chosen to administer the survey in class.
- Ideally it will take students 20-25 minutes to complete
c) Shared Governance Committee
- Met Tuesday, February 1st
- Will be called the Shared Governance Coordinating Council
- Developed Goals, Purpose, and Function of the Council
- Meeting on March 1st to work on Composition nd Meetings
d) FA Contract
- Approved at the Board of Trustees meeting on February 1st
- Catch up payment for the 1% FA contractual raise will be included in the February 25th payroll
- Payments for overload increase will come at a later date
e) Technology Policies
- Bethany, Mitch, and I met with David Lane on Tuesday (2/9)
- Acceptable Use of Technology Policy
  o Send, view and/or print lewd or pornographic materials <u>for non-academic purposes</u>.
  o Engage in <u>intentional</u> malicious activity designed to harm computers and networks. Such activity includes but is not limited to: hacking systems, disabling or crashing systems, network sniffing; sending viruses, malware or mass e-mail; creating unnecessary or multiple jobs and processes.

  o Send harassing, obscene, libelous, or threatening messages. (removed annoying)
Questions:
- M. Heel asked if there is an MCC definition for "harassing, obscene, libelous or threatening behavior." M. Ernsthausen said he would ask for more information from D. Lane.
- C. Chapman, a student government representative, asked how these policies would be enforced. . M. Ernsthausen stated it is his understanding system administrators have the ability to review any action taken on a computer. However, it is not the practice to do so unless a complaint is filed and there is an investigation. He stated the proposed policies are similar to the login "acceptance policy" everyone has to click on when logging onto MCC computers. This policy is for any device used on campus.
- A Senator asked for clarification on whether the policies apply to course materials stored on the m drive. M. Ernsthausen stated they are working on an intellectual policy. B. Wagner gave an example of the basic understanding of intellectual property.

- Cyber Security Awareness and Education Policy
  - o Annual training discussion
    - A group will continue discussions of the Security Awareness and Education Policy and the requirement for annual training. The Faculty Association and the Faculty Senate will propose wording to change the annual training requirements of the current version of the policy. When wording to satisfy the auditors and insurance needs is reached, this policy can be returned to the BOT agenda for a second read. Until that time, the Security Awareness and Education Policy should not be moved to a second reading. Work will continue as quickly as possible to reach an agreement on the requirements of the policy.
  - o Periodic unscheduled awareness assessments – Individuals will be sent a phishing email
  - o Those found not practicing good cyber security defenses will be required to repeat the training.
- He stated the polices will go for the second read at the March Board of Trustees meeting.
Questions/Discussion:
- B. Gizzi stated she communicated in writing to D. Lane the FA would not support any policy that would require annual training. This will need to be negotiated through the contact. Therefore, if this policy moves forward it will need to be re-written.

f) IT Policies Group (D. Lane)
- chaired by Donna Pogroszewski
- discuss IT policies on campus
- If you are interested in serving on this committee, please let M. Ernsthausen know as soon as possible.

g) Upcoming important Faculty Senate dates:
 SCAA Open Forums: 2/17 5-100
 Town Hall Meetings: DCC 2/22 noon-1:00 TBD Brighton: 2/25 – noon – 1:00 Monroe A.
 Social Lunch will be re-scheduled
 What's on your mind?:
  ATC: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 from noon -1:00 in Room 104
  DCC: Wednesday, March 2, 2016 from noon – 1:00 in Community Room 4193
  Brighton: Friday, March 4, 2016 from noon – 1:00 in Lecture Hall 5-100
 Next Faculty Senate meeting: March 3, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in Monroe B

h) College Judicial Board
 A. Greer is looking for volunteers for the College Judicial Board

3. **Student Announcements**
No announcements.

4. **Minutes from the January 28, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting**
   Discussion: J. Hill stated she would like to clarify some information President Kress gave at the January 28, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting regarding the following section on page 2 of the Minutes: "J. Hill asked if there are plans to compare data from the Greatest Colleges to Work for Survey to prior year's results. President Kress explained this is the first time MCC is participating in this type of survey. The results will be compared over time and also to other colleges. She gave examples of what the survey will be measuring but encouraged Senators to review more information and sample questions about the survey online."
   J. Hill stated after several emails with M. Fingar she confirmed the study is the same Greatest Colleges to Work for Survey MCC participated in during 2011 with the same questions.
   Minutes approved.

5. **Action Items:**
   Curriculum Committee:
       E. Putnam presented the following curriculum proposals:
           3 Program Revisions:

2015-PR11-Fall AS	Information Technology
2015-PR23-Fall AAS	Public Safety Communications
2015-PR25-Fall AAS	Accounting: General

       Motion to approve the above curriculum proposals.
       No further discussion.
       Motion passes.

6. **Future Action Items (vote at the March 3, 2016 Faculty Senate Meeting)**
   E. Putnam presented the following reports. H. Murphy will send out the full reports after the meeting to Senators to share with their constituents.
   a) Diversity & Diverse Perspectives Infused Competencies Report
   b) Infused Competencies Report for Critical Thinking

7. **Standing Committee Reports**
   In order to allow more time for discussion during the meeting the standing committee chairs submitted their reports for Senators to review prior to the meeting. Questions and/or comments were taken regarding the following reports, as noted. NOTE: Due to the change in the Faculty Senate meeting schedule not all standing committees will have a report at each meeting.

   <u>**Curriculum (E. Putnam)**</u>
   - The Curriculum Committee has given final approval to:
     Diversity & Diverse Perspectives Infused Competency Report
     1 Program Revision:

2015-PR11-Fall	AS	Information Technology

     1 Course Learning Outcome Revision:

2015-CO32-Fall	ELT 130	System Electricity

   - The Curriculum Committee has posted for faculty review until 2/9/16:
     2 Program Revisions:

2015-PR23-Fall	AAS	Public Safety Communications
2015-PR25-Fall	AAS	Accounting: General

     5 Course Revisions:

2015-CR68-Fall	MTH 230	Linear Algebra
2015-CR71-Fall	ENG 113	Introduction to Creative Writing
2015-CR69-Fall	FPT 215	Hazardous Materials Technician
2015-CR66-Fall	FPT 220	Fire Officer 1
2015-CR67-Fall	HMN 101	Humanities: Experiencing Culture

     2 Course Deactivations:

2015-CD46-Fall	GEO 133	Ancient Life

2015-CD47-Fall	GEO 201	Invertebrate Paleontology

- The Curriculum Committee has posted for faculty review until 2/16/16:

1 Program Revision:

2015-PR24-Fall	AAS	Applied Integrated Technology

2 Course Revisions:

2015-CR76-Fall	GEO 295	Field Studies in the Geosciences
2015-CR70-Fall	FPT 111	Firefighter I

NEG (M. Heel):
- He encouraged Senators and constituents to cast their vote for the proposed revisions to the Faculty Senate Bylaws. The deadline is February 26, 2016. There will need to be a 2/3 majority of those voting for the proposed revisions to pass.

Planning (K. Farrell on behalf of P. Emerick):
- The Committee will begin reviewing applications for the Strategic Planning Grants. There are approximately 20 applicants.

SCAA (A. Flatley):
- There are two open searches: CIO and Director of Grants. The Title IX search is complete and there will be an announcement shortly.
- There will be three new Dean searches soon.
- Input and feedback is needed on the proposed Division Reorganizations. She asked Senators to encourage their constituents to attend the open forums and Town Hall meetings. There will be an online survey if someone is unable to attend the open forums.
Discussion:
- A. Knebel stated he has had several faculty members suggest Deans should not be replaced allowing more lines for new faculty members. He asked if the Town Hall meetings would be the place to have the faculty discuss this idea. A. Flatley stated this is not part of the proposed reorganization and there are concerns that Deans are not being replaced even though they are a very important part of the current structure. A. Knebel agrees they are important part of the current structure but not a clear part of the proposed reorganization. M. Ernsthausen suggested that faculty members attend the town hall meeting or forward their suggestions to SCAA.
- B. Gizzi suggested faculty attended both the Open Forums (to give their input for SCAA report) and the Town Hall meetings (to ask any questions of the proposers).

8. **Discussion Items**
   a) Drug and Alcohol Prevention Policy & Drug Free Workplace Policy (Draft)
   b) Use of College Technology Policy and Security Awareness and Education Policy (Draft)
   Discussion:
   - L. Pierce read a statement on behalf of the English/Philosophy department giving feedback regarding the above listed policies. There was discussion and suggestions regarding the statement and subsequently it was retracted and a revised statement was submitted as follows
   "1. The Cyber-Security Policy. The Department is uncomfortable with enforced annual testing and the possibility of punitive measures for either not complying with the policy or complying with it and failing the test. We are also concerned that this policy seems to have emerged suddenly and without appropriate transparency or discussion at all levels of shared faculty governance. This latter concern is tied directly to another issue that we discussed."
   2. The Drug-Free Policy. While the Department is confident that bodies of shared governance will address concerns about the language of this policy, the way it has emerged is one of many recent instances in which matters of policy are brought to Senate leaders without the appropriate time to cascade them to their constituents for feedback before voting commences."
   - B. Grindle addressed the following concerns:
     - Different writing styles and format in the Drug-Free Workplace Policy and the Drug and Alcohol Prevention Policy.
     - Use of the word "Compliance" in Item 2B of Drug-Free Workplace Policy

- There was concern the Drug-Free Workplace policy omits tobacco. M. Ernsthausen believes it was because there is a separate policy addressing tobacco but he will express this concern to M. Fingar.
- There was discussion clarifying the BOT review process for all four policies. M. Ernsthausen stated all 4 polices have been presented to the BOT for a first read at the last meeting. The BOT have until their next meeting in March to ask questions and review the policies. The BOT will then have a second read at its March meeting and the policies can then be voted on. The Drug-Free Policy and Drug & Alcohol Prevention Policy will go for the second read at the next meeting. The second read will include input and updates from the shared governance groups.
- T. Leuzzi asked for the FAs position on the Drug-Free Workplace Policy. B. Gizzi stated the FA Council members have discussed the policy and the changes. It was agreed the re-written policy has significantly improved and they agreed to settle for the re-written version but will not actively endorse it. The FA continues to have concerns over its involvement in the process, providing feedback on the proposed policies but nothing is done with the feedback they provided, explaining the FA is not included in the College's definition of shared governance. She later explained the process currently used for the FA to give feedback on policies.
- Shared Governance: There was a discussion regarding MCCs definition of shared governance. M. Ernsthausen clarified the BOT, Administration, Faculty Senate, Support Staff Professional Development and Planning Council and Student Governments are the recognized members of shared governance at MCC as outlined in the Shared Governance Policy. He stated when the Shared Governance Committee discussed forming a Coordinating Council, the FA was excluded however, he made it clear the FA/CSEA should have a place on the Council otherwise the FS will not be a member either.
- L. Pierce asked for clarification on Shared Governance and the Coordinating Council. M. Ernsthausen explained the Coordinating Council is still being finalized but it will incorporate what is seen as shared governance on campus with the intent of improving communication between groups.
- L. Pierce clarified when the English/Philosophy Department discussed shared governance they are including FA among the other groups (administration, student, FS, CSEA) in their definition not referring to the Coordinating Council.
- T. Leuzzi asked who opposed having the FA included in the Coordinating Council. M. Ernsthausen responded it was administration. There was additional discussion regarding SUNY's definition of shared governance (which excludes the unions) as well as comments regarding the FS and FA having the same constituency but representing faculty in different roles.
- There was discussion regarding MCC's Shared Governance Policy, which lists the members and framework for the Shared Governance Committee. M. Ernsthausen explained since September, B. Gizzi and T. Vinci have been added to his EC distribution list and receive proposed policies and correspondence when he does. Prior to this time he was also under the impression the FA was included in the process. B. Gizzi explained she has been receiving the policies consistently since September and works with the FS. FA does not have a formal way of providing its feedback on proposed policies other than through their contract administration meetings with M. Fingar (or sent to her in writing). The FA does not have the ability to speak in front of the BOT unless it is at an open forum.
- M. Heel clarified the process by which the EC receives and comments on proposed policies. Explaining that if the EC were involved from the beginning of the process on any policy it would be reported to Senators at Faculty Senate meetings. Pointing out the FS has not been invited to assist in the drafting process but to only review already constructed policies.
- J. Salsburg-Taylor on behalf of her constituents gave the following feedback and concerns on the technology policies:
  - there is a heavy handed feel to the policy
  - inconsistent wording/writing style
  - a non-collaborative spirit of the policies
  - length of time of training
  - the department took issue with the "no expectation of privacy" clause. M. Ernsthausen explained anything stored on the M drive is searchable, however this would only happen when there is an investigation. Administrator needs access for these types of situations. B. Wagner gave an example of a situation when the M drive will be searched.

- J. Salsburg-Taylor then requested the FS not support the current version of the policies and not settle for this version. M. Ernsthausen stated he would support any motion the FS would like to put forth. However, he believes there is more issue with the process than the revised documents. B. Gizzi stated any policy approved by the BOT cannot supersede or just contradict the contract, and this is the language the FA is looking for in a policy as well as acknowledgement that there is a contract. She explained although she may not be completely satisfied with a policy she is satisfied that if there is an issue the contract is the governing document.
- There was a discussion regarding the lack of any reference to prescription drugs in the Drug-Free Workplace policy. However, the policy references the use of "illegal drugs" vs "legal drugs" which may address this issue. M. Ernsthausen will ask for clarification on any language related to prescription drugs.

9. **Old Business**
J. Hill asked for an update on the Faculty Senate Resolutions 5.0 and 5.2 passed by the Faculty Senate in the spring 2015. M. Ernsthausen stated there was a minor wording issue and the changes were agreed to by SCAA and Administration. He is still waiting for the updated memo from the Provost, however she indicated yesterday he should have the updated memo by the end of the week. The Faculty Senate Resolutions will then be updated to reflect the change.

10. **New Business**
a) B. Grindle updated Senators on the new housekeeping protocols and cleaning methods based on results of a study completed for MCC by Hillyard Chemical. The cleaning staff has lost good people for various reasons and re-filling those slots has been challenging. To address this problem, Facilities are in the process of instituting a new cleaning system on campus. This new cleaning system is a result of the need to re-engineer our cleaning services to meet the realities of frozen budgets due to enrollment drops. B. Grindle explained and summarized the study and the process Hillyard Chemical used to determine the system including an inventory of all the cleanable spaces on campus. Another factor in the study is to determine the level of clean which is established by two (2) organizations: APPA and the ISSA-The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association which developed the following standards for 5 levels of cleaning:

ISSA	APPA
Level 1 Spotless and Sanitary in all areas	Exceptional - Orderly spotlessness
Level 2 Tidy and Sanitary in most areas	Exceeds Standard -Ordinary Tidiness
Level 3 Orderly and Sanitary in critical areas	Meets Standard - Casual Inattention
Level 4 Noticeable soiling, sanitary in most critical areas	Marginal - Moderate Dinginess
Level 5 Noticeable neglect, questionable sanitary conditions exist.	Unacceptable - Unkempt neglect

He further explained in discussions with management, it was decided to attain a minimum of level 3 across campus, which would require 58.2 full time cleaners but there are only 37 budgeted. To close the gap there is re-training, reassigning routes, creating special routes with dedicated equipment and investing in new, current standard equipment that will allow them to meet the standard with 37 people. He pointed out the new equipment is renewable and green. He explained the gradual conversion process beginning in the north and south end of campus. There will also be some changes such as the whiteboards will not be cleaned daily, concentration will be in restrooms and eating areas. He asked for Senators to share this information with their constituents.
Questions:
- J. Mahar stated some faculty do want the white boards cleaned each day and suggested having cleaner available in the classroom so they can do it themselves. B. Grindle stated this has been discussed and they are looking into it.
b) J. Salsburg-Taylor on behalf of her constituents asked the following question. She stated President Kress placed the reorganization on hold from several years ago until the current proposed reorganization could be finalized and the job descriptions completed. She is asking for an update on the job descriptions. M. Ernsthausen stated the Job Description Ad Hoc committee has worked through the Vice Presidents and Assistant Vice President job descriptions. The Committee is currently working on Assistant to President and Dean positions. He stated in a recent discussion with

the Provost he suggested the President withdraw the original reorganization proposal. There was discussion regarding the Dean positions as outlined in the proposed division reorganizations.

c) J. Salsburg-Taylor asked what the Faculty Senate could do to return to a more collaborative and inclusive practice for reviewing policies. M. Ernsthausen stated he would discuss this issue at the next Executive Committee meeting.

d) J. Salsburg-Taylor suggested the Faculty Senate discuss revising the Shared Governance Policy. M. Ernsthausen stated the Faculty Senate could not update the policy on its own. However, this Policy will be up for its 3-year review cycle in summer 2017. The Faculty Senate could then make suggestions for revisions to the Policy.

Meeting adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Ernsthausen   Heather Murphy
President   Secretary
Faculty Senate   Executive Committee Secretary

Minutes approved at March 3, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting.