



# Faculty Senate

Monroe Community College

**Faculty Senate Meeting  
May 14, 2015**

**PRESENT:** M. Bates, S. Broberg, L. Carson, J. Chakravarthy, K. Chin, N. Christensen, A. Colosimo, T. Conte, P. Emerick, M. Ernsthausen, R. Fischer, H. Fox, K. Mooney-Graves, D. Henneberg, R. Horwitz, A. Hughes, A. Knebel, J. Kucich, E. Lanzafame, T. Leuzzi, J. Mahar, J. McPhee, K. Morris, H. Murphy, J. Oriel, P. Peterson, L. Pierce, E. Putnam, C. Rapp, M. Redlo, K. Rodriguez, R. Rodriguez, J. Scanlon, T. Schichler, K. Tierney, M. Timmons, J. Waasdorp, A. Wahba, R. Watson, H. Williams, J. Wilson

**ABSENT:** B. Babcock, S. Farrington, G. Fazekas, D. Gasbarre, M. Heel, D. Miller, D. Navarro, P. Oettinger, L. Zion-Stratton, G. Thompson

**GUESTS:** V. Avalone, S. Baker, J. Bartkovich, M. Fine, C. Fogal, B. Gizzi, J. Hill, L. Holmes, A. Leopard, K. Love, D. Mueller, H. Preische, N. Primo, D. Quatro, J. Tsai, T. Vinci, M. Witz, A. Zamiara

**Meeting called to order: 3:31 p.m.**

**1. Guest Speakers:**

Dr. Holmes began by explaining his 20+ years of experience dealing with student conduct. He was surprised to learn MCC does not currently have a clear, explainable complaint process, which would ensure students' rights to due process. As a result, he charged his staff with creating a new student handbook outlining the code of conduct.

Dr. Holmes reviewed the student handbook, which includes mandated federal and SUNY language/information, changes to the General Conduct Rules and Regulations section, a thorough Appeal from Disciplinary Sanctions process, and a flowchart outlining how a student conduct situation will be handled. He also explained the newly formed Rights and Responsibilities Office would handle educating the faculty and staff of their rights as well as how to handle student behavior concerns while enforcing the process. He also explained there would be FERPA annual notifications and training going forward.

**Questions:**

- E. Putnam addressed the following concerns and/or questions from her constituents in the Mathematics Department:

(1) E. Putnam stated there are strong concerns regarding the process and the lack of support for faculty to parallel the student support. Will the ombudsman role (currently held by Kristen Love) be eliminated or combined with the Code of Conduct Official (CCO)? Dr. Holmes stated when creating the Office of Rights of Responsibilities, it would not be an appropriate practice to combine the two (2) roles and it was never his intention to do so. He pointed out the ombudsman position needs to be an advocate and provide support in the disciplinary role.

(2) E. Putnam asked Dr. Holmes to provide more information about the Code of Conduct Official including the hiring process, job description and training/skills. Dr. Holmes stated SCAA asked him in their response to the proposed Student Service Reorganization for his plans for filling the position. He stated he has been transparent from the beginning and will continue to respect the process as outlined by the Faculty Senate. He will follow the search guidelines and the hiring process for the Director position, however he plans to have the office in place by fall 2015 so there may be a need to fill the position temporarily.

3) E. Putnam stated a constituent heard from President Kress the Deans would be serving as faculty advocates. The constituent is strongly against this idea, pointing out there is a conflict of interest since the Deans are also part of the student grievance process. E. Putnam asked if Dr. Holmes could comment on this. Dr. Holmes first pointed out the student academic process is not included in the Student Handbook since he believes Students Services should not be part of the academic process. He further explained that Academic Deans at MCC play a significantly different role than he is accustomed to at other institutions.

He stated in his experience Student Services partners with Academic Services to ensure there is support and the Academic Deans do play a role in the process. However, when creating this system there have been discussions with Vice Presidents, as well as HR and the TCC, about a support system and what it looks like. He stated along with having these discussion it's important to have a clear and understandable process in place by the fall 2015 since the process cannot be changed midyear.

(4) E. Putnam stated there are several links in the document, which are not working. Dr. Holmes stated the version forwarded to Senators has been revised to address any grammatical and typographical errors.

- M. Ernsthausen addressed the following concerns received from a constituent. He stated there is concern regarding the seemingly intentionally vague language contained within the small section on responsibilities, namely, "respect." This should not be subjective; and Dr. Holmes should consider providing a definition, no matter how broad. Dr. Holmes stated the Board of Trustees approved the language in the last version of the handbook. However, it may be difficult to define "respect" agreeing it is subjective; therefore, it may be a term that is removed.
- M. Ernsthausen expressed a concern from a constituent regarding the limited emphasis on responsibility, especially as it relates to classroom management and the options available to instructors concerning students who are disruptive to the educational process. Dr. Holmes stated this is a student code of conduct issue and he believes there are processes in place for dealing with classroom management. He further stated the importance of continuing to have discussions with the TCC in order to educate faculty on how to handle situations in the classroom with support by the code of conduct. He also would recommend adding the academic process to the student handbook and encouraged the Faculty Senate to review the process. He reiterated he did not review academic processes since he does not have the authority as VP of Student Services. M. Ernsthausen stated he believes the comment is addressing when there are "rights" there are normally "responsibilities" to go with the "rights." He pointed out there is a long list of "rights", however the "responsibilities" listed do not address that the student really needs to listen to the Professor and abide by the Course Information Sheet. M. Ernsthausen asked if there were any thoughts about including this in the Student Handbook. Dr. Holmes stated this would not be included in the Student Handbook. He explained there are policies within the handbook, which would address the issue as a whole. He gave the example of the Failure to Comply Policy, not included in the previous version of the Code of Conduct, which could be used in this circumstance. Also, he stated they reviewed at least 20 different code of conduct policies from other institutions to ensure the MCC Student Handbook was in line with other institutions and meeting national and international standards
- R. Horwitz stated a constituent has concerns regarding splitting the catalog and the student handbook. It is believed the catalog is a contract and the student handbook is not, therefore why would students have to comply with anything in it. Dr. Holmes stated the student will definitely have to follow the student handbook. He explained if a student comes to MCC under a certain catalog she/he then graduates under that catalog however, if a student comes in under a certain version of the handbook and it changes the next year, the student is required to follow the current Student Handbook. The Student Handbook is not a contract but when a student is accepted into College, they agree to abide by the policies.
- M. Timmons asked if the Student Handbook would be searchable from the College website. Dr. Holmes confirmed he has asked for it to be in searchable form.
- N. Primo asked for clarification on the Judicial Board representation at Judicial Board Hearings. Dr. Holmes stated there would always be 6 members of the Judicial Board represented during a hearing (5 members and 1 chair). He further explained there would be a total of 10 Judicial Board members, therefore, at any given time there should be 6 people available to serve at a Judicial Board Hearing.

Each of the 10 members will be given the necessary training to understand the laws and the judicial process. N. Primo asked if the Judicial Board representation at a hearing could potentially be four (4) students and one (1) Faculty Association member. Dr. Holmes stated he would hope that wouldn't be the case, however it is important to remember each individual Judicial Board member will have the same level of training and authority, capable of making informed decisions. The Office of Rights and Responsibilities will be responsible for contacting the board members for upcoming hearings; however, it will not be a requirement there be an equal distribution of FA, CSEA and/or student members.

- R. Rodriguez asked if Dr. Holmes received any feedback from students on the Student Handbook. Dr. Holmes confirmed he has met with many students, including student leadership, asking for input and ensuring the Student Handbook is understandable. Dr. Rodriguez stated in a COS course he teaches students are required to do a flow chart of the judicial process, he asked if the flow chart shown at the meeting would be included in the final version of the Student Handbook. Dr. Holmes confirmed the flow chart will be included which he has found will make understanding the process easier. He also stated there will be notifications and forms sent to students to inform them about upcoming hearings to ensure they understand the steps in the process.

- A Senator asked if students sign acknowledging the Student Handbook upon entering the College. Dr. Holmes stated when students sign their application to the College they are acknowledging they will abide by the rules outline in the Student Handbook. He stated there is specific information that is required to be sent to students yearly so he has asked that a link to the Student Handbook be included in the documents. They will also be creating a small card to be distributed to students, which will include the academic calendar and a link to the student handbook.

- A Senator asked if there is a timeline for evaluating this process going forward. Dr. Holmes stated he feels it's very important the Student Handbook be evaluated and updated on a yearly basis.

## 2. **Announcements**

No announcements.

## 3. **Student Announcements**

M. Ernsthause stated there was an election for the SEGA President and Vice President and encouraged faculty to stop by the SEGA office to meet the newly elected leadership.

4. The Minutes from the April 16, 2015 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

## 5. **Action Items:**

a) E. Putnam presented the following Curriculum Action items for approval.

3 Program Revisions:

2015-PR9-Spring	Cert	Homeland Security
2015-PR12-Spring	Cert	Hotel Management
2015-PR8-Spring	AAS	Construction Technology

1 Program Deactivation:

2015-PD2-Spring	AS	Liberal Arts and Sciences - General Studies - Landscape Architecture Advisement Sequence
-----------------	----	---

**Passed.**

b) J. Mahar presented on behalf of Academic Policies the Proposed Faculty Senate Resolution 1.2.1 Prior Learning Credits.

J. Mahar began by addressing the following questions he received from constituents prior to the meeting:

- As stated in the proposal "(4) MCC Departmental Exams. Credit is applied according to actual grade assigned by the department." Why is this allowed? J. Mahar stated it is allowed since faculty are experts in their field and some departments like to prepare departmental exams reflecting course objectives and learning outcomes.

- Is this a new policy or a revision to a prior policy? J. Mahar stated this is a significant revision to the current PLA policy (Faculty Senate Resolution 1.2.1). He reviewed the changes.

*Questions:*

- K. Mooney-Graves suggested the following grammatical changes:
    - (1) It should read "Applied Technologies Center" and "Economic Development and Innovative Workforce Services" under Items 1.2.1(5).
    - (2) 1.2.1 (6)(h) Replace the word "current" with "active".
 J. Mahar stated since this is wordsmithing he will make the changes as stated above in the final version.
  - M. Witz asked for the rationale for the following 1.2.1(6)(a) "Students who have matriculated into a degree program, and are 25 years of age or older with at least three to five years of work experience." J. Mahar stated the PLA Ad Hoc Committee determined through its researched 25 years of age is the average age used in standard PLA literature. It also more probable that students have prior learning and life experiences by this age; however, the wording could be reexamined. H. Williams pointed out military students may not be able to meet the 25 year old threshold and agreed it may need to be reexamined.
  - A Senator asked for clarification regarding 1.2.1(6) "Portfolio Credit is a recommended method for A.A.S programs." J. Mahar stated this statement is geared toward AAS programs, which are typically non-transfer (i.e. Automotive and HVAC programs). He further clarified these are not required but departments can choose to use any of the methods outlined.
  - A Senator asked for clarification regarding 1.2.1(6)(c) "Individual academic departments will determine which courses are available for portfolio assessment," further asking if this is something already being done by departments. J. Mahar confirmed this is being done, giving examples of several Criminal Justice programs. J. Mahar confirmed the policy is to update the current policy and process.
  - P. Emerick asked if the language regarding military students in the proposal would superseded the 25 year old age requirement discussed earlier. M. Bates gave more information on how DOD transcripts are evaluated and transfer credits applied.
- Motion:* K. Mooney-Graves made a motion to amend 1.2.1(6)(a) to read as follows: "Students who have matriculated into a degree program, and ~~are 25 years of age or older~~ with at least three to five years of work experience."
- Motion seconded.*
- Discussion:* There was additional discussion and clarification regarding the rationale for the age limit.
- Motion passes.*
- Vote:* There was a vote to approve Faculty Senate Resolution 1.2.1 as amended. **Passes.**

c) MCC General Education Plan: Learning Outcomes and High Impact Practices

M. Ernsthause began by explaining that the Faculty Senate agreed at the April meeting to have two separate votes for the MCC General Education Plan: Learning Outcomes and High Impact Practices

(1) Learning Outcomes

*Discussion:*

- M. Redlo asked for confirmation the Learning Outcomes outlined in the proposed General Ed Plan would be replacing the list on Page 65 of the catalog. M. Ernsthause agreed this would be the Faculty Senate's recommendation if it passes.

- E. Putnam asked if the proposed Learning Outcomes are voted down could there be opportunities to suggest revisions so the College could continue on a path of outcomes based General Education. M. Ernsthause stated it could be done however, a committee would need to be charged with this task.

- A Senator stated she has concern with the discipline-based language, which goes against tradition and she believes weakens MCC's general education.

*Vote:* There was a vote to approve the twelve (12) Learning Outcomes as written. **Passes.**

(2) High Impact Practices also referred to as Enhanced Learning Outcomes (ELOs)

*Discussion:*

- K. Mooney-Graves stated she has concerns, giving examples why it would be difficult to require three (3) writing intensive (WI) courses in ATC and much of CTE programs (AAS degrees). She agreed two (2) WI courses would be more feasible.

- L. Pierce stated she would have liked to see examples from several disciplines how three (3) WI courses would fit into the curriculum. M. Ernsthause gave examples using an engineering

program. A. Knebel stated after extensive discussions his department is opposed to the three (3) WI requirement.

- T. Leuzzi stated WI requirements should come from other course (not just English courses) and teaching writing should be the responsibility of the entire college. He sees only one department being responsible for teaching writing at the college problematic especially when students are often exposed early in their programs, writing skills improve with more exposure. He also finds it concerning programs do not offer more writing intensive courses within their curriculum. He understands there are other issues mentioned through FA however, the major issue is getting more writing intensive courses in other areas. M. Ernsthausen agreed writing is different from discipline to discipline.

- H. Williams asked B. Gizzi for FA's position on the 3 WI requirement. B. Gizzi stated the FA does not support a requirement of ELOs.

- C. Rapp expressed a concern from one of her constituents who believes it would very difficult to keep track of HIPS for each student and ensure they have met the requirements before graduation.

- M. Redlo stated this would also create master schedule and budget issues. He explained not knowing how courses with HIPS requirements would be addressed, it may open up a potential for preferential treatment for HIPS designated courses, forcing faculty to teach certain ways in order to support HIPS practices. He expressed concerns about what and how teaching practices are defined as HIPS. He does not support HIPS practices.

- A Senator expressed concerns regarding how this will impact Financial Aid for students. It may be difficult for students to find FACE compliant courses to fit into their degree requirements creating a barrier and financial problems for students.

*Vote:* There was a vote to approve the High Impact Practices as written. **Failed.**

#### **6. Future Action Item (Vote in June):**

M. Bates presented on behalf of SCAA the proposed amendments to Faculty Senate Resolutions 5.0 & 5.2. He reviewed the proposal explaining the changes address the vagueness of the language and give more clear guidelines while protecting the process. There will be a vote to approve the changes at the June Faculty Senate meeting.

#### **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.

##### **Academic Policies (J. Mahar)**

J. Mahar reports the following:

- Prior Learning Assessment Committee proposal for modifications to Resolution 1.2.1 – May Vote at Full Senate

- Discussion of Electronic Distribution of Course Information Sheets – The Committee decided that if the Course Information Sheet is to be distributed electronically, the Official Communication Policy of the College requires it to be distributed via either MCC email, MCC Website, BANNER, or Blackboard. This is because the Course Information Sheet is an official communication required by the college.

- Review of Academic Grievance Procedure (Resolution 1.9)

##### **Curriculum (E. Putnam)**

E. Putnam reports the following:

- The Curriculum Committee has given final approval to:

2 Program Revisions:

2015-PR9-Spring	Cert	Homeland Security
2015-PR12-Spring	Cert	Hotel Management

1 Program Deactivation:

2015-PD2-Spring	AS	Liberal Arts and Sciences - General Studies - Landscape Architecture Advisement Sequence
-----------------	----	--

**5 Course Revisions:**

2014-CR37-Fall	PSY 222	Social Psychology of the Holocaust
2014-CR64-Fall	ATP 171	General (A-TAP) Automotive Co-op I
2014-CR65-Fall	ATP 172	General (A-TAP) Automotive Co-op II
2014-CR66-Fall	ATP 173	General (A-TAP) Automotive Co-op III
2014-CR67-Fall	ATP 174	General (A-TAP) Automotive Co-op IV

**22 Course Learning Outcome Revisions:**

2015-CO4-Spring	ATP 101	Introduction to Automotive Technology
2015-CO5-Spring	ATP 102	Electrical/Electronic Systems 1 - Automotive
2015-CO6-Spring	ATP 103	Electrical 2 - Automotive
2015-CO7-Spring	ATP 104	Emission Controls, Computer and Fuel Systems I
2015-CO8-Spring	ATP 105	Brakes – Automotive
2015-CO14-Spring	ATP 171	Work Experience
2015-CO15-Spring	ATP 172	Work Experience
2015-CO16-Spring	ATP 173	Work Experience
2015-CO17-Spring	ATP 174	Work Experience
2015-CO18-Spring	ECE 251	Family and Culture
2015-CO27-Spring	ECE 252	Designing Environments and Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers
2015-CO25-Spring	EDU 150	Performance and Presentation Skills for Educators
2015-CO44-Spring	ATP 141	Automotive Technology-Coop I
2015-CO45-Spring	ATP 142	Automotive Technology-Coop II
2015-CO46-Spring	ATP 143	Automotive Technology-Coop III
2015-CO47-Spring	ATP 144	Automotive Technology-Coop IV
2015-CO35-Spring	ECE 200	Developing Early Literacy
2015-CO26-Spring	ECE 253	Professionalism in Early Care and Education
2015-CO33-Spring	MTH 104	Intermediate Algebra
2015-CO34-Spring	MTH 212	Calculus III
2015-CO39-Spring	HIM 205	Professional Practice Experience I-WR
2015-CO42-Spring	HIM 208	Quality Improvement, Legal and Compliance Issues for the HIM Practitioner

- The Curriculum Committee has posted for faculty review until 5/12/15:

**3 New Courses:**

2015-NC6-Spring	ATP 114	Toyota (T-TEN) Automotive Co-op I
2015-NC4-Spring	ELT 234	Advanced Programmable Logic Controllers
2015-NC5-Spring	ELT 231	System Control Electronics

**4 Course Revisions:**

2015-CR52-Spring	ATP 141	Automotive Technology-Coop I
2015-CR53-Spring	ATP 142	Automotive Technology-Coop II
2015-CR54-Spring	ATP 143	Automotive Technology-Coop III
2015-CR55-Spring	ATP 144	Automotive Technology-Coop IV

**1 Program Revision:**

2015-PR8-Spring	AAS	Construction Technology
-----------------	-----	-------------------------

- The Curriculum Committee has posted for faculty review until 5/19/15:

**3 Course Revisions:**

2015-CR57-Spring	ACC 101	Accounting Principles I
2015-CR58-Spring	ACC 110	Fundamentals of Accounting I
2015-CR59-Spring	ACC 130	Introductory Accounting and Financial Analysis

**1 Program Revision:**

2015-PR11-Spring	AAS	Nursing
------------------	-----	---------

**NEG (M. Heel)**

M. Heel reports the following:

- Senator elections in some departments/areas are still ongoing, but will be finalized and announced at the June FS meeting.

*Additional comments:* N. Christensen announced the following results for the Faculty Senate Officer Election: Mark Ernsthause (President), Mitch Redlo (Vice President) and Teresa Schichler (Secretary). M. Ernsthause pointed out there was a 35% turn out for the electronic vote which is a great improvement from past years.

**Planning (M. Redlo)**

M. Redlo reports the following:

- The Academies Steering Committee has completed the "thought" process and is now entering the implementation stage of the model. The Sustainability Committee had several successful activities during Earth Day. Both of these groups will be having various Professional Development activities during the week of June 8th.

**Professional Development (H. Williams)**

H. Williams reports the following:

- The committee will be posting the final schedule, with RSVP info, for the June Professional Development Week in the Trib in the next few days.
- The committee is also finalizing all Faculty Senate Orientation materials, in collaboration with all the committee Chairpersons and by drawing from various campus resources. Waiting for election results for the final piece of the puzzle. While required for all newly elected Senators, the Orientation will be open to anyone currently serving, as well as anyone interested/considering serving in the future.

*Additional comments:* H. Williams encouraged constituents to RSVP to events as stated in the information in the program in the Trib announcement. She stated everyone is welcome to attend the Senator orientation (new, current, future Senators).

**SCAA (M. Bates)**

M. Bates reports the following:

- SCAA has been working updating our bylaws – mainly focusing on administrative proposals and search committee processes.
- Changes to Resolutions 5.0 and 5.2.2 were presented at the May Faculty Senate meeting and will be voted on in June.
- SCAA received reorganization proposal from Vice-Presidents Holmes and Oldham to change the reporting of Campus Events from Student Services to EDIWS.

*Additional comments:* M. Bates stated Senators would receive the reorganization proposal to forward to their constituents. Feedback and/or questions should be forwarded to a SCAA member by Friday, May 22, 2015.

**8. Old Business:**

There was no old business discussed.

**9. New Business:**

M. Ernsthause stated he is hearing from constituents they are not receiving information from the Faculty Senate. He reminded Senators to share the Faculty Senate Meeting Summary and continue to keep their constituents informed of Faculty Senate business.

**Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Ernsthause  
President  
Faculty Senate



Teresa Schichler  
Secretary  
Faculty Senate

**Minutes approved at the June 25, 2015 Special Faculty Senate meeting.**