



Faculty Senate

Monroe Community College

**Special Faculty Senate Meeting
June 25, 2015**

PRESENT: M. Bates, S. Broberg, L. Carson, K. Chin, N. Christensen, A. Conte, P. Emerick, M. Ernsthausen, S. Farrington, G. Fazekas, R. Fisher, H. Fox, K. Mooney-Graves, M. Heel, D. Henneberg, R. Horwitz, J. Kucich, T. Leuzzi, J. Mahar, J. McPhee, K. Morris, H. Murphy, P. Oettinger, J. Oriel, L. Pierce, E. Putnam, M. Redlo, R. Rodriguez, J. Scanlon, T. Schichler, K. Tierney, J. Waasdorp, A. Wahba, R. Watson, H. Williams, J. Wilson
ABSENT: R. Babcock, J. Chakravarthy, D. Gasbarre, A. Hughes, A. Knebel, E. Lanzafame, D. Miller, D. Navarro, P. Peterson, C. Rapp, K. Rodriguez, Liz Zion Stratton, M. Timmons
GUESTS: S. Baker, J. Bartkovich, M. Dorsey, C. Fogal, B. Davies, H. Preische, E. West, T. Vinci

Meeting called to order: 1:05 p.m.

1. Announcements:

M. Ernsthausen thanked Senators for attending. He explained the special meeting was necessary in order to vote on action items on the agenda at the June Faculty Senate meeting, which could not be voted on due to the lack of quorum.

2. The Minutes from the May 14, 2015 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

3. Action Items:

a) Curriculum Proposals:

E. Putnam made a motion to approve the following Curriculum Proposals:

Curriculum: 5 Program Revisions:

2015-PR3-Spring	AAS	Precision Machining
2014-PR4-Fall	Cert	Precision Machining - Optical Fabrication
2015-PR8-Spring	AAS	Construction Technology
2015-PR11-Spring	AAS	Nursing
2014-PR13-Spring	AAS	Design (Fashion): Interior Design

Motion passed.

b) SCAA: Faculty Senate Resolutions 5.0 & 5.2

M. Bates presented and reviewed the proposed changes as shown in Exhibit "A" attached.

Discussion:

- L. Carson stated there are concerns some of the changes are weakening SCAA's ability to suggest changes and make its own recommendation. M. Bates stated the language gives SCAA the ability to run a parallel and separate search, with its own grid, interviewing questions etc. If SCAA members feel they are not given the opportunity to add their own interviewing questions, grid etc. during a combined search this language allows SCAA to run a parallel search.

- L. Pierce expressed a concern with the use of the words "reasonable timeframe". Pointing out the wording does not give SCAA any control of the timeframe for searches, giving one example of SCAA's extensive work during the summer months on the search for Vice President of Student Services. M. Bates explained there is a memo from 2007 regarding SCAA, which called for a protocol for searches, addressing this issue. The proposed changes follow the recommendation outlined in the memo and give SCAA the opportunity to work with administration on the timeframe. Further explaining, with this proposal holidays, breaks, snow days etc. are not included in the five (5) weeks.

Motion to approve the proposed changes as outlined in Exhibit "A".

Motion passed.

c) Proposed Education Initiatives and Advocacy Committee (EIAC)

M. Ernsthause stated C. Fogal will chair EIAC and report to the Executive Committee. He presented the following information:

Charge

- To collaborate with FCCC and MCC's shared governance partners to identify strategic areas of concern related to the interests of faculty, staff and students
- To attempt to anticipate areas of concern/policy trends to avoid the pattern of/need for reactive efforts
- To communicate and disseminate information regarding state, regional and local educational initiatives and opportunities for advocacy to FS membership and shared governance partners
- To coordinate and collaborate with MCC's shared governance partners in order to draft timely, research-based position statements and resolution proposals, to be considered by/voted on by the Faculty Senate and its shared governance partners, as necessary

Members

- FCCC MCC representative; EIAC Chairperson
- FA representative
- CSEA representative (?)
- SGA representative
- # of FS Senators

Recommended Practice

- Meet a minimum of biweekly, and additionally as needed
- Include FA Legislative representatives in EIAC committee meetings
- Send EIAC representative to attend FA Legislative meetings

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Motion to approve the EIAC committee as outlined above.

Motion passed.

d) Proposed Student Affairs Ad Hoc Committee (SA)

M. Heel presented the following information regarding the proposed Student Affairs Ad Hoc committee.

Proposal:

- Faculty Senate approve one-year formation of an "Ad Hoc Student Affairs Committee, effective AY 2015-16,"
- Vote to approve authorizes FS Executive Committee to allocate currently-seated and incoming senators to serve;
- Proposed formation of the committee is provisional, to be evaluated by NEG and the FS Executive Committee throughout 2015-2016.

Membership:

"It shall be the responsibility of this Committee to review policies, processes, and procedures of the College related specifically to student-centered issues and concerns, and to make

recommendations to the Faculty Senate. This may include but not be limited to: policies related to advising, admission, registration, probation, suspension, and student conduct matters. Additionally, matters related to services provided by the MCC Association as they pertain to students may be assigned to this Committee.”

Duties:

It shall be the responsibility of this Committee to review policies, processes, and procedures of the College related specifically to student-centered issues and concerns, and to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate. This may include but not be limited to, policies related to advising, admission, registration, probation, suspension, and student conduct matters. Additionally, matters related to services provided by the MCC Association as they pertain to students may be assigned to this Committee.

Background:

- In fall 2014, NEG charged with reviewing current FS bylaws and resolutions for possible proposals for revision (part of ongoing NEG prescribed duties);
- Review of bylaws revealed weakness in current Senate committee configuration
 - APC currently handles most matters related to students, but from faculty perspective
 - Student Services division VP has no direct connection with Senate on student matters unrelated to faculty
 - Some matters related to students and faculty may require that very different perspectives be represented and considered (hence, APC alone may not be sufficient)

Process:

- NEG Interim Chair presented proposal to FS President, April '15
- FS President opened discussion for proposal to FS Executive Committee, May '15
 - Wording for Membership & Duties proposed
 - EC members suggested revisions
- Ad Hoc Committee included in FS senator preferences, to allow for committee to be staffed by interested senators, June '15

Why a Vote?

- Responsibility for FS Committees is shared
 - EC proposes and staffs committees;
 - FS membership authorizes formation of committees
- The organization and operation of the Faculty Senate is the responsibility of the EC and of sitting senators, and not of the broader community

Discussion:

- M. Fine expressed concern regarding the SA duties. She feels student services will be scrutinized and asked why other divisions who deal with student issues are not referenced, such as public safety, and EDIWS for example. M. Heel replied stating the intent of forming the committee was admittedly unclear. M. Heel stated there are no Faculty Senate committees which serve to oversee administrative units or divisions. He explained the Planning Committee works with Administrative Services; APC and the Curriculum Committee works with Academic Services; therefore, leaving Student Services as the only division without its own access point to the Faculty Senate. He further explained that the original reason for the proposal was to give student centered issues from across the College a place to be handled. M. Heel further stated the proposed SA Ad Hoc Committee is a one-year trial and changes may be necessary after the trial period.

- There were questions asking for clarification on the wording in the proposal. M. Heel explained the language was taken from the actual Academic Policies Committee Duties and Membership. NEG will be reviewing the Faculty Senate Bylaws beginning in the fall in order to revise the outdated across all the committees.

- There was discussion regarding updating the wording for APC Membership and Duties to include SA rather than form a separate committee, along with areas omitted such as public safety, health service, financial aid, EDIWS etc. M. Heel stated this is a one-year trial and

believes there are several issues, which can be reviewed by SA, and APC already has a full agenda.

- J. Mahar explained the EC discussed making the SA a subcommittee of APC similar to the Curriculum Projects Committee however, it was agreed to form a separate committee since APC does not review proposals from a student perspective. There was discussion regarding updating the membership language for SA.
- M. Redlo clarified the process for amending motions.
- There was discussion regarding the wording "may include but not limited to".

M. Heel opened the discussion for amendments to the wording. A made a motion to amend and discuss the wording "This may include but not be limited to, policies related to public safety, health service, financial aid, EDIWS."

Discussion: There was discussion which led to the motion being withdrawn.

H. Williams made a motion to adopt language and/or similar phrases until the Faculty Senate agree as follows: "This may include but not be limited to, policies related to enrollment, academic standing, safety, and wellness."

Discussion: There was discussion, which led to the motion being withdrawn.

H. Williams made a motion to change the phrasing to include but not limited to "This may include but not be limited to, policies related to enrollment, academic standing, safety, wellness, and student conduct matters."

Discussion: There was further discussion.

E. Putnam made a motion to close the discussion on the amendment. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the amended wording as stated above. Motion passed.

Continued Discussion on amended proposal:

- J. Mahar stated the Mathematics Department members are concerned the proposed SA will take power away from the APC. They would like to see the proposal not approved and have the SA be a sub-committee of APC. J. Mahar offered input on the APC workload for the upcoming academic year.

- R. Horwitz appreciated the EC staying current with changes on campus further explaining the establishment of SA makes sense to her even though the duties overlap greatly with APC she trusts the two committees will work side by side. She stated she understands the EC voted on establishing SA before the June All College Faculty Senate meeting discussion with Dr. Holmes, which raised concerns among teaching faculty. One of the responsibilities of SA jurisdiction is policies related to student conduct matters. Since Dr. Holmes stated classroom conduct matters are for the Faculty Senate to regulate, she believes SA, like APC, should have a majority of teaching faculty members. She further stated after reviewing the Faculty Senate Bylaws she noticed four current committees do not need a majority of teaching faculty: Planning, Professional Development, SCAA and NEG however, APC and Curriculum do.

R. Horwitz made a motion to amend to the language to replace "at least seven Senators, at least a majority, of those must be employees whose primary responsibility include significant interaction with students" with "at least a majority of whom must be teaching faculty."

Discussion: There was discussion, which led to the motion being withdrawn.

R. Horwitz made a motion to amend the language to "and with a minimum of 3 teaching faculty."

Discussion:

- There were several questions clarifying the language in the Faculty Senate Bylaws and the make up the committees.

- It was suggested to include a liaison on the SA from APC, which would be facilitated in the fall. Motion passed.

Amended proposal for Student Affairs Ad Hoc Committee:

(1) Membership

The voting members of this Committee shall be at least seven Senators, at least a majority of whom must be employees whose primary responsibilities include significant interaction with students and with a minimum of 3 teaching faculty, with one Senator from each area, in so far as is possible, and two Student Representatives. The Vice President of Student Services or his/her designee shall be a non-voting member of this Committee.

(2) Duties

It shall be the responsibility of this Committee to review policies, processes, and procedures of the College related specifically to student-centered issues and concerns, and to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate. This may include but not be limited to, policies related to enrollment, academic standing, safety, wellness, and student conduct matters. Additionally, matters related to services provided by the MCC Association as they pertain to students may be assigned to this Committee.

Discussion: There was no further discussion.

Motion passed.

4. Old Business:

There was no old business discussed.

5. New Business:

H. Williams stated the Professional Development Committee would like to congratulate Joe Scanlon on successfully defending his dissertation.

Meeting adjourned at 2:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Ernsthause
President
Faculty Senate

Teresa Schichler
Secretary
Faculty Senate

Minutes approved at the September 17, 2015 Faculty Senate meeting.

Exhibit "A"
Proposed Changes to Faculty Senate Resolutions 5.0 & 5.2

Proposed

- 5.0 The Committee shall be notified of any proposed creation or redefinition of Administrative and Academic Offices and Departments, and of vacancies. The proposal must include proposed date(s) of implementation. If exact dates cannot be provided, estimated dates should be included.
- (1) The Committee will be given at least five (5) weeks to review the proposal and make its recommendation. If proposal has multiple implementation dates, the Committee's five weeks to review will be based on earliest-dated proposed item.
 - (a) When proposals are submitted between July 1 and August 31, a fair and reasonable timeframe will be negotiated for the Committee response and recommendation.
 - (b) Not included in the five week review period are days when the college is officially closed for business.
 - (2) Extensions may be granted by proposer should the Committee warrant extra time to complete its full review of the proposal. Memo should be written and signed by proposer and SCAA for proof of extension approval.
 - (3) The Committee requests a response to its recommendation(s) within two weeks (which do not include days when the college is officially closed for business).

Proposed

- 5.2.2 (Adding to section 1 on "Separate Recommendation")
- (f) The Committee may appoint non-SCAA member(s) to be part of the separate search committee in order to best address the needs of the position.
- 5.2.2 (3) SCAA/Administrative Combined Search
- (a) SCAA-member/appointed-member will be co-chair of search committee.
 - (b) At least 1:1 representation of SCAA-members: Administrative members.
 - (c) SCAA members will have collaborative editing rights with all members of the search committee relative to all applicable interview materials.
 - (d) SCAA appointed co-chair will jointly work with the committee to make final candidate(s) recommendations.