ITEM 1 (A) Gail O’Kane Introduction and ITEM 7 (F) Learning Network Team – Supalla introduced Gail O’Kane, the Interim President upon Supalla’s retirement. O’Kane expressed her excitement to work with the faculty in the upcoming year, and reported she plans to visit the campus a couple of times a month between now and July 1, 2013. Israelson and the faculty welcomed O’Kane, and requested clarification of the role and expectations of those participating in her Learning Network Transition Team. O’Kane explained it is a common practice in higher education to establish a group of individuals (non-administrators) in a transition team to assist an incoming president to fully understand the history and culture of the College through informal conversations and group meetings. O’Kane added the individuals are generally selected by the senior leadership team, and consist of about 20 people (less for an interim president). Tweeten suggested, with retention and intrusive advising being critical at the College, that a faculty member from the Development Education area be included in the Learning Network. O’Kane responded that Minneapolis Community and Technical College has done a number of reports on developmental education, noting it is fundamental to many disciplines. ACTION: Gross will follow-up with a faculty member that teaches Developmental Reading to inquire on their interest to participate in the Interim President’s Learning Network Team.

ITEM 2 (F) Searches – Israelson reported that the faculty inquired on whether there was a size limit for the number of faculty that can participate in a search team, specifically for larger departments like Math and English. Engelmeiyer responded she does not determine the size of the team, but rather it is an institutional decision; however the biggest concerns with the size of a search team centers around the logistical difficulties in finding available interview times for everyone. Engelmeiyer also questioned whether increasing the search team size would address whatever the issues are that brought the question to today’s meeting, reminding everyone the ultimate goal is to ensure the search team has the most qualified candidates in the pool for consideration. Israelson questioned if one member of the search team could veto a candidate moving forward, or whether majority rules in forwarding recommendations. Gross responded recently he chaired a search that had a similar issue, and the team decided to honor the desire of the team member with the concern; hence reduced the number of finalists. Engelmeiyer responded she would encourage search teams to not fail a search because of lack of consensus, but rather the practice of majority rules. Schmall added the current process includes the ability to write strengths and weaknesses on every finalist submitted to the President for consideration, and it should be through that avenue concerns are expressed on candidate(s). Engelmeiyer also reminded everyone that Supalla personally contacts every search team member to visit one-on-one about the recommendations. Supalla confirmed, adding that there have been occasions when not all members of the search team have agreed on every candidate, but as long as a name is submitted for consideration, it is understood that the recommended individuals are acceptable, qualified candidates for the position. Supalla added that it might be beneficial to have clarification of the consensuses issue in the search team orientation. Atwood questioned who determines the make-up of a search team. Supalla responded that ultimately it comes down to Human Resources (Haug) and Supalla visiting if the team size needs to be broadened to ensure the right mix of employees. Supalla added the addition of telephone screening to the search process has been very beneficial, and conversations have been held on whether the expertise of the Human Resources Staff should be included in those telephone interviews. Engelmeiyer responded it is a very common best practice in the private sector hiring process to utilize the Human Resources Staff in telephone interviews in the capacity to ensure only qualified candidates go to the next step. Engelmeiyer reminded everyone the role of Human Resources is not to be a gatekeeper, but rather is a value add in the entire search process. ACTION: Engelmeiyer will work with the Human Resources Staff to improve the search team orientation, and will add someone from Human Resources Department to the telephone screening interviews to assist in ensuring the most qualified candidates are secured for the final interviews.

ITEM 5 (A) Staff Development Day Recap – Engelmeiyer reported the survey will not close until the end of the week, but preliminary submissions suggest lunch was appreciated by the employees. Other comments received thus far included a belief that there may have been more value if groups were separated by areas; but overall the comments appear to be very favorable. Gross added the draft summaries from the breakout sessions are being finalized and he will meet with Engelmeiyer to determine the best process for distributing the information. ACTION: Gross will follow-up with Engelmeiyer on the steps to be taken to distribute the information.
ITEM 3 (A) IPP/FY14 Budget and Legislative Update – Supalla announced three of the five half-day budget retreat have been held for the FY14 Budget. Schmall added preliminary consideration is being given to setting the following targets: Strategic ($500,000); Capital ($250,000); Furniture ($100,000), and R&R ($740,000). Schmall also reported that since the criteria for strategic initiatives required a $2,500 minimum limit for consideration, the general operating budgets for the cost centers may increase to cover some initiatives under the $2,500 limit. Schmall added the next retreat will focus on personnel, the general operating budgets, and confirming potential leveraged equipment requests/approval. ACTION: Schmall will send copies of all FY14 Budget paperwork submitted to the system office to Israelson for review.

ITEM 4 (A) Facility Update – Schmall provided an update on the facility projects scheduled over the summer. Israelson requested that early communication be shared with those faculty affected by office moves and construction interruptions. Schmall responded the Facilities Department has been in communication with the affected faculty, and will look into having those faculty placed in a grouped e-mail contact list to ensure they continue to receive ongoing updates. ACTION: Schmall will work with Sahs to compile a faculty grouping for e-mail communication on facility updates.

ITEM 6 (A) Policy Review: Gross reported that three of the five policy proposals were recently reviewed at an Academic Affairs and Standards Council (AASC) meeting, but it was determined that the policy drafts were not the most up-to-date proposals; hence the policies were rejected. It was further noted that the Fresh Start Policy proposal was also previously submitted for review by AASC, and rejected because the proposal was not submitted by a faculty member. A conversation followed on the proper process for submitting policies for review. ACTION: Faculty and Administration confirmed that a policy can be submitted by any individual with an interest in contributing ideas; and once a proposal is prepared, it must first be presented to the appropriate Cabinet member for consideration to determine if a need exists to create, modify or repeal a policy. It was further agreed that all policies affecting faculty must be reviewed by FSGC, but policies relating to academics will be referred to AASC for a recommendation. (See MSCF Contract, Article 8, Section 1, Subd. 8).

a) Policy 3.17.3 – Academic Standards (Revisions) – Because the policy relates to academics, faculty recommended AASC review the proposed revisions. ACTION: The revisions for the Academic Standards Policy will be shared by Gross at AASC. If the proposal is supported by AASC, Administration will approve the revisions as submitted. If the policy is not supported by AASC, the policy will return to FSGC for a second reading.

b) Policy 3.4.1 – Immunization Records (Revisions) – Faculty supported the revised policy and waived the second reading of the policy. ACTION: Administration approved the revised Immunization Records Policy.

c) Policy 3.15.3 – Credit for Prior Learning (Work Experience) (Repeal) – Because the policy relates to academics, faculty recommended AASC review the proposal to repeal the policy. ACTION: The proposal to repeal the Credit for Prior Learning (Work Experience) Policy will be shared by Gross at AASC. If the proposal is supported by AASC, Administration will repeal the policy. If the proposal is not supported by AASC, the policy will return to FSGC for a second reading.

d) Policy 3.15.4 – Credit for Prior Learning (Non-Work Experience) (Repeal) – Because the policy relates to academics, faculty recommended AASC review the proposal to repeal the policy. ACTION: The proposal to repeal the Credit for Prior Learning (Non-Work Experience) Policy will be shared by Gross at AASC. If the proposal is supported by AASC, Administration will repeal the policy. If the proposal is not supported by AASC, the policy will return to FSGC for a second reading.

e) New Policy 3.15.3 - Credit for Prior Learning (New Policy) – Because the policy relates to academics, faculty recommended AASC review the proposed policy. ACTION: The proposed Credit for Prior Learning Policy will be shared by Gross at AASC. If the proposal is supported by AASC, Administration will approve the policy. If the proposal is not supported by AASC, the policy will return to FSGC for a second reading.

f) Policy 3.15.8 – Credit by Examination (Revisions) – Because the policy relates to academics, faculty recommended AASC review the proposed revisions. ACTION: The revisions for the Credit by Examination Policy will be shared by Gross at AASC. If the policy revisions are supported by AASC, Administration will approve the revisions as submitted. If the policy is not supported by AASC, the policy will return to FSGC for a second reading.

g) Policy 3.17.3 – Fresh Start (Revisions) – Faculty recommended AASC review the proposed revisions. ACTION: The revisions for the Fresh Start Policy will be shared by Gross at AASC. If the policy revisions are supported by AASC, Administration will approve the revisions as submitted. If the policy is not supported by AASC, the policy will return to FSGC for a second reading.

Adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: August 27, 2013 – 2:00 p.m. – SS209