

# College Council Meeting Minutes

## San Diego Miramar College

9/14/21 • [Zoom](#) • 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm

**Members:** Wesley Lundburg (co-chair), Laura Murphy (co-chair), Brett Bell (no proxy), Adrian Gonzales, Michael Odu, Pablo Martin, Sean Young, Clarissa Padilla, Sam Shoostary, Dan Igou, Edward Borek, Mandie Hankinson (no proxy), and Emily Smith (no proxy)

**Alternates:** Jorge Morales

**Vacancies:** Administrators: Alternate; Classified Senate: Alternate; Academic Senate: Alternate; ASG: None

**Guests:** Daniel Miramontez, Cheryl Barnard, Linda Woods, Jesse Lopez, Judy Patacsil, Carmen Carrasquillo Jay, Mardi Parleman, Adrian Arancibia, and Mara Palma-Sanft

- A. Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 1:03 pm.
- B. Approval of Agenda and Minutes** – **Igou** made a motion to approve the 9-14-21 meeting agenda. Seconded by **Young**. There was no discussion. There were 9 yay votes, 0 nay votes, and 0 abstentions. The motion carried. **Martin** made a motion to approve the 8-31-21 meeting minutes. Seconded by **Igou**. There was no discussion. There were 8 yay votes, 0 nay votes, and 1 abstention. The motion carried.
- C. Committee Reports/Other (2-3 minutes)**
- **President’s Report** – **Lundburg** reported that he was not able to attend Chancellor’s Cabinet this morning due to his son’s orthodontist appointment. **Gonzales** attended in his place and he asked him to provide any important updates. **Gonzales** reported that spring planning was the main focus of the meeting. There weren’t any decisions made. The District wants to be able to provide parameters to the colleges that they can work within but also need to take into consideration the health and safety of our students, faculty and classified professionals. He continued to report [AB 169](#), regarding student housing, will be going to the Senate and there will be a quick turnaround time. If colleges are interested in being considered for/participating in the feasibility study, conversations will need to take place quickly as the deadline is late October. **Kunst** will send out a copy of the bill. Lastly, he shared Food Services is scheduled to re-open September 20<sup>th</sup>. This includes both the grill and the c-store.
  - **AS Report** – **Murphy** reported that the Academic Senate had their first meeting last week. There will be a special meeting this afternoon, from 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm, with Steinberg-Hart regarding the facilities master planning. The Committee on Committees (ConC) meets tomorrow and are continuing with faculty appointments. Lastly, she shared that the Academic Senate Presidents from all the Colleges will be meeting with the Chancellor to discuss spring planning.
  - **CS Report** – **Young** reported that the Classified Senate met last Thursday. Meetings will be the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays from 11:00 am – 12:00 pm. Steinburg-Hart will be attending the meeting on September 21<sup>st</sup>. There will be three standing committees of the Classified Senate including the Classified Professionals Development Committee, the Classified Professionals Representation Committee, and the Classified Professionals Equity Committee. A notification to classified professionals for participation will be sent out by the end of the week.
  - **ASG Report** – **Borek** reported that ASG met last Friday and held elections. A new treasurer and new senators were elected. He was glad to report that senate positions have been filled. There were also four amendments passed which combined a few internal committees. An email was sent out on Friday with student assignments to shared governance committees. He reported that the participation forms will remain open throughout the year and encouraged any committee chairs seeking student representation to use it. Lastly, an interest form for student clubs has been sent out in an attempt to bring student life back to campus.
  - **Other** – There were no other reports.

**D. Old Business:**

#	Item
1	Accreditation (Standing item) – <b>Miramontez</b> reminded everyone that the ACCJC Training is scheduled on Friday, October 8 <sup>th</sup> from 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm via zoom. This is for the tri-chair teams to attend. He and Palma-Sanft are working with the

respective constituencies to fill these teams. The District Office is working on the accreditation surveys. There will a separate survey for students and for employees. Feedback will be due by the end of this month. The survey will be administered in October and will close in November. IT will analyze the data and produce reports by the end of January. **Martin** asked if the tri-chair structure needs to be approved by the other constituencies and if the tri-chair structure should be added to the handbook so that it doesn't need to be approved for every accreditation cycle. **Murphy** explained that this is not necessarily a formal committee and this structure has been used many times so she doesn't anticipate the Academic Senate having any issues with this structure. If we'd like to establish a more formal body for monitoring or being engaged in accreditation, this could be brought to College Council or the Change Process taskforce in terms of edits to the handbook. **Lundburg** stated that the goal was to go status quo for the first year, in terms of the handbook, and to stand by for a process to be created for submitting changes to it. There was a robust discussion about what the writing teams are responsible for, codifying this structure in the handbook, and the accreditation steering committee's role.

**E. New Business:**

#	Item
1	<p><i>SDMC Technology Plan 3.0 (attachment)</i> – <b>Miramontez</b> reported that the Managers, Academic Senate and Students have approved this plan and it awaiting approval from the Classified Senate. He gave a brief overview of the plan. <b>Lundburg</b> pointed out that the cover sheet says “Approved by CEC” and should be changed to College Council. <b>Miramontez</b> will ensure that is updated. <b>Young</b> asked what route outstanding issues for classroom needs will follow in relation to this plan. <b>Miramontez</b> explained that the plan is working its way through an integrated planning process with resource development through the BRDS process. <b>Murphy</b> asked if there is a plan in place to address requests that don't get funded and how we are going to accommodate requests that are top priority. <b>Miramontez</b> responded that there is currently no process in place for that. <b>Gonzales</b> asked how the data advocacy bullet will be tied in. <b>Miramontez</b> responded that there is a need for the type of technology for end users to be able to extract that information, which is the end goal. These goals are not mutually exclusive and support one another. <b>Lundburg</b> suggested that <b>Miramontez</b> add this item to their next standing meeting for additional discussion. <b>Murphy</b> reiterated that they are waiting for the classified to take a position on the plan and this agenda item will</p>
2	<p><i>Spring 2022 Planning</i> – <b>Gonzales</b> emphasized that there was no decision made at Chancellor's Cabinet as they are trying to allow for local decision making but also acknowledge that parameters need to be set. Cabinet will be taking a deeper dive. <b>Lundburg</b> added that there is a resounding call from all constituencies to get used to COVID and learning to live with it and work on getting back to campus. We need to listen to our students and start moving forward. <b>Borek</b> stated that students are not getting the services they are paying for and felt strongly that those that can return safely to campus should do so. <b>Gonzales</b> added that we need to address what we have learned over the last year and a half. Students do have a need for in-person and remote services and we need to figure out how we can manage both types with our current staffing levels. <b>Odu</b> added that we are continuing to plan for return in spring. <b>Young</b> suggested reviewing our safety protocols. <b>Gonzales</b> briefly summarized the protocols in place and shared that the COVID testing is a work in progress. The company we partnered with over promised what they can do and we are working really hard to fix things with this process. He thanked everyone with their patience and grace with this situation.</p>
3	<p><i>Taskforce to Create Process to Make Changes to Governance Handbook</i> – <b>Murphy</b> explained that under the new governance structure the College Governance Committee has been dissolved and governance will now be under the purview of College Council. She is aware that there are some committees wanting to make changes or adjustments but there is not a formal process in place. <b>Lundburg</b> stated this taskforce is in the process of being formed. <b>Kunst</b> added the members are Murphy, Martin, Young, Borek and Gonzales. They will be meeting on 9/21 from 11am – 12pm. <b>Parleman</b> asked if the process would be the same for changes and errors. <b>Lundburg</b> responded that it would depend on what it is and noted that there may be some confusion around the process. There may be exceptions but the plan was to live with the handbook for a year before any changes were made. <b>Parleman</b> cited the IDEA Committee co-chair structure explaining that the committee had voted to have the Faculty Equity Coordinator be the co-chair by position. This recommendation went to CGC and according to the minutes from 4-13-21 appears to have been approved but it did not make it in the new handbook. The Faculty Equity Coordinator is serving as the co-chair now but the committee would like to formalize this and understand why it wasn't included. <b>Murphy</b> explained that the CGC change didn't appear to have come to College Executive Committee for final approval. Time was exceeded on this item. <b>Padilla</b> made a motion to extend the time by 5 minutes. Seconded by <b>Martin</b>. There was no discussion. There were 8 yay votes, 0 nay votes, and 0 abstentions. <u>The motion carried.</u> <b>Murphy</b> reminded everyone to keep the discussion to the agenda item in order to allow everyone the opportunity to speak to it. <b>Martin</b> would like to see the new process include transparent and timely communication specifically allowing time for constituent review and input and communicating back to committees the outcome of their requested changes. <b>Patacsil</b> agreed with <b>Martin</b>. In the interest of time, she asked what the appropriate next step would be. <b>Murphy</b> reiterated that any committee with issues regarding the handbook can put it on the College Council agenda, as that is the appropriate body. <b>Lundburg</b> asked that this be the first item</p>

	on the taskforce's agenda and report back at the next meeting, if appropriate.
4	<i>Student Committee Assignments</i> – <b>Borek</b> shared that two emails were sent out; one to students and one to staff and faculty. Students were able to select which committees they were interested in and committee chairs were responsible for submitting the form to request student participation. He indicated if students were not assigned to a committee there was either no interest or no request for participation. The form will remain open throughout the year and students will be assigned as they come forward and as requests are received. There were no questions about this process.
5	<i>CAGP Phase Two Participation Agreement (attachment)</i> – <b>Gonzales</b> reminded everyone that we are part of the California Guided Pathways project. We are 1 of 23 colleges working as a co-hort. Last year, we signed off on multiple year participation and year one was all virtual due to the pandemic. We participated in webinars and worked with our consultant. There is a new memo for year two and there have been a few changes. Funding was available last year to cover our participation but there may or may not be funding this year. He added that there is money earmarked in Guided Pathways for this expense and encouraged everyone to not worry about that right now. He expressed that the biggest benefit of this agreement has been working with the other schools. <b>Gonzales</b> also reviewed the training scheduled, which the Guided Pathways LEAD, Equity LEAD and President are required to attend. He reported that the Academic Senate is currently reviewing this document as the AS President will need to sign off on it along with the College President. The form was due on September 17 <sup>th</sup> but we've been granted an extension until October 21 <sup>st</sup> to ensure there is time for discussion.
6	<i>Facilities Master Planning</i> – <b>Lundburg</b> shared that he would be covering this item for <b>Bell</b> . The only update at this time was that Steinburg-Hart will be meeting with the Senates over the next week. There was general consensus to keep this item on the agenda for the next meeting for additional updates.

- F. **Announcements** – **Gonzales** shared that the campaign to encourage students to get vaccinated launched this week. Students will have an opportunity to win laptops, tablets, and visa gift cards. **Odu** shared that he will be hosting an open forum on Friday, September 24<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 am – 10:00 am to continue off of his speech at Opening Day.
- G. **Adjourn** – **Young** made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by **Martin**. There was no discussion. All responded in favor. The meeting adjourned at 2:23 pm.
- H. **Next Scheduled Meeting:** *Tuesday, September 28<sup>th</sup>, 2021 from 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm via Zoom*

**Link to recording:** [https://cccconfer.zoom.us/rec/share/x\\_Ce9vZ6Y85wEczACR-3YrHnj2uYvG7w0bxFZ2\\_BbfFyn9y669GK80v7N2f8GwT0.6frC3zA2Lj1xcDMS](https://cccconfer.zoom.us/rec/share/x_Ce9vZ6Y85wEczACR-3YrHnj2uYvG7w0bxFZ2_BbfFyn9y669GK80v7N2f8GwT0.6frC3zA2Lj1xcDMS)