

College Council Meeting Minutes

San Diego Miramar College

9/28/21 • [Zoom](#) • 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm

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

Alternates: Daniel Miramontez, Jorge Morales

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

Guests: Cheryl Barnard, Kurt Hill, Mara Palma-Sanft, Linda Woods, Jesse Lopez, Matthew Cain, Judy Patacsil

- A. Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 1:03 pm.
- B. Approval of Agenda and Minutes** – **Young** made a motion to approve the 9-28-21 agenda. Seconded by **Martin**. There was no discussion. There were 8 yay votes, 0 nay votes, and 0 abstentions. The motion carried. The 9-14-21 minutes were reviewed. **Young** requested a change under item E.1. It read, “Young raised a question about how the plan addresses staffing needs.” He clarified that his question was not related to staffing and should read “Young asked what route outstanding issues for classroom needs will follow in relation to this plan.” **Martin** made a motion to approve the 9-14-21 minutes with Young’s revision. Seconded by **Igou**. There was no discussion. There were 8 yay votes, 0 nay votes, and 0 abstentions. The motion carried.
- C. Committee Reports/Other (2-3 minutes)**
- **President’s Report** – **Lundburg** shared that he is experiencing plumbing issues at home and will need to step away but he will give his report first and then asked Murphy to take over. At Chancellor’s Cabinet this morning, he urged for clarity on messaging regarding spring. He spoke up saying Miramar would like to be back and the constituencies are aligned on this. He stated that he would like to see the District move in this direction, and if not, he desired to take Miramar in this direction. There was some discussion but everyone agreed. He thanked Borek and ASG for speaking up. **Lundburg** also pushed that the messaging be “We are back January 1” and exceptions and percentages be left out in hopes of avoiding more confusion.
 - **AS Report** – **Murphy** shared that Spring planning is a standing agenda item for the Academic Senate. We need to avoid saying “we are 100% back” because we have never been 100% in-person. She is aware that some faculty are not comfortable returning and they are encouraged to seek exceptions. Lastly, she shared the next meeting is on Tuesday.
 - **CS Report** – **Young** shared that the Classified Senate met with Steinburg Hart last week. It was a great conversation and he hopes the feedback can be incorporated. He thanked Bell for his leadership and coordination of the facilities master planning.
 - **ASG Report** – **Borek** shared that ASG also met with Steinburg Hart last week and it was also a great conversation. He shared that some of the suggestions can even be implemented now. The student art competition that is part of the Equity Summit was announced on Friday. ASG is sponsoring a \$500 scholarship to the winner (subject to meeting specified criteria). He asked everyone to spread the word to students. He also shared that the conversation has been started about returning to campus and what that would look like. ASG will do a trial run for their meeting, in two weeks, on campus. His goal is to lead by example and show students there are safety precautions in place and that it is time to return.
 - **Other** – There were no other reports.

D. Old Business:

#	Item
1	Accreditation (Standing item) – Palma-Sanft shared that there was a 1 st read of the proposed tri-chair structure at the Academic Senate. It was then brought to the departments for additional discussion. It came back to the Senate and was approved. The next step is to begin identifying the faculty. Miramontez reminded everyone that the ACCJC training is scheduled on <i>Friday, October 8th from 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm via zoom</i> . District personnel will be present to ensure better coordination across the campuses and district.

2	<p><i>SDMC Technology Plan 3.0 (attachment)</i> – Miramontez reported that three of the four constituencies have approved the technology plan. He believes this was on the agenda at the last Classified Senate meeting and asked Young if there was an update. Young responded that the last meeting was focused on the facilities master plan and his questions from the previous college council meeting still stands, which is how what route outstanding issues for classroom needs will follow in relation to this plan. Miramontez responded that he is still working on an answer. He emphasized that this is a rolling plan and can be updated every year. Borek asked Miramontez if he could present the plan at ASG again since there are a lot of new senators. Miramontez confirmed. Murphy asked if this item should be brought back again to the next meeting. Miramontez asked if the discussion to answer Young's question should to place and College Council or at the Classified Senate. Young responded that an offline conversation would be best and then it can be brought back to College Council. Lastly, Miramontez shared that there is a Technology Committee meeting today at 3:00 pm.</p>
3	<p><i>Spring 2022 Planning</i> – Murphy acknowledged the Lundburg gave an update on this item in his report. She also shared that while some faculty have concerns about returning, there are others that want to be back and recognize that students want us back. She re-emphasized that we need to avoid using percentages in our language/messaging. Murphy also added that there are in-depth discussions happening about how returning to campus affects meetings. The Academic Senate is currently following AB 361. She reminded everyone that legally only the Academic Senate and ASG are required to follow the Brown Act but per the new handbook, the college has decided to apply the Brown Act to our governance meetings. She just wanted everyone to be aware that the sooner we make a decision on this the better as faculty have been concerned about meeting format for Spring. Borek added that people should start thinking about this now as meetings will no longer be able to be back to back. Murphy shared the senate is considering hybrid meetings.</p>
4	<p><i>Taskforce to Create Process to Make Changes to Governance Handbook</i> – Murphy reported that the taskforce has met and discussed the types of changes that could be needed. Those have been broken down into three categories; 1) editorial (i.e. grammatical in nature and doesn't change intent), 2) structural/content, and 3) emergency (i.e. without the recommended changes, business can't move forward). She continued that the taskforce has worked on the draft process and a timeline and determined that it would be best to do once a semester. The taskforce is working on outlining a time frame for requests and when they would go to College Council so everyone can hear the discussion. Gonzales added that the goal is to finishing outlining the process this semester and have it available in the spring and then we would go from there. Martin expressed unclarity regarding emergency requests for fall and cited Guided Pathways faculty representation as an example. He shared that the taskforce will continue to discuss at its next meeting and we are off to great start. Borek added that committees should start getting ready now, if they know they want to make a change. He also mentioned that the intent is to have the originator of the request involved in the entire process.</p>

E. New Business:

#	Item
1	<p><i>Facilities Master Planning</i> – Bell reported that Steinburg Hart has met with all the constituencies and facilitated conversations for feedback and input, which have gone very well. The next step is to set up meetings with each division and school in October. He continued that Student Services will have their meeting on October 19th; BTCWI and Public Safety will have theirs on October 21st; MBEPS, Liberal Arts, and PRIELT will have their meetings on October 22nd. These meetings will be similar to the constituency groups and will inform their recommendations. He is also working on a substantiality event in October, which will engage the Environmental Sustainability Committee for their participation and input. Steinburg Hart will come back in November or December with their recommendations. Murphy asked if there will be an opportunity for official constituency/ faculty vetting. Bell confirmed.</p>
2	<p><i>Board of Trustees Presentation Planning (February 10th)</i> – Murphy shared that the Miramar Campus Presentation for the Board of Trustees meeting will be on February 10th and we are opening it up to see how we can approach this. She explained that this is a time to showcase what we are doing well. She opened it up for ideas, some of which included: highlighting the ConC faculty appointment process, interdisciplinary efforts on campus, reinvigorating PTK and the honors committee, the LEAD office, Guided Pathways efforts, becoming a student ready college, the food pantry and free closet. Murphy encouraged everyone to reach out to folks in their areas for more ideas and then we can create a theme. Odu asked what has been done in the past. Murphy responded that previously we have highlighted our career technical programs including, FIRE/EMT and our Career Center. This is an opportunity to showcase our diversity within our programs and our people. Palma-Sanft suggested showcasing all those extra things we do for our students including honors, PATH, Guided Pathways, etc. Borek suggested highlighting "Return to on-campus." As in "We are still here. Still Miramar. Still serving students where they are." There are small groups throughout the campus that have been here doing the work the entire time. Gonzales added that typically after the presentation the Board will ask "How can we support you." This is also an opportunity to share with them what our needs are. Murphy noted the ongoing need for more staff. A list of ideas will be shared out and she encouraged everyone to collect more. This is the only first discussion.</p>

3	<p><i>Website –</i></p> <p>a. <i>Guided Pathways Proposal for Consultant – Gonzales</i> started off by stating many people in this meeting have been a part of the conversations over the past couple of years about strengthening the website and how we present our information on the website. He continued that Guided Pathways has also been a part of these conversations, on a more micro level, thinking about the pages for the course mapper, interest areas, and meta majors. More recently, there has been some discussion on looking at our website and identifying areas we can strengthen like fixing links, changing the aesthetics, or addressing some structural issues. Guided Pathways has proposed identifying a consultant to work with the campus on a broader level to identify what changes we are really looking for on our website. He emphasized that this would be more of an assessment of the website and that there is some funding available through Guided Pathways. Martin asked how this effort would be different, how are the results going to reflect the requests for changes, and if there will be more stakeholders involved. Gonzales responded this is why we need to do more of an assessment than to commit to certain changes. There are varying opinions of what is wrong with the website but there are good things about it too. Murphy added it is important to have a response to every piece of feedback and why it was incorporated or not and reminded everyone that the students are the ones suffering if they are not able to find what they need. Miramontez mentioned that the college grew but our resources did not and a big piece of the website is security. He also reminded everyone that this last website project was funded by Strong Workforce and he inherited the project from Ben Gamboa and somethings were lost in transition. Lastly, he mentioned that GP was given the chance to extend the launch of the website but the content wasn't there so the idea was to revisit it and that is sparking the conversation now. He felt it was important to add that context and stated it should be an assessment for what can be improved, not a list of complaints, and how we can move it forward as a college. Murphy reminded everyone that in this last round of work, the vendors largely didn't incorporate the feedback from faculty and GP leads and that we can't keep doing the same thing and expect a different result. Gonzales clarified that GP has no interest in leading this effort, they will provide financial support, but this really does need to be a college-wide effort. Hill emphasized that we did really well this last go around considering the funding we were given. This go around we three times that budget and more faculty involvement. Input wasn't ignored. ImageX was supposed to say why something wasn't incorporated. He gave a few examples and concluded by stating that there are systemic issues that need to be resolved before we spend more money. Martin suggested a committee with wide representation. The time limit was exceeded for this item. Borek made a motion to extend the time by five minutes. Seconded by Young. There was no discussion. There were 8 yay votes, 0 nay votes, and 0 abstentions. <u>The motion carried.</u> Borek stated that the issues are not with the mechanics but with the content. He continued the question is not "is it aesthetically pleasing?" but "is it user friendly?" He offered that it is a waste of money to hire a consultant, again, to tell us what we already know. It comes down to managers to oversee specific web pages for their areas, more training, and hiring a webmaster. Murphy emphasized the need to figure out how to manage our content. Gonzales expressed the need to figure out a game plan as a college. Time was, again, exceeded. Martin made a motion to extend another five minutes, realized the time, and pulled the motion. Gonzales made a motion to bring this back to the next meeting. Martin made an amendment to the motion to include key stakeholders at the meeting. Gonzales accepted the amendment. There was no further discussion. There were 8 yay votes, 0 nay votes, and 0 abstentions. <u>The motion carried.</u></p> <p>b. <i>Overall Structure and Content Management</i></p>
4	<p><i>Committee on Committees Appointment Process (attachment) – Martin</i> quickly reviewed the ConC appointment process document. He noted the separate processes for appointing faculty to college and district committees, faculty hiring screening committees, other hiring screening committees, operational committees, and coordinator/professional development positions. Young asked how responsive is this process. Martin responded that we were slow to start because there was not a process in place but now there is so he anticipates it being quick. Bell asked Martin to forward him this document.</p>
5	<p><i>CAGP Phase Two Participation Agreement (attachment) – Murphy</i> noted this item is a placeholder until it is ready for approval.</p>

F. **Announcements – Borek** shared that LGBTQA participated in a walk for aids and raised \$5,000.

G. **Adjourn** – The meeting adjourned at 2:31 pm.

H. **Next Scheduled Meeting:** *Tuesday, October 12th, 2021 from 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm via Zoom*

Link to recording:

https://cccconfer.zoom.us/rec/share/QaIPs51XknIE_CX8fdaahzCRodf5XGTGBMRzdPUddFku7P47WPzmLTeQK4MKuHa1.IPx f bnQv8wBChS4