

College Council Meeting Minutes

San Diego Miramar College

03/22/22 • L-108/Zoom • 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm

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

Alternates: Daniel Miramontez, Kurt Hill, Jorge Morales (not present)

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

Guests: Judy Patacsil, Nessa Julian, Cheryl Barnard, Mara Palma-Sanft, Claudia Estrada-Howell

- A. Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 1:03 pm.
- B. Approval of Agenda and Minutes** – **Bell** made a motion to approve the 3-22-22 meeting agenda. Seconded by **Martin**. There was no discussion. There were 11 yay votes, 0 nay votes, and 0 abstentions. The motion carried. **Martin** made a motion to approve the 3-8-22 meeting minutes. Seconded by **Odu**. **Martin** pointed out that his question, under the President’s Report, was about the faculty’s 30 hours, not 10 hours. There were no other suggested edits or further discussion. There were 11 yay votes, 0 nay votes, and 0 abstentions. The motion carried.
- C. Public Comment** – There was no public comment.
- D. Committee Reports/Other (2-3 minutes)**
- **President’s Report** – **Gonzales** reported that the President did attend Chancellor’s Cabinet this morning but he didn’t have time to provide an update. He asked the other VPs if they had anything to report. **Bell** reported that the RFF process is up and running and has been for a week. It will close this coming Friday and he strongly encouraged everyone to work through their dean and department chair or direct supervisor. **Odu** had nothing to report. **Gonzales** reported that a second round of student direct aid was released and closes today. If there is money left over, there will be a third round; \$3M was automatically awarded already. **Murphy** asked why the turnaround was so short. **Gonzales** responded that the benefit of Edquity is the funds are available to students within 48 hours of being approved. Unfortunately, there is a federal piece we have to comply with. He continued that students typically apply within the first two to three days and then there is a significant drop off in applications. **Borek** asked what it costs to use Edquity to distribute the funds. **Gonzales** responded that it costs 1.6% of the total distributed amount. **Borek** asked what the cost would be if we did it ourselves. **Gonzales** responded that it is a 4-week process and has to go through financial aid and the business office. **Borek** asked if HEERF funds cover the fees. **Gonzales** responded yes, it comes from the institutional portion.
 - **AS Report** – **Murphy** reported that the Academic Senate will be opening up nominations for new executives; there are several positions open. She continued that ConC will meet after spring break to continue appointing faculty to committees. She noted that it is important to know what vacancies there are so a call can go out. The Senate is reviewing the bylaws and constitution and the faculty hiring committee is reviewing its criteria and trying to identify a set of criteria and a rubric that will allow us to evaluate the need of faculty positions whether they are instructional or non-instructional. The next senate meeting is April 5th.
 - **CS Report** – **Young** had nothing new to report.
 - **ASG Report** – **Borek** reported that last Friday, ASG votes on a package for ASCCC. There were also a couple of events last week, including a club rush event, which had good turn outs.
 - **Other** – There were no other reports.

E. Old Business:

#	Item	Initiator
1	Accreditation (Standing item) – Palma-Sanft shared that she will be sending an email to the tri-chairs with the accreditation survey results from the fall so they can incorporate it into their narratives, if they want. She also reminded everyone that first drafts are due Wednesday, April 13 th . Murphy asked if the tri-chairs are reaching out to people to gather evidence. Palma-Sanft confirmed. Murphy expressed concern that no one has reached out to her for evidence. Gonzales noted that a lot of the evidence can be found on our website. Miramontez explained that ACCJC has provided good examples and streamlined the process which has taken	<i>Miramontez/ Palma-Sanft</i>

<p>the guess work out of collecting the evidence. Bell asked if there was an update for section 3 and what the District is responsible for responding to and what the College is responsible for. Miramontez responded that he received an update from VC Topham last week that she is working with the other Vice Chancellors on what we should expect. Bell clarified that there are specific micro standards that the District should respond to first and he would like confirmation so he doesn't have worry about those pieces, as they pertain to finance. Miramontez responded that he will reach out to VC Topham.</p>	
---	--

F. New Business:

#	Item	Initiator
1	<p><i>Student Equity Plan 2022-2025 (attachment)</i> – Julian presented an overview of the Student Equity Plan for 2022-2025. She outlined the template, the RP Group Equity Framework, the changes from the 2019-2022 plan, and Miramar’s planning process. She noted the alignment with Guided Pathways and Vision for Success, the race conscious design which prioritizes DI groups, and systemic design to address campus reform. One of the biggest changes in the design is that it is not compliance oriented but community driven and reflective. She continued to explain that the form is not yet available in NOVA and we are still waiting on the State Chancellor’s office to release the data. Time on this item was exceeded. Martin made a motion to table items 3 and 6 and extend discussion by 5 minutes. Murphy seconded. There was no further discussion and <u>there were no objections</u>. Julian reviewed the timeline; March, develop workgroups; April – August, college input, draft plan, college input, and presentations; September – October, College constituency presentations and approvals; November, Board of Trustees approval and submit into NOVA. Murphy asked if there would be faculty participation, in what form, and what structure. Julian responded that the plan is to follow what we did last time. The workgroups will be cross constituents and have content experts. We need to form them as soon as possible however, we are still waiting on the data from the state. Borek asked about student involved over the summer and if Guided Pathways money could be used for participation incentive. Gonzales responded that summer classes will be in session so we could look ask those students who are enrolled and look into providing incentive. Julian added that the hope is to have the bulk of the work done before we let out. Patacsil also added that the IDEA committee will be heavily involved in the development of this plan.</p>	<i>Julian</i>
2	<p><i>Governance (attachment)</i> – Martin explained that a few questions have come up. The new college Governance Handbook asks us to do certain things, including to identify all the committees we are involved with such as participatory, academic senate, operational, and district. He was wondering if a change request form needs to be submitted to be specific or people understand what that means. The President’s Office is housing the membership lists and Martin has been working with Kunst. However, he suggested that College Council provide guidance because not many people have responded with their committee term limits and rotation cycle. Gonzales responded that the intent was to track membership for participatory governance committees and the academic senate committees and the terms limits would be rotated; operational wasn’t included. Murphy added that this was a parking lot item and believed these were two different topics; 1) rotation of membership terms and 2) tracking who is on the committee. The faculty is clear; all faculty must be appointed by the Academic Senate President or designee, in this case, the Committee on Committees. As far as term limits and application of term limits, we’ve only made a decision on participatory governance and academic senate committees. We’ve struggled trying to identify all of the district committees and task forces as well as operational groups, which is why it ended up in the parking lot. Young’s recollection was if it is task based and/or related to specific functions, at least for staff, it will have relevant personnel to the operational function. He sends an announcement out to the DL for participation, however, not many people have volunteered to participate. Borek agreed that this does need to get figured out. There are different individuals on campus saying we need this student position filled or they’re going off to find students, which is not supposed to happen. Gonzales suggested putting together a small task force. Murphy stated that her, Young, and Lundburg discussed this and came to an agreement; put a call out saying that committees have two weeks to submit their staggered terms, if they are interested, otherwise it will be automatically assigned. Young noted that staggering term limits give people who have been on the committee awhile will the chance to pass along institutional memory. Gonzales stated that he went back and looked at the notes. Two items were presented, the membership spreadsheet and the master calendar but we never made a decision and it seems like we need to come back to it. Murphy stated that regardless of how we do it, it needs to get done. We are at the point now where were going to run out of time to staff committees for next year. She suggested that we put out the call and give two weeks to respond otherwise we randomize it and put it forward. Gonzales will confirm with Lundburg that his office will send out this message. He also mentioned that we are going to need to come back to the governance training plan. Murphy said we should identify</p>	<i>Martin</i>

	point people for each topic so it doesn't fall all on one person.	
3	<i>Governance Evaluation Survey (attachment)</i> – This item was tabled to the next meeting due to time.	Miramontez
4	<i>ACCJC Annual Report 2022 (attachment)</i> – Miramontez stated that this is a report that we do every year and he is responsible for populating the numbers. There is no narrative. He reviewed the populated form. He noted a significant change in #8, Distance Education, which as increased to 79% and explained that this is entirely due to COVID. He also noted that there is no employment data for #19.	Miramontez
5	<i>ASG Resolution regarding HEERF and Transportation Costs (attachment)</i> – Borek stated that this is a formal resolution from ASG to use money left in HEERF (II or III) for transportation costs. He noted that the average gas price is over \$5/gallon. Students are back on campus, and while this may not be directly related to COVID, it is a basic need. Borek also shared that ASG is asking for a formal response from President Lundburg. Gonzales shared that \$200k has already been earmarked and should be available in April through the Edquity app. We are planning for \$100/per student but can revisit the amount if there is an additional need. Murphy asked why \$200k and if the distribution pattern would be the same. Gonzales responded that \$200k was decided on to match the other colleges and also the timeline. The target date is when we return from spring break. Borek asked if the criteria could be student enrolled in a course with a portion of it being in-person. Barnard added that the intent of this resolution is because the price of gas may be affecting student's ability to come to campus, not just for classes, but also for services like tutoring and counseling. Gonzales responded that he will talk to the other colleges and will explore the numbers. Its important that students aren't excluded. Borek asked about the deadline for HEERF funds. Gonzales shared that the deadline has been automatically extended to next year. We are waiting on the official announcement in the federal registrar but this will extension will give us time to expend all of the money.	Borek
6	<i>Follow up on HEERF Open Forum</i> – This item was tabled to the next meeting due to time.	Lundburg/ Murphy
7	<i>Miramar Facilities Path to 2023 (attachment)</i> – Bell stated that we are closed to completing the facilities plan. He pointed out that we are no longer using the work "master" due to Anti-Racism concerns. The plan will be referred to as the facilities plan for facilities path to 2035. The facilities plan is being reviewed on a technical level. All over the input, from the last 5 months, has been incorporated. He shared the plan and pointed out the following: page 3.31, which lists the challenges and opportunities; page 8, which recognizes all of the facilities that have been discussed including the visual and performing arts center, welcome and multi-cultural center, STEM labs, etc.; page 10, which displays the landscape changes to create and unified campus with both formal and informal outdoor gathering spaces. Bell stated that this plan will be going to the Board of Trustees for approval on May 12 th .	Bell

- G. **Announcements** – **Odu** encouraged people to RSVP for the Sat. April 23rd Guided Pathways event. **Julian** shared that Miramar will host the 2022 Rite of Passage Ceremony. An announcement will be sent out when the date is finalized.
- H. **Adjourn** – The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.
- I. **Next Scheduled Meeting:** Tuesday, April 12th, 2022 from 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm in L-108/Zoom

Link to recording: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/rec/share/QFzMWy7EyWc-Qiryp43QdMe33VIO-CM4HhJTid4Mm-p9cBhtrQ5PEPXqR5mK2.nd0amWtJVZT_gbS9