

Minutes – Miramar College Academic Senate
3:30-5:00pm **April 03, 2018** Location: L-309

Senators Present: Marie McMahon, Laura Murphy, Mary Kjartanson, Shayne Vargo, Mara Sanft, Daniel Gutowski, Josh Alley, Barbara Clark, Mark Dinger, Patricia Flower, Anne Gloag, David Halttunen, Darrel Harrison, Mary Hart, Dan Igou, April Koch, Jennifer Leaver, Alex Mata, Ryan Moore, Wheeler North, Patty Parker, Kevin Petti, Wai-Ling Rubic, Alex Sanchez, Nam Sinkaset, Gabi Mansfield, Marc McGrath, Kyleb Wild

Absent: Jason Librande (proxy: D. Gutowski), Lisa Clarke, Gina Bochicchio, Kandice Brandt, Lisa Brewster, Otto Dobre, Kevin Gallagher, Jordan Omens, John Salinsky, Desi Klaar, Elise Lindgren

Other Attendees: Patricia Hsieh, Gerald Ramsey, Melissa Wolfson, Duane Short, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:35pm.

A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes

The agenda was unanimously approved after a reordering to table E.v. (North/Vargo)

The previous minutes were approved unchanged, with two abstentions. (Vargo/Kjartanson)

B. Special Reports/Information

i. Administration – P. Hsieh

President Hsieh queried the Senate to determine the number of faculty requesting regalia and faculty who owned their own. She congratulated faculty on the 103 who have signed up for the graduation ceremony. Hsieh reminded faculty of the upcoming Scholarship Award Ceremony on Wednesday, April 25th. She encouraged faculty attendance.

ii. Classified Staff – None

iii. Associated Students – None

iv. AFT – None

C. Old Business

i. CGC Change Proposal for College Executive Committee (CEC) – L. Murphy

Murphy reported that we received feedback from the Curriculum Committee and, hence, incorporated the comments into the changes. She said that the primary recommendation was to not designate the Curriculum Chair as one of the faculty, but to make it a second faculty representative appointed by the AS President. Murphy said that the change was requested because the Curriculum Committee said that the Curriculum Chair did not have knowledge of college-wide matters. Short concurred, adding that the unstipulated faculty representative would provide more flexibility for the committee. McMahon said the other changes that were made earlier in this semester were in order to bring the CEC agenda into alignment with what the College Governance Handbook describes, and this involved partitioning the CEC meeting agenda into two sections: section one was all-campus issues, or non AB-1725 issues, and section two was academic and professional, or AB-1725, i.e. Academic Senate matters. McMahon added that the pro forma of the CEC agenda recognizes the purview for academic and professional matters and curriculum as central to the Academic Senate. With regard to membership changes, McMahon added that the recommended expansion of faculty on that committee was not to emulate Mesa College but to have a broader spectrum of faculty representation and knowledge base at the table during the meetings. Since curriculum is so central to faculty purview, that is why that position was recommended. It was also noted that the broader scope of members would allow more faculty to hear the information, as well as encourage more effective dissemination of information from that venue.

Short suggested there are two different ways to structure this committee: one being a large body of representatives and one decider (the College President) or, two, a small number of people deciding. Short indicated that this was suggesting a hybrid of these two structures. Murphy commented that those are only two of many ways of structuring this committee, and the suggestion of the larger body goes back to emulating Mesa College, and that it in no way means there are only two ways of organizing such a committee. Short added that the Curriculum Committee liked the idea of having more faculty members, particularly the additions of the Chair of Chairs and the Counseling department chair. It was noted that the number of votes doesn't change by the addition of faculty members, but this change allows a more representative group to participate in the discussion and to disseminate information to the faculty more effectively, which is paramount.

McMahon noted that a closer scrutiny of the CEC meeting format and membership composition was stimulated by the way that the first CEC meeting at the beginning of the spring semester was conducted. The format of that first CEC meeting was radically different and was changed without consultation with the co-chair, the Academic Senate President. That meeting included presentations that were way out of the norm for that committee, and the two Academic Senate reps (McMahon and Murphy) were vastly outnumbered by administrators in a room change, and these changes were an attempt to bring a more balanced manner back to this committee.

McMahon said that the administration indicated that they would be proposing a separate committee structure for CEC – probably more similar to the Mesa model (called President's Cabinet). Short offered to attend CEC meetings at the

committee's behest. North motioned to forward the recommended changes to CEC (with noted changes that have been made); motion unanimously approved. (North/Sanchez)

ii. Option for Changing Senate Meeting Times – D. Igou and M. McMahon

Faculty discussed various date and time options. Igou requested viable options from McMahon. McMahon explained that many of the District meetings are held on Wednesdays and Thursdays, and that many campus meetings are held on Monday afternoons. North related that many of the District meeting dates and times are fixed. McMahon said that it is wise to have AS meetings immediately follow CEC, since dissemination of timely information is an important consideration in our decision making. Igou requested that McMahon put together a grid that shows the possible times available for all to see and McMahon agreed to create and send out a chart of options.

iii. Guided Pathways Update – M. McMahon

McMahon explained that the comments made by the College President at the last AS meeting drew her attention, so she had to listen to the recording to figure out exactly what was being said, because it is important they we communicate effectively and relay information effectively, especially if you are a leader; that is our fiduciary duty. Here is the highlighted excerpt language taken directly from the 03/06/18 minutes that the AS approved today: "Hsieh said that, upon request of the AS President, she contacted the State Chancellor's Office regarding the 'technical challenges' of uploading Guided Pathways documents to the online portal and how this info prepopulated our plan. We are waiting for a response."

McMahon stated that this statement by the President was accurate. McMahon said that she asked the College President, in a collegial manner, to furnish the updated version of the GP document to the State Chancellor's Office, since neither of the other two documents that were submitted in the fall was accurate. That is, neither the officially submitted GP Self-Assessment via the online portal (the one that was not approved by the Academic Senate), nor the approved document that was emailed to the State (with highlights, various font and two separate scales) was the GP Self-Assessment that we as a college had recently agreed upon. McMahon stated that President Hsieh ultimately refused to furnish them with that document as requested and, therefore, McMahon contacted the State Chancellor's Office and submitted the revised updated and college-approved GP Self-Assessment on March 6th, 2018.

McMahon reiterated that the GP Self-Assessment problems started with the inflated rankings that were wrongly submitted to the State. It is important that we understand this issue as it fits into a pattern. It created an enormous amount of trouble that we did not need to have, and it showed that there is a problem (in the College President's office) of relaying appropriate information accurately. This should be a college's job to do this, not the AS President asking the College President and her refusing to do this. That is not collaboration. That is adversarial, and that poor practice does not benefit anyone; however, it seems to be the way we have to conduct business, and this is not healthy or effective in terms of our mission.

Just as the AS predicted, the rankings (that we did not approve) prepopulated the GP Work Plan and cannot be redacted from this GP Work Plan. We can edit it and it is a document that can change as we go along, but what occurred in the submission has impacted the Work Plan. McMahon shared that the problems with the GP Self-Assessment started with the constituency groups initially not being included in the vetting process, which was absolutely necessary. This was then followed by the faulty submission of the GP Self-Assessment document, which was not approved. However, what happened with the GP Work Plan submission has been much better, and McMahon thanked Ramsey for helping to shepherd this effectively, which we have not been accustomed to as a college. One reason for the success of the GP Work Plan was due to the AS proposal of a GP steering committee, which guided the process to a successful and early submission of the GP Work Plan.

McMahon noted that many of the disagreements within our college are due to two things: one, the lack of understanding about where we really are as a college, based on the falsely inflated rankings for no good reason and, two, a lack of understanding of what the true purpose of GP actually is. Many want 'deliverables' right away, yet this is an opportunity for deep inquiry and assessment, exploration and discovery, which takes time and personnel to commit to the work. She reported that the GP Steering Committee has had two meetings, and arrived at an understanding of the need to focus on the Inquiry Phase: Key Elements 1-3. She said that the work on the GP Work Plan is done and it was submitted on time jointly by Ramsey and McMahon. McMahon reported that the allocation for GP would be paid out over five years. McMahon said that the process will be labor intensive and will require time and compensation (see resource allocation chart and actual budget submitted in the Work Plan below):

Resource Allocation for GP Work Plan

Allocation Categories (%)	Constituency Group			
	Academic Senate	Classified Senate	ASG	MGT
Personnel	70	40	30	60
Research	5	10	10	25
Prof Dev	20	20	20	10
Software	0			
Other	5	15	15	5
Projects: Vision of Success Outcomes	0	0	25	0
Roll over to next year	0	15	0	0

Budget from GP Work Plan

Budget Totals

Total Budget

\$257,995

Code	Amount	Percent of Budget
1000 - Instructional Salaries	\$147,598	57.21%
2000 - Non-Instructional Salaries	\$22,050	8.55%
3000 - Employee Benefits	\$28,993	11.24%
4000 - Supplies and Materials	\$2,580	1%
5000 - Other Operating Expenses and Services	\$55,638	21.57%
6000 - Capital Outlay	\$1,135	0.44%
San Diego Miramar College Total	\$257,994	100%

McMahon noted that the final allocation determined and submitted for all personnel was approximately 77% of the total allocation, supporting the contention that this is what is required to focus on the Inquiry Phase. McMahon explained that the resource allocation was a collaborative effort and that we, as the Academic Senate, were right on target in our resource allocation planning. She added that all constituencies will be able to participate and receive commensurate compensation. She also explained that the submitted scaling in the Work Plan could not be changed now, but that as we go along, we will be able to insert our accurate self-assessment. Murphy said that the next step is to start doing the work. She said that the GP Steering Committee will be soliciting participants. Ramsey said that the documents could be updated annually and the scaling could be modified. The funds will be released on April 30th. Ramsey reported that another workshop will be offered and that there was another GP Steering Committee meeting happening the following Monday (April 8th, 2018). There is an upcoming IEPI GP event on April 27th, a Peer-to-Peer Reading Circle for up to five college reps to attend. McMahon will send the GP workshop flyer.

iv. Collegial Consultation and Participatory Governance (Update) – M. McMahon

McMahon shared the email sent to the State Chancellors' Office on December 20th, 2017 from President Hsieh for the submission of the GP Self-Assessment document, a day after the College President submitted the online version that was not approved by the AS. McMahon noted that she, as the AS President, was not copied on that email when it was sent, and that if she had been, she would have immediately corrected the number of inaccuracies and falsehoods contained in the email.

From: Patricia Hsieh
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 3:33 PM
To: COGuidedPathways@cccoco.edu
Cc: lhope@cccoco.edu; Constance Carroll; kcarroll@cccoco.edu
Subject: San Diego Miramar College Guided Pathways Award Program Self-Assessment Signature Page and Self-Assessment Submission
Attachments: San Diego Miramar College Assessment Overview 12.19.17.pdf; San Diego Miramar College Guided Pathway Self-Assessment (AS).pdf; GP Self-Assessment Signature Page - Fully-Executed 12.18.17.pdf

The San Diego Miramar College's Guided Pathways Self-Assessment was submitted to the State Chancellor's Office on Tuesday, December 19, 2017 via the required link. A PDF copy of the submission is attached (first attachment). The fillable areas of the digital submission would not allow for the college's colored, highlighted, and strike-through portions of the assessment to be featured (when copied-and-pasted, all of the special identifying features were lost, and only the plain, black text remained). Therefore, the original assessment completed by San Diego Miramar College's various participatory governance committees, incorporating the college's Academic Senate alternative ratings and narrative changes, is also attached for your reference (second attachment). This is the document (second attachment) that the college intended to submit; however **the digital submission only allowed for one rating at the top of each section. Please note that although the digital submission only features one rating, the college's Academic Senate ratings are incorporated in the narratives by the college's Academic Senate for each metric, as well as highlighted in the second attachment.**

In the meantime, to demonstrate the college's commitment to implementing the Guided Pathways framework, **the college constituencies agreed** that in spring 2018, the classified, students, and management will respectively **invite the Academic Senate to dialogue** the differences of opinions related to the ratings for the various self-assessment elements. **These dialogues will allow the college to have a deeper understanding** of the intent and expectations of the Guided Pathways framework. These dialogues did not happen prior to the submission of the signature page and the self-assessment because **the attached Academic Senate ratings and justifications were provided to the College President's Office on Thursday, 12/14/2017; one day before the fall semester ended** on Friday, 12/15/2017.

If you have any questions, please advise.
Thank you.
Patricia Hsieh

McMahon suggested that the poor communication and deliberate obfuscation was done without the knowledge of the Academic Senate President, and with the intent to exclude faculty and not be accountable for the gross inaccuracies she conveyed. McMahon shared that the College President was fully aware on Dec 19th that the online submission of the GP Self-Assessment only allowed for one ranking to be submitted and that all of the formatting was lost during that submission of the approved documents, changing it radically by only showing one scale of adoption (the administration's choice) and making the narrative nonsensical. In that same email, the College President indicated that all college constituencies agreed to a dialogue in the spring; that was completely untrue and, in fact, the AS was excluded from any knowledge, planning or direct involvement in the presentation of this dialogue. Also, as revealed at the dialogue, its purpose was not to have a deeper understanding of GP, but to conduct a court of public opinion to persuade the AS to change its ranking to the higher scale (the scale the administration/College President desired and had already submitted) so that her faulty submission of the higher ranking would be approved retroactively after the campus dialogue. McMahon also noted that, in the email, the College President stated that she did not receive the ratings and justifications from the AS until the day before semester ended – also untrue; she received them on Dec 12th, 2017, in plenty of time to come to an agreement as a college, which would have been a much more sound submission and in the best interest of the entire college.

McMahon asserted that, in all these efforts, there was a deliberate manipulation by the College President to pit the College against the Academic Senate in a very divisive and destructive manner. McMahon said it was totally unnecessary and that she will take the "Collegiality in Action" team visit and survey very seriously and bring up these points, as well as others. Harrison said that this was an example of the lack of trust issue that exists with administration.

v. Faculty Retreat – M. McMahon

Faculty discussed the pros and cons of the historical faculty barbecue. McMahon will email all faculty to solicit interest in the formation of a work group/taskforce to discuss and plan a faculty retreat.

D. Committee Reports

- i. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) Recommendation for Faculty Co-chair of Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee to Receive Reassigned Time Commensurate with Duties – M. Kjartanson
Kjartanson reported that the initial recommendation from IPR/SLOAC to allow Taskstream access to non-faculty members was not voted on. Kjartanson reported that Academic Affairs recommended that the IPR/SLOAC Co-chair receive reassigned time commensurate to duties of the subcommittee. Discussion ensued. Kjartanson said the IPR/SLOAC Subcommittee was to take the recommendation back to the subcommittee to determine the workload that would drive release time.

E. New Business

- i. Collegiality in Action Team Visit: Surveys, Workshop and Participation – M. McMahon
McMahon said that this is a great opportunity to provide input. She said that the process as initially presented was unclear but that we are making progress. The workshop will take place on May 1st at 2pm. She said that the information will be

made public via the survey link. McMahon said that, initially, only workshop attendees could participate in the survey; however, as of this morning, the survey will be sent to all faculty. Discussion ensued. Murphy emphasized the importance of an inclusive and anonymous process involving all constituencies. There was discussion about the fear that some felt with regard to openly participating – fears of retaliation and hostility. North said that by not engaging faculty, the current faculty leaders may be set up to seem as if they are not supported and that would not be beneficial to faculty and others who are fearful. McMahon said that it was a tragic state of affairs that people were in such fear and it would be a shame if we do not engage in this as much as possible. Murphy solicited faculty to encourage colleague participation. Clark requested validation of anonymous input. McMahon said that she would inquire about the anonymity of the process. North pointed out that fear is a working condition issue and, therefore, an AFT issue and they should be made aware of this.

ii. FTES Productivity and Programs and Student Services Quality and Integrity – M. McMahon

McMahon reported on the rapid growth (two years ahead of schedule) of Miramar to 10,000 FTES and the troubling impact it has had on the College. McMahon explained the benefits of hitting this target: We have bolstered growth in our District when 32 out of 72 districts state-wide are in stability. McMahon said that stability is not a good thing; it means a District is not meeting their Base FTES Allocation targets, let alone growth targets. She said that if a district is in stability and no improvement is made by that district to meet their base, the State funds them for about two years at the unmet (higher) base, but then will reduce their base to the new lows that they are achieving, equating to section cuts, reduction in FTEF, pulling reassigned time, deleterious effects to programs and student achievement – all of which are bad things for a college/district. McMahon said that, of the \$650,000 that Miramar brings to the District, 15% will go to the District directly and 85% will go into the RAF (resource allocation formula). McMahon stated that the Miramar College AS has thoroughly and repeatedly demonstrated the dire need for simple *parity* in the ratio of FTES to FT faculty within the SDCCD. The colleges have NOT been allocated new faculty in a proportionately equitable way, and this has continued to hamper development at Miramar College in many ways. See data below from Miramar’s AS resolution, presented to the Board of Trustees in Oct 2017:

	City	Mesa	Miramar
Actual FTES 2016-2017*	10,486.24	15,257.84	9308.28
Target FTES 2017-2018**	10,420	15,244	10,004
Full-Time FTEF Fall 2017***	192	271	126
Number of FTES per Full Time FTEF	54.27	56.25	79.40

McMahon cautioned that if we do not meaningfully advocate for more full-time faculty, the wheels will start coming off all of our FTES and ‘butts in seats’ planning as a college. McMahon reported that, at the March 20th CEC meeting, she asked how the administration plans to advocate for parity in FT faculty at Miramar College, and that the administration’s and the College President’s response was that they had no plan to advocate for more full-time faculty at Miramar. Murphy reported that we have been asked to increase our FTES in the summer session, as the other colleges are not meeting their respective targets. Ramsey said that the College President continually advocates for more contract faculty. McMahon suggested to Ramsey that the College President might want to share her mystery strategies with the AS so we might work in synergy, rather than without any information from her at all. McMahon reported that the SDCCD AS Presidents are working on a resolution for more FT faculty that will be presented at the state-wide ASCCC Spring 2018 Plenary. McMahon solicited support from the Chair’s Committee in voicing concern over the increase in FTES and the deleterious effects this has on programs and services without the addition of more full-time faculty.

iii. Evaluation of Reassigned Time for Miramar College Faculty in Campus Leadership Roles (Prog Rev, Chair of Chairs FLEX, Prof Dev, SLO, etc.): Comparison with Other Colleges – M. McMahon

McMahon reported on reassigned time and faculty compensation for pay commensurate to workload. McMahon compared many of the common faculty leadership roles across all SDCCD campuses and how the values of FTEF varied. As an example, she examined and shared that the other SDCCD credit colleges, City and Mesa, have a 1.0 reassigned time load for a faculty coordinator of professional development, in which the duties of the FLEX coordinator were incorporated. This is compared to 0 FTEF for a faculty professional development coordinator at Miramar and only 0.2 FTEF for a faculty FLEX coordinator. She spoke of the history and the on-going struggle on

our campus for effective professional development and how we are hampered by these inequities. Murphy indicated that the reassigned time should parallel the reassigned time allotted to the other colleges, and just because we were a smaller college than, say, Mesa, the reassigned time should not be less but the same, as the workload is the same, indifferent to college size. McMahon reiterated that, from her assessments in discussing faculty duties for various roles, the reassigned time that is currently designated for multiple faculty leadership roles on Miramar College is not adequate at all for the duties and time commitments involved. McMahon indicated that she is still getting additional information on the table she provided that shows the four SDCCD institutions and their respective FTEF reassigned time for faculty roles. McMahon also showed the FTEF value of the extended service unit (1 ESU = 0.032 FTEF) and FTEF equated to hours of work (0.10 = 4 hours/wk) to give indications of how to assess workload commitments and compensation.

- iv. Options for Increasing AS Travel Budget for Promoting Faculty Leadership – M. McMahon
McMahon said that she would advocate for additional travel funds. She said that travel funds are based on FT faculty and we have not received an increase in travel funds, despite an increase in FT faculty.
- v. Recommendation from AAC Regarding IPR/SLO Recommendations on Taskstream Access – M. McMahon
This item was tabled by Kjartanson.
- vi. Faculty Coordinator for High School Partnerships – M. Kjartanson
Kjartanson reported that the Chair's Committee has discussed the need for a faculty coordinator for dual enrollment. Faculty expressed a desire for a faculty coordinator to serve as a resource person and provide orientation support. Kjartanson said that there have been discussions regarding an administrative coordinator for dual enrollment, adding that faculty would feel more comfortable with a faculty coordinator. Ramsey said that there has been a proliferation of growth in dual enrollment (one class in 2012 to 700 students in Spring 2018) and the infrastructure hasn't been developed to meet the growth demand. Ramsey said that we have had multiple discussions regarding the coordinator position. Kjartanson said that Carmen Jay was going to draft job responsibilities for the position. Ramsey said that we need an honest conversation regarding the necessary resources. Discussion ensued. McMahon will send out an email soliciting participation in a workgroup to explore a faculty coordinator for dual enrollment.
- vii. 2018-19 AS Exec Committee Election: Create Election Cmte and Open Nominations – M. McMahon
Three volunteers are needed to serve on the AS Election Committee and one of the volunteers will serve as the chair. Barbara Clark, Wai-Ling Rubic and Gabi Mansfield volunteered to serve. Clark agreed to serve as the chair and opened nominations for the 2018-19 AS Exec Committee election. Clark will send out an email soliciting nominations.

F. Senate Reports

- i. Adjunct – J. Librande and D. Gutowski had no report.
- ii. Treasurer – S. Vargo reported a balance of \$1092.97.
- iii. President's Report – M. McMahon had no report.
- iv. Vice President – L. Murphy had no report.

G. Announcements

- i. McMahon encouraged faculty to read the resolution packets for the ASCCC Spring Plenary and provide feedback. McMahon said that the link had already been emailed to senators.
- ii. McMahon solicited an AS representative to volunteer to attend the District BOT meeting on Thursday, April 12th.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm. The next meeting will be on April 17th. Please submit agenda items to both Marie McMahon and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Kjartanson and Juli Bartolomei