

Minutes – Miramar College Academic Senate
3:40-5:00pm **Sept 18, 2018** Location: M-110

Senators Present: Marie McMahon, Laura Murphy, Josh Alley, Alex Sanchez, Sabrina M. Menchaca, Lisa Clarke, Kandice Brandt, Barbara Clark, Mark Dinger, Otto Dobre, David Halttunen, Mary Hart, Patricia Hunter, Shawn Hurley, Dan Igou, April Koch, Andrew Lowe, Alex Mata, Ryan Moore, Wheeler North, Jordan Omens, Patty Parker, Kevin Petti, Nam Sinkaset, Shayne Vargo, Valerie Chau, Liz Hubert, Laura Louie, Melissa Martinez, Kyleb Wild

Absent: Adrian Arancibia, Gina Bochicchio, Kevin Gallagher, Darrel Harrison, Mary Kjartanson, George Kallas

Other Attendees: Laura Gonzalez, Donnie Tran, Tin Ki (Angela) Tsang, Sonny Nguyen, Mara Sanft, Adrian Gonzales, Lou Ascione, Gabriela Mansfield, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:40pm.

A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes

The agenda was unanimously approved unchanged. (Vargo/Sanchez)

The previous minutes were approved unchanged. (Koch/Vargo)

B. Old Business

i. Collegial Consultation: Updates and Next Steps – M. McMahon

McMahon reminded the AS that, after our first AS meeting this semester, the four constituency leaders of Miramar College met with the Chancellor on Sept. 5th in response to the continuing problems we are having at Miramar College. This meeting was to address three things: 1) timing (when we should address our situation), 2) governance training/processes and 3) the climate on campus and interpersonal relationships.

At this Sept 5th meeting with the constituency leaders, there were some differences of opinion about the suggestions made by the Chancellor regarding the next steps to take and the Senate's position about what the next steps should be. The AS President reported to that group that the Senate was comfortable with going forward with issues we believed were positive – for example, moving ahead this Fall with governance issues and training – but that the other problems we were having were unlikely to be solved with the interpersonal training that was being suggested. In addition, McMahon conveyed that the AS was wanting to make the SDCCD Board of Trustees more aware of the circumstances and situations at Miramar College. McMahon stated that the nature of leadership roles in both the Classified and Academic Senates (as well as with students) was that it changes, rotates out. Therefore, it is not the same people in those leadership roles over long periods of time, unlike that of the College President, so the effects of training this current group (of eight people) for interpersonal skills may be limited in value. The more important issue would be: Is this the main problem at Miramar College? Would undergoing this training effect positive change? Again, we need to ask ourselves the question: What is our main problem and is what has been suggested as the next steps a way to go about solving our main problem?

McMahon noted that, in the Collegiality Report (and in conversations with Julie Bruno), it was indicated that many of our processes are good; it is the practices that are failing us. When we are not acting in alignment with processes and procedures, that is problematic. This was called out directly in the CIA report with regard to adherence to regulations in Title 5. As the AS leadership has been reporting problematic behavior and practices of the administration to this Senate, the AS President is aware that some faculty cannot see these breaches by administration directly, such that we are going to have to establish a way for the Senate as a whole to trust the Senate leadership's impressions and opinions on how things are occurring. The AS President reported that Constance Carroll suggested we had a lot of structural and governance improvements to make at our campus. This was a little alarming to the AS President, since those kinds of changes are really for the entire college to decide. In addition, if a college is not practicing those procedures that are already good, then how is trying to improve the structure and procedures going to be of any help if our practices are still not in line with those 'improvements'? That's not sequential in how we want to address these items; let's have good practices first.

The AS President asked in the Sept 5th meeting, "What about accountability? That word has not been mentioned."

McMahon shared with the Chancellor the latest issue regarding the recording of meetings without consent, and she replied "I am aware of that." Carroll is the College President's boss, and yet there has not been any accountability when the AS President emails "Is this right?" asking for help regarding a situation. Is there accountability for poor behavior on our campus or with Carroll? There's been no clarity or accountability for that practice of recording without consent which, regardless of its legality, is about practices, the climate and the lack of trust, so this issue is being taken forward to the DGC as another troubling behavior. If we are doing things poorly, then we need to identify those breaches and then remedy them.

We are working on a timeline of tangible things, evidence to share with everyone – often people say, "Is there evidence?" The answer is yes, there is plenty of evidence. Here are some of the major infractions just since Spring 2018, and the situation has only gotten worse since the CIA visit in May 2018. Many issues are at least breaches in trust, if not the law. Some examples:

- Online submittal of a different GP Self-Assessment document to the one agreed to by AS.
- Planning and conducting campus-wide GP dialogues that deliberately excluded the AS.
- Administration making faculty appointments to committees excluding the AS (in violation of AP-2510).
- Providing extremely poor justifications for withholding information from the AS about filling the vacant Assoc. Dean position.
- Refusal by College President to share answers to most questions/requests from AS in writing.
- No effective communication from College President to the Academic Senate outside of “in-person meetings.” This is untenable in a functional Institution of Higher Education.
- Recording meetings without faculty consent. Currently inquiring about the legality of this at the DGC to get a legal opinion. Regardless of the legality, this is a very poor practice. Administration conducting business this way simply reinforces and amplifies the lack of trust that already exists.
- Approval of faculty compensation (reassigned time) not honored, practiced, or dialogued.
- No collaboration in taking positive actions to address our significant problems as a college. The AS’s Fall 2018 Convocation Plan to “Improve our College Culture and Relationships” was not embraced by the College President, who showed no interest (funding/support/collaboration) in this approach.

McMahon reported that, currently, there is a difference in understanding and the purpose of collegial consultation meetings between the College and Academic Senate Presidents. We have not had an effective practice for some time. We, the AS leadership, are also having a problem in face to face meetings. In the July 31st collegial consultation meeting, there were very different opinions and statements coming from each party, such that the AS President requested to record the meetings and have summaries written up for all attendees. The current practice adopted by the College President (and occurred earlier today) is that we, the AS, provide her with the questions beforehand (we had four questions today). The in-person meetings are basically non-interactive monologues or talking over each other (now openly recorded). If follow-up questions are possible, they are rarely sufficiently addressed/answered without duress. The notes are to be sent out – this, in theory, is now no different than writing ‘answers’ down in an email and sending them out to AS leadership. However, the CP continues to avoid communication via email with Senate leadership, and then conducts meetings like this, which is circular logic. This practice is extremely ineffective, causing long unnecessary delays in communication of important information. This is no way to effectively run our institution. The questions asked and the results of the Sept 18th Collegial Consultation meeting were summarized as follows:

1. Confirmation of the AS faculty appointment recommendation to a District Committee: This has been held up for almost two months because the College President (CP) has refused to answer this in any other setting than a private face to face meeting. The CP stated that the AS President needed to ensure the faculty had their immediate supervisor’s approval, and that the AS President also needed to send a courtesy notice to that immediate supervisor to confirm that this recommendation is OK. Not only is this non-functional, but it also has never been a practice, nor is it required by law. The AS President declined the need to do these things, noting that request was not required by law, as stated in Title 5. It is made clear in law that the Academic Senate (AS) must consult with the College President, but that the AS makes the appointment. The College President stated that we had always used this “practice.” This is simply not true. This is an absurd practice to suggest, and has never been used, nor has the College President ever requested this from the current AS President. This includes any faculty committee appointments, including ones that may involve reassigned time (e.g. Curriculum Committee). Whether or not reassigned time is involved has no bearing on the AS President’s role in appointing faculty to committees.
2. Status of funding for the vacant Assoc. Dean of Student Equity & Academic Success: The answer was yes, there appears to still be funding available for filling this position that has been vacant for 15 months. The new VPSS A. Gonzales confirmed this. This question about funding was first asked by the AS in July 2018 and only answered today (Sept. 18th, 2018).
3. Increasing the Academic Senate travel budget: The College President is not going to increase these funds. Her explanation is that this money comes from discretionary funds and that money is better spent on students. She suggested we apply to the Prof Dev Com to get any additional funding. The AS President indicated that AS Leadership is different than Prof Dev and that the \$1,000 maximum per faculty would not be sufficient to attend any off-campus event. Currently, Miramar College gets \$6,400/year for AS travel; by comparison, the Mesa College Academic Senate receives \$20,000/year from their College President in support of AS leadership travel. North indicated that, at one time, the operating budget for the AS was a negotiated item; it used to be \$10,000. McMahon stated that the AFT is currently in negotiations for additional reassigned time for Senate duties, but there was nothing about travel funds for Senate. Petti will look into AFT negotiated funding.
4. Finally, genuine collegial consultation is a dialogue, not a monologue. It’s about discussing information in an effective and efficient way and transmitting, sharing this information to help our college run well. At the moment, any time the AS makes any requests of the CP, the CP refuses to send any information by email and instead requests a face to face

meeting. It is hard to imagine how this is deemed workable or tenable. Her reasoning today for not sending any information via email to the AS President is because the AS President picks apart the CP's emails and accuses the CP of not being truthful, so now the CP does not put any information in emails so that she cannot be accused of doing anything inaccurate or untruthful. The AS President suggested that the CP would have nothing to fear if she were accurate and truthful! She could have total confidence in sharing her information in emails if they were accurate and truthful. It then went around in circles until the meeting ended. Again, it's not possible to see this as reasonable that we should need to conduct face to face meetings for every request the Academic Senate has.

Murphy summarized by reminding the body that, with regard to what has been discussed, the suggested 'Next Steps' were what the Chancellor proposed. What we as a Senate can determine is what are the next steps that the Senate would like to take, either in addition to those proposed or in lieu of them. Murphy reiterated that one of the suggestions last semester was the offer from Senate leadership to attend department meetings to talk about some of these issues and give a run-down of what's been going on so that all the faculty have a better understanding of what's been happening, if there is some lack of understanding or knowledge about what is happening. This can also occur in other forums so we can make sure everyone is well informed.

Clarke asked if the Chancellor was not addressing the total discord that was relayed by the CIA team regarding the climate at Miramar and all of the factual information given as to why. McMahon reported that her impression was we were all to blame for problems cited but also that that information was confidential. The third party Collegiality in Action brought in three facilitators to make evaluations and generate findings and make recommendations. The facilitators are now being commissioned again, but were they able to address or solve any of our problems? It was suggested that the depths of our problems was out of their hands. North suggested that the AS believes that the report generated by CIA was reasonably accurate, and others agreed. North continued that, if this report is now being re-interpreted into something else, then it would be a very good idea to have the CIA team return to clarify their report and reiterate its findings, making it clear to all what was meant. We need to get this understanding; ultimately, if we cannot, then these are data points we need to share with accreditation and/or our Board to tell them "They are not getting it!"

McMahon indicated that the classified and student constituencies do not have the same kind of protection as the AS, especially when deliberating with Carroll in that small venue, so the AS valiantly attempted to present contrary views at the Sept 5th meeting. However, that was a limited venue and perhaps we need to create our own venues; maybe we could conduct our own surveys. Constance stated that involvement of Board of Trustees (BOT) members or other College Presidents in helping the AS get to a place of more effective communication with the CP in meetings was not going to happen. North and Petti imposed that McMahon has the right to invite them to be aware (referring to other venues), in light of, or if there is lost faith in their designee. The AS wants to direct the college to engage in activities that are actually beneficial. McMahon expressed that there have been several benefits from the CIA experience, indicating that it was exhilarating to report that there was a tremendous and important improvement in the working relationship between the Classified and Academic Senates. The four leaders of both Senates had a very good meeting last week and have expressed keen interests in working more closely and positively together, with a particular focus on improving our college. In fact, we are having an 'All Senate Exec' get together off campus on Monday Oct 1st starting at 4pm. All AS senators are invited. Igou asked, when the CIA team is invited to come back, would the Board be invited to be a part of it? Discussion ensued. Murphy pointed out that if the Senate directs the AS President to invite BOT members to attend a venue we have, then that is what we can do.

ii. Guided Pathways Update – M. McMahon and L. Murphy

McMahon attended the ASCCC Workshop on September 14-15, 2018: Faculty Leaders in Guided Pathways.

Murphy stated that there has been pushback on paying faculty and staff to do the work and, as of now, no work has been done on the GP Work Plan. Faculty involvement will be needed in October. By the end of October, we hope to have some work completed (inquiry) and have a better idea of what Guided Pathways will be and what works and what needs work. McMahon will be requesting work groups of faculty/staff. McMahon emphasized that this is an opportunity for transformation within the college. The latest information about GP is that this is a decade-long plan (though funding is for five years), so it is recommended that we take our time and be methodical, particularly in the foundational stages.

iii. Academic Success Center (ASC) Taskforce and Assoc. Dean Timeline – M. McMahon

The first meeting is Wednesday, Sept. 26, at 1:00pm. McMahon presented the proposed updated membership list. Basic goals include effective communication, data analysis, inclusive and collaborative methods for prioritizing campus needs, and a move toward more innovative and creative approaches to student success. VPSS Gonzales is working on the job description for the Associate Dean. Funding is very likely.

iv. Website Utilization Report from CEC – M. McMahon

McMahon provided a quick review of the Website Utilization Report, looking at the progress over a year of the issues faculty shared with Dean Miramontez in Fall 2017. McMahon reported that the "Notes" from any Focus Group Meetings were a very long time in coming back to constituency groups. The AS just today (9/18/18) received the notes from the

Faculty Focus Group meetings that was held in Nov. 2017, and which was comprised of only three full-time faculty members. At this point, the Classified Senate has yet to get their promised meeting notes from their Focus Group meeting, which also occurred about a year ago. Miramontez explained that they separated out faculty needs from college-wide needs. The group focused on college-wide needs, and that is what the report covered. McMahon recommended regrouping as faculty and creating surveys for comprehensive feedback. Getting constituency surveys has been a primary and repeated request from the AS for over a year. It stands to reason that this would be vital to getting comprehensive feedback from all website users. Counselors indicate that the website is a daily tool that is used in their jobs and with assisting students and that there were many limitations to the current website for use as an effective faculty tool. It was suggested that, in constructing the surveys, faculty may want to identify specific categories of faculty users in order to draw out the specific problems encountered by the various groups.

McMahon also recommended planning for the Guided Pathways approach to the college website improvements. It may be that the focus of the work to be done on the website should be strongly linked to the Guided Pathways endeavor at our college. This may be one way to ensure that faculty, classified and student input is effectively incorporated into the college website. Miramontez replied that they are on the same page on that.

C. Committee Reports

i. Budget Development and Planning Council: Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) – L. Murphy

Budget Update: State: COLA of 2.71% in state budget, addressed through RAF.

State: BASE apportionment funding increase of \$2.4 M addressed thru RAF.

New Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) 2018-19

-70% funding based on FTES

-20% funding based on Supplemental Allocation

-10% of funding based on Student Success/Outcomes

The ratio for 2020/21 will be 60% FTES and 20% each for the others.

Miramar did meet 10,000 FTES and is officially considered a mid-size college. The District overspent by \$8M to reach the District target but missed, so the District is out \$15M. Peoplesoft ERP, Campus Solutions and missed FTES growth have drained our reserves more than \$28M in two years. District FTES target is 40,004 and the “strategic plan” is not FTES but productivity. 2018-19 FTES target for Miramar is reduced to 9,500. Class caps and class sizes are going to start to be an issue due to the productivity goal. Concern was expressed about class size caps not being consistent across the District. It is unclear what portion of the supplemental allocation and student success/outcomes funding will be required from Miramar. There are no new faculty positions in the District budget; the State does have a \$50M line item for “faculty support,” but there is no clarity on what that means.

ii. All Senate Exec Committee Meeting – M. McMahon

A relaxed and informal meeting between the Academic Senate and Classified Senate Exec Committees will occur on Monday, October 1st, from 4:00-5:00pm at Filippi’s in Scripps Ranch (9969 Mira Mesa Blvd). McMahon extended an invitation to all senators.

D. New Business

i. High School (HS) Partnerships – S. Nguyen and L. Ascione

Dean Ascione introduced Nguyen, the Associate Dean of Outreach and School Relations. Nguyen explained that he provides real-time information from the high schools, as he physically goes to them to communicate with their administrators to help coordinate and facilitate. Nguyen said that there are some classrooms at the high school sites designated for Miramar classes only. Nguyen further explained that some issues, like technology, cannot be resolved, but they work to see if there are ways around those issues via things like supplemental technology. Nguyen said that there were eight sections of high school classes four years ago and there are 60+ now. Nguyen impressed that the focus is communication and that he is the point of contact. It was pointed out that they have implemented faculty orientations on each campus to help mitigate some of the issues.

ii. Facilities Master Plan Update – B. Bell and L. Gonzalez

Bell showed Senators the Planning Document for the Facilities Master Plan Update. Bell explained that the committee prioritization of facilities needs is based on safety/environment and instructional impact. They are looking to strengthen how they collect facilities needs items and will work on a way to extract needs through program review. They are looking into the future for their Master Plan. The committee is seeking approval of their process, not the list itself. A motion was made to suspend the rules to approve the process. (North/?) Discussion ensued. The motion failed. It was noted by Senators that this prioritized list is ranked by the committee members based on a number of factors, and items requested and approved did not necessarily have to be in any program review. Petti noted that it was assumed that everything had to be in program review to be requested on a campus level and why was this process different? Bell explained that the ranking is based on safety, accreditation standards, state mandates, and some of the items were linked to items requested in program review. It was asked how input was solicited to this committee and Bell replied it was done through committee

members going back and sharing information with their depts. McMahon noted that the faculty membership was designated by Schools, so that information would have to then be relayed to all depts. and that may not be occurring as fully as we would like.

Senators will discuss the process with their departments and this item will be brought back to a future meeting.

- iii. Assist.org Delays & EMOC Oversight: Recommendations from Articulation Officers – M. Palma-Sanft
Palma-Sanft is asking for support from the Academic Senate on a position paper drafted by the Region 10 Articulation Officers. There is an issue with the fact that the old system for functioning articulation agreements is out of date and the new system—which was supposed to launch three years ago—is not available yet, with no specific release date. In the meantime, they have a note on the website for students to speak directly with counselors. This is a concern because it will lead to problems like hindering transfer guidance, curriculum development and institutional program planning/CCC funding formulas. They have written a position paper addressing their concerns and want support in bringing a resolution forward to the upcoming Area D meeting and ASCCC Fall Plenary. A motion to support the position paper passed unanimously. (Clark/Halttunen) Palma-Sanft will draft a resolution and bring it back to the next AS meeting. Senators were asked to bring the position paper to their departments for discussion.
- iv. ASCCC Part-Time Leadership Conference: Attendees Report – L. Hubert
In the interest of time, this item was postponed to the next meeting.
- v. CGC Change Form Proposal for Technology Committee – L. Murphy
Murphy presented the proposed changes to the Technology Committee as a first reading. Changes include updates and representation changes, including adding a column for “other” in response to an Accreditation requirement to include a District member. This item will come back for a second reading.
- vi. Solicitation of Interest from CCCCO of Program Pathways Mapper Pilot – M. McMahon and L. Murphy
In the interest of time, this item was postponed to the next meeting.

E. **Senate Reports**

- i. Adjunct – S. Menchaca had no report.
- ii. Treasurer – J. Alley
Alley reported a balance of \$1292.47.
- iii. President’s Report – M. McMahon had no report.
- iv. President-Elect – L. Murphy had no report.

F. **Announcements**

- i. No announcements.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09pm. The next meeting will be on Oct 2nd. Please submit agenda items to both Marie McMahon and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Sabrina M. Menchaca and Juli Bartolomei