

Minutes – Miramar College Academic Senate
3:30-5:00pm **Oct 16, 2018** Location: M-110

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

Absent: Adrian Arancibia, Gina Bochicchio, Barbara Clark, Darrel Harrison, Nam Sinkaset, Gabriela Mansfield (proxy: S. Menchaca)

Other Attendees: Brett Bell, Daniel Miramontez, Kurt Hill, Laura Gonzalez, Donnie Tran, George Kallas, Melissa Wolfson, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:45pm.

A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes

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

The previous minutes were unanimously approved unchanged. (Igou/Hart)

B. Old Business

i. Facilities Master Plan Update – B. Bell

- Facilities is looking at strengthening the process of approval for projects on campus. Asking Senate to approve the process itself, not the ranking of the items on the list.
- One concern was brought forward regarding the parking structure closure on Saturday mornings (when classes are in session). The question was asked, “Why can’t we keep the garage open on the weekends?” Bell will take back to Facilities to inquire.
- Murphy asked if it is possible for additional requests to be submitted and considered for the current list. This inquiry was made because all other budget requests are done through a much more formal process (i.e. Program Review and BRDS, etc.) and requests for Facilities did not go through a formal process and did not reach all constituents. Murphy clarified that she did not wish to stop the process but was asking if there was still time for submission.
- Bell said he would talk to McMahon and take it back to the committee for reworking.

ii. Website Workgroup Update: Faculty Surveys – Members of Workgroup

- Faculty members are creating a “Satisfaction and Usefulness” survey for all faculty at Miramar. McMahon will send Word doc to faculty.
- If, through the exercise of creating and conducting a faculty survey, we identify some issues of concern and problems that faculty are experiencing with the college website, then we can start to address these issues more effectively and work toward resolving them. There was a concern shared: once issues and suggestions were identified by faculty, staff or students, we would not know where to take them or how to address them. Concerns were raised about the potential dissolution of the Website Subcommittee.
- A question was raised about the purpose of the faculty survey. The response was that the only input solicited by the Website Upgrade efforts was that, over a year ago, there was a ‘Faculty Focus group’ conducted in order to get feedback; however, this consisted of only three full time faculty members who participated in an hour long discussion and, from that discussion, none of the pressing concerns have been addressed, nor has a faculty (or any other constituency) survey considered been sent. The Senate was informed that these focus groups were used to develop “themes” for the website but, again, the point was made that the faculty input was extremely narrow and the notes for that meeting were only shared with AS last month. Murphy added that this survey is a means for gathering a more thorough and comprehensive understanding from faculty and staff of concerns regarding the website and its functionality. Miramontez said that, after reviewing the 8-page document from the original survey, they delineated faculty and college-wide concerns, and faculty concerns were dealt with. College-wide concerns were discussed by the focus groups and perhaps were not all met yet; they are now focusing on some of those concerns, as well as the functions of the specific departments. He agreed that capturing more information in a survey would be great, but the Website Subcommittee is currently working with each department specifically at this time.
- To move forward, Sanchez proposes that we send a draft of the new survey to the senators and gather information before the next Senate meeting. Senators concurred.
- A recommendation was made to have the Research Office help create and send out the survey.

iii. Online Courses and Evaluations Workgroup – Members of Workgroup

- Still in rudimentary form. McMahon provided this update: The workgroup is aiming to collaborate with Distance Ed, Curriculum and any other committees and other interested faculty.

- Some important online issues (Evaluations, Standards and AP-5105) were discussed at the District Governance Council (DGC) on Oct 3rd, and it was suggested at DGC that there is another District group the workgroup can connect with as they explore ways to improve what we do online.
 - Topics of interest so far include: Effective Faculty Evaluation Tools, Effective Practices for Teaching Online, Understanding Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedure (APs) for Distance Ed, and Support Systems for Online Instruction.
- iv. ASCCC Exemplary Award (Submission Deadline: 11/05/18) – M. McMahon
- Deadline to Register/Application Deadline: Monday, Nov. 5, 2018 at 5:00pm.
 - In an effort to promote the work faculty and students are doing to address environmental responsibility and good stewardship on their campuses, the theme for the 2018-2019 Exemplary Program Award is “Environmental Responsibility.”
 - Take to departments and discuss, encourage nominations.
 - Logistical questions asked about what acceptable nominations would look like. North shared that any academic program or any academic endeavor to promote a program can be nominated.
 - L. Gonzalez encouraged faculty to talk to P. Martin, the Environmental Stewardship Subcommittee Chair, for more information about environmental programs/activities on campus.

C. New Business

- i. Contract Faculty Hiring Committee Change Proposal (**1st Reading**) – M. Kjartanson
- A chart displaying the electorate constituencies was projected to discuss the history of the changes being presented by Kjartanson. In the past, some schools were allotted 5 votes to rank hiring priorities for new positions on campus, while other schools were allotted only 4 votes. Because this appeared to cause some inequity, a change for ALL schools to be allotted 5 votes was proposed. Furthermore, in examining administrators’ roles in voting, the committee also agreed that Deans should be allotted one vote each. Lastly, the committee allotted 5 faculty votes to counseling. Other changes in this proposal reflect the removal of the Academic Senate Executive Committee in an effort to avoid any potential conflicts of interest. However, the Academic Senate President will maintain a vote as a representative of the faculty as a whole.
 - The committee has shared this information with CGC, who presented some concerns that the committee is considering now.
 - Senate representatives did ask why the Articulation Officer maintains a vote under the new proposal. Kjartanson answered that the committee decided the AO can serve as a neutral vote and was, therefore, valuable to maintain.
 - The committee is requesting that senators take it back to their departments to discuss. This item will come back for a second reading.
- ii. EEO Fund: Campus Expenditure Request – L. Gonzalez
- Gonzalez hopes to bring a speaker to campus and is requesting approval of funding. Asked to suspend the rules to receive final approval at the meeting today.
 - Motion to suspend the rules unanimously approved. (Koch/Kjartanson)
 - Motion to bless unanimously approved. (Igou/Koch)
 - A suggestion was made to have the Diversity Committee create an operational plan to include all planned events and have that blessed, so individual event funding approval will not be necessary.

D. Committee Reports, Senate Updates and Information

- i. Guided Pathways Update – M. McMahon and L. Murphy
- The campus is still moving forward with a GP steering committee, created by the Academic Senate. The group is currently working on the inquiry portion of the process, asking questions like “What is Guided Pathways? Why is this good for us; how can GP help us?” Committee is reaching out to other institutions and programs to gather more information.
 - In discussions with other AS Presidents, McMahon shared that Mesa College is currently in the process of instigating a Faculty Lead for their GP efforts with 1.0 reassigned time to dedicate to Guided Pathways work on that campus. This is following City’s College lead, which currently has a faculty lead with 1.0 reassigned time to dedicate to GP. We are not at that point, but wanted to share what other campuses within our district are doing.
 - The committee will continue to update the Senate as more information is gathered. More information is expected by the end of Oct, followed by a college forum.
- ii. Options for Increasing AS Travel Budget for Promoting Faculty Leadership (Update) – M. McMahon
- McMahon stressed that more funding is needed for leadership and succession planning for the Academic Senate.
 - McMahon met with Bell to inquire and get more information about the campus budget, how the different categories are decided and how they are funded. The intent of our examining the structure of our campus budget is to see if we can utilize campus money that is not currently being used but is allocated to another program to help

promote the needs on campus, whether that is for the Academic Senate or any other program, committee or group on campus. In our last Senate meeting, McMahon mentioned that the College President receives an additional \$45,000 from the SDCC Auxiliary Organization, but it is now actually \$47,250 from this organization. This discretionary money is in addition to another \$12,100 in discretionary funds from the Miramar campus budget, for a total of over \$59,350 that the College President receives in discretionary funds each year.

- McMahon contacted Bell to get assistance on finding out who determines where this money gets placed; that is, how is it allocated? Also, where or how has this money been spent year-to-year? This question was difficult to answer because the allocation for all categories is via Program Review with three exceptions: College President funds, Campus-wide funds, and Academic Senate funds. Therefore, tracking how much and where money is spent is difficult, since it is not tied to program review.
 - We should review the spreadsheet for the breakdown of Civic Center Funds as well. Civic Center funds come from another pot of money. There are four categories that are paid out of that pot of funds: Athletics, Fitness Center, Campus Equipment and Professional Development. This Professional Development receives 5% of the total amount, which is about \$5K/yr. That would indicate that the total amount of money from this Civic Center fund is about \$100,100/year. BRDS decides how those percentages are divided. Decision was made from a previously approved list/process.
 - Another question was: Are the Program Review funds in addition to other operational funds? “For example, is the \$187,749 that MBEPS gets the only funding for classes or ‘serving students’? Senators asked at the last AS meeting and the AS president wants to be able to offer some information. We know labs are can expensive in science and wanted to be able to indicate why that amount is so much greater than the other schools.”
 - Another question was: Is there any accounting or reporting out of how the College President’s discretionary money is used? Specifically, how it is spent? Since the College President also receives an additional \$47,250 from the SDDCAO, could we have information about how all of this money is used? Again, since this funding is outside of program review, there is no information readily available as to what the requests were for those funds, nor how that money is ultimately used.
 - Igou requested that McMahon also ask Bell to inquire about where money for renting out the H Building to the Chinese School goes and if any of it goes back to repairing those classrooms being rented out.
- iii. Academic Success Center (ASC) Taskforce and Assoc. Dean Timeline (Update) – M. McMahon
- In 2015, the Academic Senate put forward specific plans for comprehensive campus-wide tutoring with the intent of hiring an Associate Dean and Faculty Coordinator. McMahon displayed a time line of the achievements of the plan:
 - In the fall of 2016, the search for an Associate Dean commenced.
 - In the spring of 2017, the Associate Dean started and the search commenced for the Faculty Coordinator.
 - In the summer of 2017, the Associate Dean resigned. That same summer, the Faculty Coordinator started.
 - It was noted by McMahon, who has been deeply involved since the beginning of this endeavor, that immediately upon receiving accreditation as a college in the summer of 2017, the support for the Academic Senate’s plan for campus-wide comprehensive tutoring significantly dried up. The vacated Assoc. Dean position has been left vacant for 15 months without meaningful information from the College President about replacing it, while the Academic Success Center (ASC) has suffered as a consequence.
 - In the fall of 2018, the Academic Success Center Taskforce was reconvened, as the Academic Senate had been excluded from participating in the development of the ASC, which has also been troubling. One goal of the renewed ASC taskforce activity is to get that vacant Associate Dean position filled. They are currently working on the job description and on getting the go-ahead to form a search committee. McMahon will send out a notice to solicit interest for faculty to serve on this taskforce.
- iv. Solicitation of Interest from CCCCO of Program Pathways Mapper Pilot – L. Murphy and M. McMahon
- This pilot program was presented to the Academic Senate at the last meeting. The program involves loading curriculum and program maps into the Program Pathways Mapper and publishing these maps online. At that previous Academic Senate meeting, two weeks ago, the Senate overwhelmingly voiced concerns that we, as a college, are not ready for the pilot program. There was no official discussion of this topic or any kind of vote on this matter in the Guided Pathways Steering Committee. There was also no official discussion of this topic or any kind of vote on this matter at any CEC meeting. The only official discussion of this topic occurred at the Academic Senate meeting on October 2, 2018, and that discussion resulted in the conclusion that faculty did NOT support submission of the SOI for this Mapper Pilot at this time. This was clearly reflected in the meeting minutes of the 10/02/18 Academic Senate meeting. On October 5, 2018, the District submitted a SOI for Mapper Pilot. The District submission of SOI was based on Chancellor’s Cabinet discussions and agreement of representatives therein (i.e. our College President).
 - Fortunately, Miramar College was not chosen for the pilot; however, a deeper issue is being addressed by Senate Exec as to why the Academic Senate’s voice was not heard regarding this issue, which is the legally binding representative

of the faculty in all matters academic and professional. The concern remains that the agreement to the submission of the SOI was in violation of AB 1725, faculty purview, and collegial consultation.

- v. Resolutions and Reports from Area D Meeting – M. McMahon, L. Murphy and M. Sanft
 - Meeting was on Saturday at Palomar College.
 - One resolution was to adopt a Guided Pathways Glossary and also some discussion about metrics.
 - One of most interesting discussions was a potential for a Vote of No Confidence for the California Community Colleges Chancellor (CCCC). There are many concerns with how the CCCC has operated without engaging in genuine collegial consultation with the Statewide Academic Senate, or the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges (ASCCC). Some of the issues of contention between the CCCC and ASCCC have been: the Fully Online College, no consultation and a starting cost of \$100M, plus another \$20M ongoing. Some other issues identified include: There is no Board of Trustees for this college, it may be just duplicating what we are already doing; there are future partnerships with Walmart in the works; and no faculty have been identified as instructors at this new college. Additionally, it will be outside of the purview of a union representative or accreditation.
 - On another note, the resolution set forth by Sanft and approved by the Academic Senate was very successful and well-received.
- vi. Feedback on Actionable items (Concerns with College Admin) and Dialogue with Chancellor Carroll
 - Dialogue ensued about possibly setting forth a milestone, a plan of action or some kind of process for accountability to move forward. There is a need to establish a timeline and codify issues with a resolution.
 - Solicitation of attendees for the Open Door Session at the Board of Trustees meeting on Thursday, Nov. 8, 2018, from 3:30-4:00pm at Mesa College.
 - One idea is to have a Survey Monkey link on our Academic Senate website for anonymous submission of comments and issues. Information would be collated by the Academic Senate Executive Committee and shared with the AS body.

E. Senate Reports

- i. Adjunct – S. Menchaca had no report.
- ii. Treasurer – J. Alley reported a balance of \$1,597.97.
- iii. President's Report – M. McMahon had no report.
- iv. President-Elect – L. Murphy had no report.

F. Announcements

- i. Academic & Classified Senate Happy Hour was great!
- ii. Foundation Scholarship for Fall Plenary!

The meeting was adjourned at 4:56pm. The next meeting will be on Nov 6th. Please submit agenda items to both Marie McMahon and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Alex Mata and Juli Bartolomei