

Minutes – Miramar College Academic Senate
3:30-5:00pm **Nov 06, 2018** Location: M-110

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

Absent: Josh Alley (proxy: A. Mata), Adrian Arancibia, Gina Bochicchio, Otto Dobre, Darrel Harrison, Mary Hart, Jordan Omens, Shayne Vargo (proxy: R. Moore), Laura Louie, Gabriela Mansfield (proxy: S. Menchaca)

Other Attendees: Donnie Tran, Duane Short, Naomi Grisham, Anne Gloag, M. Patricia Beller, Lou Ascione, Melissa Wolfson, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:40pm.

A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes

The agenda was unanimously approved after a reordering to move Item C.i before B.i. (Igou/Sanchez)

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

B. Old Business

i. Contract Faculty Hiring Committee Change Proposal (**2nd Reading**) – M. Kjartanson

- Kjartanson reiterated the genesis of the new list and that the real driver of this change was to allot every school five votes, making the process more equitable. Student Services was also bumped up to five votes, the Academic Senate Executive Committee (with the exception of the AS President) was removed, and the membership for administrators did not change at all. This change in committee membership was approved by the Faculty Contract Hiring Committee.
- Harrison asked, again, why the Articulation Officer is on the committee and allotted a vote. D. Short spoke up, as a former AO, and said that the AO is an impartial member who is in tune with the needs of the entire campus (as that person works with all departments) and that the AO also has a good overview of what the campus really needs, on both the Student Services and Instructional sides. Discussion ensued regarding the importance and necessity of keeping the AO as a voting member of the committee, for oversight.
- Motion to modify the document to remove the Articulation Officer as a voting member of the Faculty Hiring Committee. (Harris/Clarke) Discussion ensued. Motion failed.
- Motion to modify the proposal to add a Faculty EEO Officer as a voting member. (Harrison/Chau) Since, currently, no such faculty EEO position exists, it was determined that, if such a position were to exist on this committee, it would be appointed by the Academic Senate. It was supposed that this designee would be EEO trained for that position. Discussion ensued about what this person would do on the Faculty Hiring Committee and why an EEO Officer is necessary as a voting member, as we do not currently have a faculty member in this position. Motion to modify the original motion passed. Motion to approve the revised proposal as amended passed unanimously. (Petti/Kjartanson)

ii. Faculty Website Survey: Final Draft for Approval – Members of Workgroup

- Regarding the survey, McMahon asked the Senate for some input about how specific questions should be presented. For example, should we ask faculty to distinguish whether they are full time or part time? Should we ask them what department, what program or what discipline they are in? In essence, how important is it to gather that kind of information about each faculty member who fills out the survey? It was suggested that getting some basic information about full and part time faculty and their disciplines would inform us about who and what areas have given feedback, and who we still want to hear from. What departments were being represented? Discussion ensued. The general outcome was that questions should be as specific as possible and it would be to our benefit to gather as much pertinent information as we can.
- McMahon also wanted input about whether to add or modify any questions. Senators will email suggestions.
- Miramontez and Hill pointed out that there is a “report an issue” link on the site, at the bottom of the page.
- Senators did ask a clarifying question regarding who should vet information before it is put onto the website, as our website is such a public and visible forum. Hill said that the Dean or whoever is in charge of the page itself is who will vet information, not anyone on the Website Subcommittee. However, if anything is blatantly breaking rules or regulations, the Website Subcommittee will contact the publisher of that information.
- Based on the discussion, McMahon will make edits to the website questionnaire and send it to Senators for review. This will then be able to go to the Campus Research Office (Xi Zhang) for assistance in creating the online survey.

C. New Business

i. BP 5020 Review – D. Short

- Short presented a document for a first reading of an adjustment to BP5020. Though this language is already in Title V, the State is requesting that we put this language in the policy. Senators should take it back to their departments for feedback.
- This item will come back for a second reading.
- ii. College Mission and Vision Statement (PIEC) – N. Grisham
 - Three-year mission statement review. Some changes were made, so Grisham is asking that Senators take it back to their departments and send feedback to her.
 - Discussion ensued about adding something about “personal enrichment” and being more specific about “effective participation” in governance. It was clarified that “effective participation” is the legal term.
 - This item will be brought back for a second reading.
- iii. Miramar College Student Scholarships – M. McMahon
 - Motion to approve two \$300 scholarships for civic and community leadership passed unanimously. (Igou/Hurley)
 - A scholarship screening committee will be created in Spring ’19 to review the applications.

D. Committee Reports, Senate Updates and Information

- i. De-Brief from Collegiality in Action 2nd Visit (Nov 6th, 2018) – M. McMahon
 - The same three third-party facilitators from the first Collegiality in Action Team visit in May 2018 mediated a follow-up meeting with eight members from Miramar College. The representatives from Miramar College were two members from each constituency. Management Leadership: Patricia Hsieh and Daniel Miramontez. Academic Senate Leadership: Marie McMahon and Laura Murphy. Classified Senate Leadership: Terrie Hubbard and Sean Young (Classified Senate Vice President). Student Leadership: Alana Bermodes and Kayla Buenaventura. There was good discussion, different perspectives presented and meaningful dialogue. There was support of faculty and classified staff concerns. A significant concern conveyed by Academic and Classified Senates to the visiting team was that, since the first visit on May 1st, 2018, the college climate has continued to deteriorate and, in fact, there has been acceleration in terms of breaches of practice and policies as a consequence.
 - The short-term outcome from this follow-up visit is that there will be a commitment to work on relationships, behaviors towards one another, and how we communicate with each other, including email communication and face to face meetings. It was also recognized that there needs to be focus on how to make meetings function better, with a focus on meeting agendas and meeting minutes.
 - Feedback was that the College as a whole needs to work on governance structure and the role of faculty (10+1). To clarify, this is not just to examine the roles of the constituencies, but to review how decisions should actually be made, and ensure that all members of the constituency bodies are aware of what we should be doing and what the processes are for decision making on campus as a college. For example, it was noted that items in the 10 + 1 (Academic and Professional Matters) that fall into the “Rely Primarily” category should ideally be presented merely as an FYI at CEC. The current CEC agenda was modified to delineate AB-1725 (10 + 1) items and specifically call them out, which has not been well received by the College President. These details about what our processes are and the practices that we use on this campus need to be discussed openly, to reinforce the concepts, and then followed through with the practice of respecting the rights of faculty in their primacy of decision making for academic and professional matters.
 - This returning Collegiality in Action (CIA) team offered to further assist Miramar College in moving forward with such concerns and solutions on an ongoing basis.
 - Other issues that will be addressed are the breaches in conduct, practices and protocol, which will be followed up with the Board later this week.
- ii. Update from the AS Meeting with the SDCCD Chancellor – M. McMahon
 - McMahon confirmed with the AS that they would like to follow up with Chancellor Carroll in terms of the responses she promised to provide after hearing our concerns at the Oct 16th meeting. The body also wanted to invite the Chancellor back to an actual Academic Senate meeting. Discussion ensued about what the Senate would like to see in a follow-up meeting. After some discussion, McMahon asked the Academic Senate for permission to send out an email asking the Chancellor to share her plan to move forward on the issues that have been and continue to be presented to her, and then invite her to come back for further discussions with the Academic Senate.
 - Senators were reminded that there was a Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting on Thursday, with the open door session starting at 3:30pm. McMahon stressed that it is important for others to attend and be honest with the Board about what is going on at Miramar College; the BOT members want to hear from faculty, that is what their open door sessions are for. Discussion ensued about this meeting, as well as what direction the Senate should pursue. The recommendation was made to give the Board a chance to rectify the situation.
- iii. Guided Pathways Update – M. McMahon and L. Murphy
 - McMahon reported that, unfortunately, in two recent incidences, the Miramar Administration did not follow the process that has been agreed to for approving campus-wide GP related initiatives, and that the understandings in place about how

to proceed have apparently been broken. The first example was the SOI Program Mapper Pilot application. Although discussions began on campus, there was no agreement as a college to commit the campus to this software. Despite that, the decision was made at the Chancellor's Cabinet to apply for this program as a District. If this application were accepted, this would mean that Miramar College would agree to adopt this program software that the Academic Senate had already determined that we, as a college, were not yet ready to make that commitment to. McMahon presented these concerns to the BOT meeting on Oct 11th and the Chancellor assured us that we would not have to engage in anything we did not agree to. The second incident was the "Leading from the Middle" (LFM) Academy application for creating a five member team to attend seminars and workshops for a year. Again, this activity involved faculty and GP and potentially making commitments as a college on 10+1 matters. Specifically, neither of these initiatives was even brought to CEC, let alone approved by CEC. McMahon wanted to clarify that the Academic Senate was never opposed to the LFM Academy. There was never a vote anywhere on this issue. AS leadership was actually in support of this great idea, but we were not willing to bypass our processes yet again in order to achieve this. The other very important component of this was that when the VPSS and VPI were soliciting faculty interest, they did not consult with the AS; all we asked was to be included in the process of seeking faculty interest for inclusions as a College LFM team member. Faculty appointments to committees, groups, taskforces, etc. is the purview of the AS if it is a 10 +1 matter and involves a commitment being made by the entire college. To reiterate: The AS did not vote "no" in CEC on these issues, but these items were not brought to CEC; therefore, they did not go through the proper process, that is that everything must be approved via CEC before moving forward. Therefore, both of these examples explicitly violated Miramar's approval process. This is further evidence of how our campus-wide approval process is being circumvented, leading to decisions being made without going through the proper channels. Administrators are agreeing to things as a college that have not been discussed as a campus and we cannot continue to operate in this manner.

- iv. Options for Increasing AS Travel Budget for Promoting Faculty Leadership (Update) – M. McMahon
 - Brett Bell will be working on supplying the Senate with more information.
 - In consultation with the other SDCCD AS Presidents, McMahon formally asked the SDCC Auxiliary Organization if the SDCCD Academic Senates could receive discretionary money from this body the way that all of the College Presidents currently do. B. Dowd from the SDCC Auxiliary Organization indicated that she will be taking the matter of the possibility of funding the AS in some capacity to the Chancellor's Cabinet.
 - Harrison asked if the EEO Officer is paid out of the President's discretionary money, as it used to be before the position went to a dean. McMahon will look into this.
 - Other avenues being explored include finding additional resources: If Program Review is used to allocate funds, it may be that the Senate could do this? Need to establish if this is feasible. Again, the question of any accounting or reporting out of how the College President's discretionary money is used was asked. This is because, in addition to the \$12,100 from the campus budget (almost twice the budget of the AS), the College President also receives an additional \$47,250 from the SDDCAO. McMahon will follow up and report back to the Senate.
- v. Academic Success Center (ASC) Steering Com – D. Tran
 - At the last ASC meeting, the group agreed to turn this "Task Force" into a "Steering Committee." This was because, by the specific definitions of these groups in terms of governance, it was agreed that the usage of "Steering Committee" was much more accurate.
 - Due to time constraints, Tran will return to a future meeting with his update.
- vi. Assoc. Dean for ASC Timeline (Update) – M. McMahon
 - At the last ASC meeting, the basic dates for the formation of a search committee and first and second interview windows were shared, with the expectation that the new Associate Dean of ASC should be on board by March 2019. Specific dates will be sent out for the timeline.
 - Kjartanson reported that the new position will be under Dean Miramontez.
- vii. Resolutions and Reports from ASCCC Fall Plenary – M. McMahon, L. Murphy
 - McMahon will send update.

E. Senate Reports

- i. Adjunct – S. Menchaca had no report.
- ii. Treasurer – J. Alley was not present.
- iii. President's Report – M. McMahon had no report.
- iv. President-Elect – L. Murphy had no report.

F. Announcements

- i. Miramar College Holiday Ball: Sun., Dec. 16th, 2018, from 5:00pm to 9:00pm (\$35/person). Contact Laura Gonzalez or Terrie Hubbard for tickets.
- ii. ASCCC Hayward Award: Nominations due at 5:00pm on Dec 17th.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01pm. The next meeting will be on Dec 4th. Please submit agenda items to both Marie McMahon and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Alex Mata and Juli Bartolomei