

**Minutes – Miramar College Academic Senate**  
3:40-5:00pm      **Apr 16, 2019**      Location: L-309

**Senators Present:** Marie McMahon, Laura Murphy, Alex Mata, Josh Alley, Alex Sanchez, Sabrina Menchaca, Lisa Clarke, Kandice Brandt, Barbara Clark, David Halttunen, Darrel Harrison, Mary Hart, Shawn Hurley, Dan Igou, Mary Kjartanson, April Koch, Andrew Lowe, Ryan Moore, Wheeler North, Patty Parker, Nam Sinkaset, Melissa Wolfson, Valerie Chau, Melissa Martinez, Kyleb Wild

**Absent:** Adrian Arancibia, Gina Bochicchio, Mark Dinger, Otto Dobre, Kevin Gallagher, Rich Halliday (proxy: D. Igou), Patricia Hunter (proxy: D. Tran), Pablo Martin (proxy: D. Igou), Jordan Omens, Kevin Petti, Jerry Benson, George Kallas, Gabriela Mansfield

**Other Attendees:** Donnie Tran, Tin Ki Tsang, Jessica Lopez, Duane Short, Wendy Kinsinger, Patricia Guevarra, Linda Woods, Leslie Marovich, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:41pm.

**A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes**

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

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

**B. Public Presentations**

i. Processes for District Faculty Screening Committees – W. Surbrook

- Working off questions that were submitted earlier. Questions are centered on what criteria are required for searches and for selection of new candidates.
- Question was submitted about the legal aspect of protected categories and what is protected, and can committee members score members higher or lower due to these criteria? Goal is to have a level playing field for all applicants. With processes in place, the goal is to get the *best* applicant and you cannot score anyone higher because of a diversity aspect. Proposition 209 that passed in California states that you cannot score someone based on protected classes, categories and activities or on any diversity aspect, as the definition for “diversity” is different for everyone. This is why we have provided you with the definition of Diversity for the District (see BP 7100). There are 19 protected classes identified in the state of California.
- You cannot just look at ethnicity, gender or the disability of applicants. However, HR is required to collect information on ethnicity, gender and disability of applicants, in order to create a report called the AIA Report. The AIA Report occurs after the process of screening all applicants for interviews (via an ISS form that goes to HR). The AIA Report is developed from this and has no names attached, just stats of who is going in for interviews. A senator asks, when that AIA Report is provided, does that have an effect on anything? It is presumed that, if the information is still about protected classes, that information could not be used for any decision making. The answer was that this is compared to adverse impact data. Example given was a recruitment for counselors, which is very diverse group; if the applicants coming through were all white males, then they know that there’s an issue and there should be more diversity in that pool. A senator asked if that can result in a rejection of the pool. The answer was yes. A senator noted that the rejection would then be based on a protected class, correct? The answer was yes.
- A question about diversity for areas such as Aviation came up, and would that pool be rejected due to lack of “diversity” and how many times? The answer was, sometimes, you need a couple times to get it right; taking a look at the posting, the outreach, the diversity of the committee and additional advertising and promotion would be recommended. It was stated that Johanna Palkowitz and all Site Compliance Officers conduct trainings that can also answer these questions.
- Q: Can candidates call and get feedback about why they were not selected? No. These results are confidential and nothing will be shared for fear of negative results down the line (perhaps legal). HR can give general information and advice, but they cannot give specifics to applicants.

**C. Old Business**

i. Curriculum Committee Changes (**2<sup>nd</sup> Reading**) – D. Short

- Motion to approve passes unanimously. (Igou/Clark)
- Goes to CEC, where only the AS President and College President have votes, due to it being an AS committee.

ii. Local Goals Alignment – N. Grisham and D. Miramontez

- Since last meeting, benchmarks were vetted through subject-matter expert teams across campus.
- Timeline is to go to the Board of Trustees on May 9<sup>th</sup>; hoping to go to CEC on Tuesday.
- Murphy asks if we will be held to meeting their benchmarks, even with this limited data. Answer: You can indicate that you expect to meet these goals over multiple years. Murphy is concerned that these benchmarks are not reflective of reality for Miramar College because the data is not accurate or difficult to collect at this time.

- North believes that we should be able to tell the Chancellor's Office that their benchmarks do not apply to our college, since we are different.
- Miramontez explains that Miramar College works off two sets of books: data for internal use and data to report to the Chancellor's Office for alignment. These books have data that does not align; our internal documents are accurate, while the ones we report to the Chancellor's Office are unreliable.
- To clarify, these are going to move forward to the Chancellor's Office for Vision for Success for this semester. However, for ACCJC, we get to use our own local data, and that is reported in the fall.
- Motion to move forward passes unanimously. (Kjartanson/Lowe)
- iii. Ongoing Concerns from Academic Senate Regarding the Integrity of Our Institution – M. McMahon
  - The following items will be presented to the BOT as violations of the Brown Act, Accreditation and other areas:
    - 1) Violation of CEC in meeting agendas and minutes.
    - 2) Non-compliance of DE (Title 5 and AP-5105).
    - 3) Unethical treatment, intimidation and retaliation towards ASG student leaders by Miramar Administration.
    - 4) Poor treatment towards specific classified professionals by managers.
    - 5) Violations of Title 5 regarding practices of faculty appointments to committees.
    - 6) Extremely poor practices regarding EEO certification requirements, which appear to be used to exclude specific faculty and classified participation in the process.
    - 7) Lack of good faith behavior across all high level administrators at Miramar with Academic Senate.
  - McMahon will send specifics to all senators to share with their departments and then forward to BOT with comments.
- iv. Faculty and Classified Get-together in May – M. McMahon
  - McMahon solicited ideas for a joint year-end get-together with classified staff.

#### D. New Business

- i. Budget Shortfall and Measures to Address Deficit, College and District-wide – AS Exec
  - McMahon shares information learned from DGC – that SDCCD Chancellor Carroll initially stated that the only definitive measure taken to address the budget shortfall would be the temporary freezing of vacant positions. This then came to include “other measures” as identified by each institution.
  - North asks for clarification. Currently vacant positions will be held and not filled. The email sent by the College President alluded to more cuts. Miramar comprises about 14% of the district budget, so we must account for 14% of the \$1.3M. Freezing new hires alone will not account for that \$1.3M.
  - North asks why faculty are not invited to help find other areas where these cuts can be made. Faculty should be involved at both the Chancellor's Cabinet and at the college level.
  - Other concerns that were brought forward included cuts to adjunct faculty (which was referred to in an email sent out earlier this month). Also, the point was made that, if we measure our contribution to alleviate the deficit based on our push for new FTES, shouldn't we have less cuts, as we were promised more positions to account for this increase?
  - McMahon and Murphy will follow-up as our representatives.
- ii. CTE Online Pathways Grant for Paralegal and Entrepreneurship – D. Harrison
  - There is a grant that is being offered to the schools through the California Virtual Campus Online Education Initiative. A tentative application went out on 3/15. The grant would essentially highlight the online programs we already have. If awarded, the grant would provide \$150,000 for faculty time and resources to enhance CTE curriculum. It focuses on improving the quality of existing certificates, is aimed at enhancing zero textbook and OER resources, and supports students on their existing academic pathways. We haven't applied yet; currently in grant development process. Miramar's group reached out to the District to help get things done on time. We are interested in enhancing what is already out there, not in developing new programs.
- iii. Credit for Prior Learning Project and Military Education Skillsbridge – J. Lopez
  - In certain industries, graduates are not developing their soft skills; therefore, how do we fill our classes with students who already have these soft skills? Many students who have military experience have developed these soft skills, so how do we get more military vets into our CTE classes?
  - The Skillsbridge program is coordination based on cohorts and could serve as an up-to 19-week pre-apprenticeship to feed into our programs (example: Automotive). The military would pay for the program, so it would not cost the students. It is currently in the exploratory stage.
  - Suggestion made to work with Personal Growth instructors.

#### E. Committee Reports, Senate Updates and Information

- i. Learning Technology Interoperability (LTI) Installation in Canvas and the Accessibility Issue – D. Igou
  - Igou reported that it is moving forward slowly.
- ii. Governance Review Steering Committees Update – L. Murphy and M. McMahon
  - Two forums are being held on Wednesday: 9am to 10:30am and 1pm to 2:30pm.

- iii. Guided Pathways Update – M. McMahon and L. Murphy
  - Email sent out earlier this week to solicit interest from full time faculty in the roles of the Guided Pathways Core Team faculty co-leads or co-facilitators (0.5 FTEF each) and with submission deadline (4/26).
  - Districtwide GP meeting on May 3<sup>rd</sup>.

**F. Senate Reports**

- i. Adjunct – S. Menchaca had no report.
- ii. Treasurer – J. Alley reported a balance of \$ 1,012.97.
- iii. President’s Report – M. McMahon reported on:
  - a) Report on ASCCC Spring Plenary
    - The resolution originated by Mesa College faculty about American Institutions passed.
    - Some resolutions that were discussed include AB 302. This is legislation that has not passed yet, but which would mandate community colleges in California to open their parking structures to homeless students.
    - The state-level funding formula, including the very problematic fallout from it, was discussed.
    - Fully Online College was discussed. A big frustration is that the massive funding for this poorly thought out concept takes a lot of money and resources away from current institutions in our system.
    - Discussion about validity of State Chancellor’s agenda was also addressed at the plenary.
    - There was a very informative session at the ASCCC plenary about what “onboarding” means for other colleges in their Guided Pathways endeavors. Every college should explore what onboarding means to them.
    - Another critical element was the effectiveness of “CCCApply”, which students are required to use in order to start the applications process at any college. Apparently, once faculty at other colleges decided to try to use it as their students would, the experience was very bad; it was deemed a “nightmare” by many, and the point of this discussion was that we as an institution should be fully aware of the systems we ask our students to use and dependent on. There is a lot of room for improvement in CCCApply, and faculty should be aware of these in order to promote progress on this issue.
- iv. President-Elect – L. Murphy had no report.

**G. Announcements**

- i. Governance Review “Open Forums”: Wed, April 17th, from 9:00am to 10:30am and from 1:00pm to 2:30pm.
- ii. BOT Meeting on Thursday.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:53pm. The next meeting will be on May 7<sup>th</sup>. Please submit agenda items to both Marie McMahon and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alex Mata and Juli Bartolomei