

Minutes – Miramar College Academic Senate
3:40-5:00pm **April 17, 2018** Location: L-309

Senators Present: Marie McMahon, Laura Murphy, Mary Kjartanson, Shayne Vargo, Mara Sanft, Jason Librande, Lisa Clarke, Josh Alley, Gina Bochicchio, Kandice Brandt, Barbara Clark, Mark Dinger, Otto Dobre, Patricia Flower, Kevin Gallagher, Anne Gloag, Darrel Harrison, Mary Hart, Dan Igou, April Koch, Jennifer Leaver, Alex Mata, Ryan Moore, Wheeler North, Jordan Omens, Patty Parker, Alex Sanchez, Nam Sinkaset, Elise Lindgren, Gabi Mansfield, Marc McGrath, Kyleb Wild
Absent: Daniel Gutowski, Lisa Brewster, David Halttunen, Kevin Petti, Wai-Ling Rubic, John Salinsky, Desi Klaar
Other Attendees: Patricia Hsieh, Naomi Grisham, Adrian Arancibia, Duane Short, David Melhoff, Lou Ascione, Melissa Wolfson, Daniel Miramontez, Nick Gehler, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:39pm.

A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes

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

Hearing no objections, the previous minutes were approved unchanged. (Vargo/Kjartanson)

B. Special Reports/Information

i. Administration – P. Hsieh

President Hsieh provided an update on Miramar’s achieving 10,104 FTES. She reported that Palomar College is scheduled to open a satellite center in Rancho Bernardo on May 7th, offering classes that we don’t offer much. Hsieh shared the following proposed agenda items for the Fall 2018 Convocation:

- 2018-2019 Statewide Budget and the impact on Miramar and new funding for the District
- Accreditation Midterm Report (due in December 2018)
- Impact of AB 705 on Miramar College

ii. Classified Staff – None

iii. Associated Students – None

iv. AFT – None

C. Old Business

i. Diversity Center Concept – L. González

González provided the second reading on the “Diversity Center Concept.” González said that the goal is to consider whether this would be beneficial to our college. She added that this is an idea, not a program or implementation. González said that public spaces, like the library or cafeteria, lack intentionality that a diversity center would provide. She said that the center would provide an inclusive, not exclusive, environment; all students would be welcome. González explained that part of the center would have volunteer hours for students to receive mentoring. She said that the center could be used to provide space for speakers, discussions, programming and meeting times for student organizations. It could be a gathering room that would promote community. She explored the possibility of a quiet room that could benefit Muslim and autistic students. She asserted that all groups, including ethnicity, culture, gender, spirituality, abilities, and age, would benefit from the promotion of cross-cultural understanding. González said that many local universities and community colleges have similar centers, including City College’s Hub. A mission statement was provided. Facilities would decide on a location and it is not funded yet. Funding would not be one-time SEP funding. A short film showcasing student views of the deliverables that a diversity center could provide for Miramar students was shown. Discussion ensued. Motion to approve the “Diversity Center Concept” unanimously approved. (Koch/Weaver)

ii. Guided Pathways (Update) – M. McMahon

McMahon reported that we have a college team going to the IEPI Peer to Peer Reading Circle on Fri, April 27th. McMahon mentioned that an item introduced at CEC earlier today was planning for the convocation topics. The three suggestions were noted by the College President in her report, but added to that was the suggestion from McMahon and Murphy that we could engage Dr. Kim Bateman as a keynote speaker for convocation. Dr. Bateman presented the theme of a “College Culture Remix - “We’re Jammin’” at the recent ASCCC Spring Plenary, which addressed the idea of college culture and how to improve understanding between each other and collaborative work. Murphy said that the talk was very engaging and energizing and could provide an opportunity to springboard into AB 705 ideas at the start of Fall and give us a tone for the semester. McMahon indicated that Dr. Bateman started as a faculty member and is now an administrator and has quite a good sense of what a great community college could be. McMahon asked for feedback about getting this ‘outside’ person to present at convocation, and will send the speaker’s biographical info to all senators and invite input.

iii. Collegiality in Action Team Visit (Update) – M. McMahon

McMahon provided an update. The Collegiality in Action team visit will take place on May 1st from 2-4pm in M-110.

Participants will include the following: three facilitators, nine administrators, 35 faculty, five classified and eight students.

All are welcome to attend. There was some mention of capping the event as the room was getting full, but the same room will accommodate additional attendees. The CIA surveys are due on Friday, April 20th.

iv. All Campus Faculty Retreat (Update) – M. McMahon

McMahon solicited suggestions for the date, time and place for the faculty retreat. She added that this could be an opportunity for debriefing after the Collegiality in Action team visit.

D. Committee Reports

i. PIEC: Miramar College Annual Planning Calendar/Cycle 2018-19 – D. Miramontez

Miramontez provided a PIEC update on the Annual Planning Calendar. He reported no substantive changes, just date updates. He said that Taskstream is now Watermark. The content and clerical changes are all denoted in red. Input was solicited.

ii. PDC: Professional Development Form – C. Barnard

Barnard, Co-chair of PD, provided information on the new PD form. The PDF fillable form will be used for requesting travel and/or conference funds from the PDC. Barnard encouraged faculty to submit the form a least a month in advance. She reported that \$6,000 in funds remain for this year. Barnard clarified that the form is now comprehensive. She said that Carrie De Moll will be available to assist faculty in completing the form. McMahon encouraged faculty to apply for funding ASAP, with the caveat that applying for funding outside of the confines of the fiscal year may be problematic for the committee. Bochicchio queried about the deliverable items post-conference. McMahon clarified that this ‘new’ form is the merging of two previous forms; one was for faculty travel and the other was a form for requesting funds for campus events. She said that if it is solely travel, you only need to complete that part of the ‘new’ form. McMahon said that the inclusion of deliverables was in order to meet accreditation standards as the work was being done to reformat the travel and Professional Development requests. She added that the specific deliverables will be up to the faculty; this could be achieved in many ways, including reporting out to your department or integrating an activity into your class. McMahon encouraged faculty to contact the committee, if they wanted to provide additional input. McMahon encouraged faculty to use the new form and, by doing so, offer suggestions for improvement. Barnard confirmed that, with the implementation of the new form, none of the forms have been returned. McMahon said that voting on the form was unnecessary, as there were no procedural changes.

iii. Basic Skills Subcommittee: AB 705 at Miramar College – S. Johnson and B. Stephens

Stephens reported on the impact of AB 705 on Miramar College. She reported: “AB 705 requires community college districts to maximize the probability that a student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in Math and English within a one-year timeframe by utilizing assessment measures that include high school performance to achieve this goal.” (A student enrolled in ESL within a timeframe of 3 years.) She said that this is not anything new; they are now just holding us accountable. Students must have a pathway to complete within two semesters. Stephens reported that students have less than an 8% chance to complete courses. She added that the longer the student takes, the less likely they will be able to achieve their goals. Students are still able to take longer to achieve their educational goals. The College must have courses aligned in order to facilitate completion of the process. Stephens reported that colleges are required to use multiple measures in determining course placement. She added that we can choose an exam, but it must be approved. Stephens reported that community colleges are prohibited from requiring students to take a prerequisite course unless they are highly unlikely to succeed in a higher-level course without it. Discussion ensued.

E. New Business

i. General Education Option 4 to CTE Degrees – D. Short

Short reported on the recommendation to add the option to complete SDCCD General Education (GE) without District requirements (Option 4) to all Career Technical Education degrees. He said that different GE pattern options are available for different types of degrees:

GE Pattern	AA-T/AS-T	AA/AS (Transfer)	AA/AS (CTE)
IGETC	X	X	X
CSU GE	X	X	X
SDCCD GE <u>with</u> District Requirements		X	X
SDCCD GE <u>without</u> District Requirements		X	[proposed]
Bachelor’s Degree		X	X

Short confirmed that we have three degrees and five options for GE (see above chart). He added that there is a different approval process for each option. The committee would like to expand option 4 to allow students completing CTE degrees to complete without District requirements. The recommendation would remove option three from the list. Short provided the pros and cons of the committee’s proposal. He stated that, currently, only CTE students are held to completing District requirements. Short provided historical background to the GE requirement for CTE degrees. He said that a degree called

Transfer Studies was the only transfer degree that we had. He added that the State decided that the transfer degree was illegal. Transfer-focus degrees were substituted at this time. At CIC, when creating degrees, they were supposed to work for all universities, but some universities do not have a multicultural or history requirement. The CIC provided GE options to allow a wider selection of courses. Discussion ensued. Short provided the CIC generated pros and cons of the argument in his presentation, but did not verbally review. He presented the District Requirements (see below) and requested faculty feedback. This item will be brought back to the next meeting.

- Health Education (HEAL) 101
- Two Exercise Science Activity courses
- One Multicultural Studies course (may also be used to fulfill SDCCD GE requirements)
- Two courses in American Institutions/California Government (one course may also be used to fulfill SDCCD GE requirements)

ii. Outcomes Assessment Operational Plan – N. Grisham

Grisham reported on the 2018-2019 College-wide Outcomes and Assessment Plan. Grisham said that this is one of the operational plans in the student success framework. In shepherding the plan through the college governance process, feedback was received. Feedback regarding the establishment of a permanent source of assistance for Taskstream was received from the management team today. Grisham said that the feedback would be incorporated into the document. Grisham received queries on the viability of Taskstream, confirming that Taskstream is now Watermark. Grisham said that we are in the process of investigating options as the District contract with Taskstream is nearing expiration. Grisham confirmed that we will be asking for feedback from the users. This item will come back to the next meeting.

iii. Faculty Role in Coordination of High School Classes – D. Igou

Igou reported on problems with dual enrollment at the high schools. He shared a list of requests generated by the chairs in the School of Liberal Arts. He cited faculty concerns with poor technology, lack of internet access, lack of heating, as well as pedagogy and curriculum concerns. He reported that there have been several meetings over the last two years, but the issues remain unaddressed. Igou said that there has been a rapid increase in program growth, but little program oversight or good communication. Dean Ascione is functioning as the coordinator at this point. He has many other obligations and the lines of communication do not work very well because, if he speaks with a counselor, they must talk with the principal (chain of command), and it can take weeks for things to get fixed. He said that the department chairs from Liberal Arts got together with their concerns and wanted some assurances of improvement, prior to starting classes in Fall 2018. He also met with many of the other department chairs who have classes at the high schools and, in spirit, many agree with these concerns of what we are trying to do. No more expansions of HS classes until we figure these issues out. The need for a faculty coordinator was expressed. Igou said that they met with the VPI and have discussed the possibility of a faculty coordinator position, as there was no faculty oversight.

Murphy spoke to lack of services and faculty support, both in the dual enrollment and Saturday classes held on campus. Murphy also noted that this very same topic and set of concerns came to the Academic Senate a year ago, and she was surprised to see it was still not addressed, as it has come back to Academic Affairs. She stated that these problems appear to be in line with other types of class scheduling, like Saturday classes, where there are no support services and limited lab tech support, and that this is something the Senate should stand behind.

Clarke queried how the students were selected for dual enrollment. Ascione said that the MOU stipulated that the students' GPA should be a minimum of 2.5. Gloag said that they were placing students utilizing multiple measures. She said that it is a work in progress, adding that the high schools are working with limited resources and are not able to provide our faculty with conditions parallel to Miramar, and that things could be better but there is a limit to their ability to improve. Igou indicated faculty simply needed a computer that worked. McMahon indicated a problem is the tenuous nature of the situation; if, for whatever reason, those faculty members who are currently doing these assignments decide not to, then what? Igou indicated that many faculty are dissatisfied with conditions and limitations and also that faculty are not vetted in any way more than who is able or willing to go out to the high school; therefore, it is not a matter of selecting the best faculty for this role. Murphy indicated that if these are our courses that are being offered, then we have a level and standard amount of material that we must provide, and if we have conditions that are inhibitive to achieving this, then that is problematic. Discussion ensued. Motion to support a faculty coordinator for the dual enrollment program unanimously approved. (Clarke/Gallagher)

iv. Fully Online Community College, Online Teaching Pedagogies and Certification Modules – M. McMahon

McMahon reported that the State AS objects to and opposes the creation of the fully online community college (FOCC). McMahon presented synopsis of resolution 602, Opposition to Fully Online Community College, that was passed at the Spring 2018 Plenary. McMahon said that AB 2621 will support conducting a viability survey first, to ascertain the feasibility of a fully online college prior to making plans to create one, and that resolution 6.07 was in support of that. She spoke to the benefits of wrap-around services for students taking online classes and that resolution 7.02 from the State plenary views these services as an essential component for the success of online students. McMahon solicited faculty

participation in the conversation. She spoke to the equivalency of online vs. face-to-face instruction, querying, “Are standards being upheld?” Two other important resolutions were related to “Effective Practices in Online Courses”, wherein it was affirmed by the ASCCC that faculty needed to identify and disseminate effective and promising practices to teaching oral communication courses online (resolution 9.03) and to identify and disseminate effective and promising practices to teaching appropriate laboratory courses online (resolution 9.04). To reiterate, the State Academic Senate resolved that faculty discipline experts should be at the forefront to determine what courses should be considered for online modalities. Resolution 9.04 is seeking faculty involvement in determining what types of lab courses could be considered for online; thus, it is very important to weigh, especially to determine which courses should not be taught online. As faculty, we need to leverage our services with our expectations of integrity and quality, such that we should be drawing a “line in the sand” and saying no to diminished quality in order to hit enrollment targets, just as the departments with classes at the high schools have done.

With regard to online courses currently being taught at Miramar College: Articulations with CSU’s and UC’s depend on the vigilance of Faculty Evaluation, especially ensuring that on-campus & online course content are equivalent (rigor, standards, access, support, etc.), regardless of mode of delivery. The important question to raise is: Are these course standards in fact being upheld? The legitimate practice of faculty discipline experts evaluating these courses appears to be central in safeguarding our agreements and validating equivalency. McMahon asked how do we as faculty (and a college) ensure this is occurring and protect the integrity of our courses, programs and transfer agreements? How do we maintain vigilance and examine online courses effectively, even if administrators are not interested in that approach? Do we create a taskforce to safeguard our class integrity? Have this as a standing item at various meetings? Clarke said that she would like input from the Distance Ed Subcommittee. McMahon indicated she would parley this information from the Senate to that group and we should link in this issue with that committee. Gallagher indicated that the different outcomes for an on-campus course versus an online class may be due to the assumption that the quality and the standard of the online class is low, and he asked if there is evidence or data to suggest that online classes were not. McMahon indicated that the metrics for success were all traditionally lower in online classes (success, retention, persistence), and Gallagher indicated we do not know what the cause is. McMahon suggested that the cause would be discovered with appropriate faculty evaluation. There is no question that these online classes are evaluated. The question is, what is the depth, the rigor and the acceptance of these evaluations of online classes by managers. It may be there is a reluctance to accept a low evaluation if they (administration) want to continue to offer this modality of course, while faculty may insist that it does not meet the standards of being equivalent to an on-campus delivery mode.

With regard to the online certification courses that faculty must complete in order to teach online, McMahon said she has heard input from faculty who have recently taken the Blackboard certification (completed within the last year), and now faculty taking the "Canvas Transition Course" find that the Pedagogy modules are essentially a repeat content (the first three modules) of the Blackboard certification. The time commitment for this redundancy is very significant and unnecessary; therefore, many faculty are requesting to waive the "repeat" modules and allow them to get into the "Canvas Transition Course" in preparation for the new platform. Discussion ensued regarding Blackboard vs. Canvas. A condensed version may be in progress. Ascione said that, as a dean, he gets to waive those redundant modules if his faculty have already done the Blackboard training or already have significant Canvas training; he just says they do not have to do those modules. He indicated it was not just for faculty in his school, but was a campus decision, adding that any school dean may waive training for redundant modules.

v. AS Meeting Options for May – M. McMahon

McMahon advised that, due to the CIA team visit on May 1st, we will have a meeting on May 15th instead.

F. Senate Reports

- i. Adjunct – J. Librande or D. Gutowski had no report.
- ii. Treasurer – S. Vargo
Reported a balance of \$1131.47.
- iii. President’s Report – M. McMahon had no report.
- iv. Vice President – L. Murphy had no report.

G. Announcements

- i. None

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05pm. The next meeting will be on May 15th. Please submit agenda items to both Marie McMahon and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Kjartanson and Juli Bartolomei