**Senators Present:** Marie McMahon, Laura Murphy, Alex Mata, Josh Alley, Alex Sanchez, Sabrina M. Menchaca, Gina Bochicchio, Barbara Clark, Mark Dinger, Kevin Gallagher, Patricia Hunter , Shawn Hurley, Dan Igou, April Koch, Andrew Lowe, 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**: Lisa Clarke, Adrian Arancibia, Kandice Brandt (proxy: I. Martin), Otto Dobre, David Halttunen, Darrel Harrison, Mary Hart, Mary Kjartanson, Gabriela Mansfield
**Other Attendees**: Isabelle Martin, Mara Sanft, Donnie Tran, George Kallas, Kurt Hill, Daniel Miramontez, Adrian Gonzales, Lou Ascione, Melissa Wolfson, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:33pm.

A. **Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes**
   The agenda was unanimously approved unchanged. (Vargo/Gallagher)
   The election minutes were approved unchanged. (Murphy/Sanchez)
   The previous minutes were approved unchanged. (Vargo/Clark)

B. **Old Business**
   i. Collegial Consultation: Updates and Next Steps – M. McMahon
      - AS Response to Suggested Next Steps by Chancellor Carroll: The AS believes this proposed plan from Chancellor Carroll does not fully address the scope nor begin to solve the more significant problems that exist at Miramar College.
      - As the AS leader, McMahon stated that there appears to be no discernable accountability and that we've already had a Collegiality in Action visit and they have identified some significant issues, and now it is a matter of how we move forward to address them.
      - Concern was expressed about the fact that the Chancellor wants to wait two months to have a meeting with the eight current constituency leaders about interpersonal relationships and governance training. Constituency leadership changes though; thus, in some ways, this is meaningless, in that the only constancy over the long term has been the presence of the College President. This activity in unlikely to provide a suitable long-term solution to the problems that the AS and the Collegiality in Action team have identified.
      - Yet we have so many problems that continue. Just today at the CEC meeting, we were not able to get the agenda approved; thus, there was no official meeting. We are at such an impasse that we are unable to conduct business because of the inability to communicate effectively, via email or face to face. This underscores the incredible problems that we are having.
      - Also, what are we doing in the meantime? A list of prioritized actions was shared: 1) Venues: Create legitimate, meaningful and protected venues for airing concerns to share the reality of the situation, to promote more understanding and documentation of it, and to generate more solutions about what actions we can take to make genuine improvements. 2) Share documented concerns (evidence) with all!
      - A question was asked as to whether these issues are the purview of the Academic Senate and the response was yes. McMahon mentioned that she attended the Open Session for the Board of Trustees (prior to the meeting) and engaged in conversation with a Board member to ask more about this and was told that the Chancellor is our conduit to the Board regarding violations of collegiality. We are engaged in these discussions with the Chancellor precisely because they are under AS purview. Additionally, Murphy reminded everyone that the reason this came to the Academic Senate is because these 10+1 issues are not being adhered to, amongst other things. We are one of four parties involved in this process, and due to the 10+1 issues, the AS is addressing these as a representative of the faculty's needs and concerns; this includes violations of Title 5 that we are obliged as a body to bring forward and have these matters be addressed. The Board designates a designee to interface with the AS, and if we find issues with that designee that are creating or resulting in a breakdown in adhering to the law, or regulations and/or our Board Policies, then we are responsible for bringing any of these concerns forward for a remedy to the Board as we see fit. Discussion ensued about what is the best way for us to bring these concerns forward so that they will actually be remedied in a timely manner.
      - We are concerned as a senate that what is being proposed is not going to fix some of the more egregious problems that have been identified and brought forward.
      - One of the suggestions from last semester was to go out to departments and talk about these issues; also to provide details of the issues, details of examples of the problems that have been encountered, as evidence.
      - McMahon forwarded to senators earlier in the day the email that Chancellor Carroll sent to the AS Exec, and there were questions about the reference by Chancellor Carroll in that email regarding a "threatening" letter the Chancellor

received. The letter was sent anonymously via USPS and is currently confidential. Not much information was provided about the letter, other than it was in reference to Collegiality in Action issues and that the "threat" could possibly be referring to a demand to take action and the suggestion that, if action is not taken to remedy the situation, that information will be made more public.
- Senators agreed that there is a need for next steps. There is a lack of accountability for issues that have been identified by AS and many are seeking answers. There is currently no mechanism for addressing violations.
- In conclusion, the question was posed as to whether the Chancellor should be invited to come to a future AS meeting. Discussion ensued. Consensus was that we should invite the Chancellor, with the understanding that senators should be allowed to ask questions, address items with her, and that the meeting must (as it always is) be recorded. Next steps should be: Go back to departments, share more detailed information, and create a list of questions for the Chancellor's visit to the AS. Senators again pointed out that there has been no mechanism for accountability, such that practices outside of regulations have not been corrected and this has been a continuing problem.

ii. CGC Change Form Proposal for Technology Committee (**2nd Reading**) – L. Murphy
- Any questions or commentary? None
- Motion to move forward (Vargo/Gallagher): Passed unanimously
- Item moves forward to CEC

iii. Faculty Evaluations for Online Courses: Pedagogy, Caps, Course Content – Creation of a Workgroup – M. McMahon
- Concern for online course rigor was presented. An important issue, particularly with regard to the push for more and more online classes, is are we holding students in online courses to the same rigor as we do in our on-campus classes? Are they getting the same quality, content and contact? Should we create a subgroup/workgroup in concert with the Distance Ed Subcommittee to determine online course offerings and to decide how online courses should be evaluated? A lot of the metrics used for evaluations do not apply to an online stetting; is this problematic? Can this be improved? There may also be some issues with how we are evaluating those courses, and also the issue of what if there is a bad course evaluation, and how is it dealt with when these issues are brought forward? We need to have some internal checks and balances to make sure we are doing what we say we are doing and we are in fact adhering to procedures.
- Discussion ensued about the concept of a subgroup determining evaluation methods and procedures. This should be viewed as a broad and over-arching issue. If evaluation is determined as a responsibility of this committee, AFT would be involved. If not, AS can manage workgroup. Though Curriculum Committee assesses standards currently, do we also want to create an internal checks and balances process to meet required and desirable standards? A call was made for those interested to serve on this subcommittee. Gallagher, Chau and Alley volunteered.

iv. Website Upgrade Project (Surveys Update and Website Subcommittee) – M. McMahon and L. Murphy
- McMahon stated that the AS was concerned about the Feedback Loop for faculty input and that it did not appear to be working very well. There was a faculty focus group created a year ago, but it consisted of only three full time faculty members who participated in one meeting. There was discussion at that meeting and the notes from that meeting were supposed to be supplied directly afterwards, but they were only delivered today, almost a year later. The feedback or response to faculty input has been very slow, and much of the eight pages of specific detailed comments and suggestions that were submitted on behalf of faculty by the AS about a year ago have not been effectively addressed. There have been repeated requests for the office of PRIELT to conduct constituency surveys because it seems like there is dissatisfaction with the website across the board. McMahon reiterated the need to create and distribute surveys for comprehensive feedback.
- Hill proposed dissolving the Website Subcommittee because the current group process is not effective; he suggested using a workgroup instead. McMahon projected Website Subcommittee goals and responsibilities from the CGC Handbook. Discussion ensued about whether subcommittees who are not meeting goals and responsibilities should be dissolved. McMahon suggested that, rather than dissolve the Website Subcommittee, it could be more effective to actually have it follow its goals and responsibilities and then it could be the body that would address the current issues we are now facing. Additionally, having the issues of website input be firmly embedded in shared governance could make the aspect of accountability more feasible. This would be similar to what occurred during Accreditation with the transformation of the Staff Development Committee into the broader, more comprehensive Professional Development Committee on campus. McMahon further suggested that dissolving this committee in favor of having a 'workgroup' do this task instead was essentially what was in place now and, by AS accounts, this approach has been problematic and unsuccessful. Again, much of the problem seems to lie in no accountability to act on suggestions made by faculty. Taking this issue away from a participatory governance committee and placing it in the hands of a small work group (as it currently is) does not seem like a good solution to our current problems.
- The AS is in favor of the approach to create an updated and more expansive committee to reflect current needs of the campus. Discussion will be brought to CGC. Send feedback to McMahon so it can be shared at CGC.

- Miramontez discussed timeline for website projects. Current next steps are focused on building up back-ends so that the website runs smoothly. AS can create their own survey for faculty if they desire. Miramontez expressed that the priority for this year is to make sure things run smoothly for the student experience. Miramontez is open to collaborating with AS to build a timeline together.

C. **New Business**
   i. Assist.org Delays & EMOC Oversight: Resolution from Articulation Officers (**1st Reading**) – M. Palma-Sanft
      - Review: Statewide system is in transition and has been for several years. It is not displaying current articulation agreements. Problem is that we cannot guide students properly; because articulated classes are not being displayed, students cannot see if their classes transfer. Also, this is impacting/will impact Guided Pathways.
      - As a response, AOs created a proposal that they hope to share at the ASCCC Fall Area D meeting on October 13. Palomar approved proposal yesterday with one minor edit. Sanft shared this updated document.
      - In an effort to meet the deadline, Sanft asked if the AS could suspend the rules and move forward with approval. A motion to suspend the rules passed unanimously. (North/Gallagher) A motion to approve the resolution passed unanimously. (Clark/Gallagher) The resolution will move forward to Area D.
   ii. Solicitation of Interest from CCCCO of Program Pathways Mapper Pilot – L. Murphy and M. McMahon
      - Review: The Guided Pathways work calls for all colleges to develop and publish program maps that specify term-by-term pathways from program entry through completion, enabling students to clearly visualize what is involved in a typical or possible program pathway as well as the types of occupations and associated labor market information that has been demonstrated to increase program engagement and retention.
      - In partnership with the Chancellor's Office, Bakersfield College is seeking Letters of Interest from: 1) up to 10 Colleges; 2) up to three Districts; and/or 3) up to two Regional Consortia to load their curriculum and program maps into the Program Pathways Mapper and publish these maps online. The letter is due on Oct. 8th.
      - This is being brought to the AS to consider as an option to use this technology to work on course mapping for Guided Pathways. Murphy noted that the work of course mapping is required beforehand to be done and that it is accurate and we have done some mapping already. Original course mapping was done as a part of accreditation last year, but no mapping has been done for certificates, and metamajors and areas of interest have not been discussed. Bakersfield is currently using this and we have heard good things about this software. If we were to move forward with this solicitation of interest with our current GP schedule, we would need to input program maps by February and we would pay $50,000 and designate 1.0 FTE. We would also need to have a good amount of work done on our back end to move forward. Academic sequencing and scheduling is what would be addressed if using this program, which needs to be done before using the software.
      - The Guided Pathways Steering Committee is discussing, but no decision has been made. Murphy is making faculty aware. There is a lot of work to be done, and faculty will eventually need to do it. Could using this program make this process easier? Faculty would be required to make edits and perform upkeep. The concern expressed by many senators is that the college is not at a point where we are ready to use this software and, furthermore, there has been no campus-wide discussion on this issue. Importantly, there is no rush to make a decision to express interest in this now because the option to express interest in this project will be offered again in the future. There has been no decision made about whether to move forward on this, but the general thought from the AS body was, "Yes, this program is a good idea, but we are not currently ready, so maybe later." McMahon asked for this info to go to constituents for feedback.
   iii. ASCCC Exemplary Award (Submission Deadline: 11/05/18) – M. McMahon
      - This year's theme is Environmental Responsibility. McMahon will send out more information.

D. **Committee Reports, Senate Updates and Information**
   i. ASCCC Part-Time Leadership Conference: Attendees Report – L. Hubert
      - In August, Hubert and two other part-time faculty attended this conference in San Francisco. Workshops included hiring, undocumented student resources and FERPA, to name a few. Hubert advised that UCSD and SDSU have DACA resource centers that are open to our students. Clark added that R. Claros is the DACA contact on our campus. Hubert expressed that it was a great experience and there is a plan to hold the conference again next year. Website to learn more is: 3csn.org. Bring back to adjuncts in your departments to share/promote.
   ii. Options for Increasing AS Travel Budget for Promoting Faculty Leadership (Update) – M. McMahon
      - McMahon presented spreadsheet information supplied by VPA Bell showing sources of funds and asked the AS to think about the possibilities that may be available for the AS to get more needed funds. There are different categories of funds and it seems we need access to funds that are separate from the President's allocation. Can we use any of these sources of money to meet needs more effectively?
      - McMahon reported that she met with the College President and asked for assistance in getting more travel money for the AS in order to better support AS leadership and succession planning. If McMahon understands what the College President said, it was indicated that a request would come from discretionary funds, and that money was allocated to

better serve students and that is where it will stay. In other words, no, you cannot have any more money. It is important to remember that if we as the AS have a poor relationship with the College President and the College President is who we have to rely on in order to get more support for additional funding to make the Senate stronger, this creates a conflict of interest that is not good, and what we need to do is free ourselves from that arrangement and have access to funds that would support a strong Senate without having to go through the College President.

- McMahon pointed out on the spreadsheet that, in our campus (BRDS) budget, the College President has discretionary funds of $12,000. In addition to this, she also gets about $45,000 for the San Diego Community College Auxiliary Organization (SDCCAO). Senators asked if there was an accounting or record of how this discretionary money was spent by the College President and the answer was no.
- It is our business to know what the landscape looks like in terms of how money is allocated on this campus. The Civic Center funds, from the rental of Miramar College facilities, is provided to the Professional Development Committee for on-campus events, and it appears that this is underutilized, and a question may be, how could we better use our resources? There are limitations and stipulations attached to the use of Civic Center funds; that is, that the activity must be on campus and open to everyone, and/or be directly involved in student success.
- Are there funds the AS could tap into for more professional development? McMahon indicated that this is an area worthy of further exploration.

iii. Guided Pathways Update – M. McMahon and L. Murphy
- In the process of forming an inquiry workgroup for GP on our campus, as well as solicitation of interest from others at the college.
- Movement is expected by the end of October.

iv. Academic Success Center (ASC) Taskforce and Assoc. Dean Timeline (Update) – M. McMahon
- We had our first ASC taskforce meeting on Sept 26, but we did not get to the issue of the timeline for the ASC Associate Dean position. The Associate Dean of Student Success position has been vacant for 15 months, and it has been determined for some time that there is actually still money available for this position.
- McMahon emailed the VPSS and asked to get answers to the question of the timeline for hiring this position; still no answer. Since it is already October, we as a college need to get started on this as soon as possible if there is any hope of us getting this position on board by Spring 2019.
- The AS is hoping to move forward as soon as possible with filling this position. We are kind of in limbo, anticipating the go-ahead for a search committee, but we have no timeline.

E. **Senate Reports**
   i. Adjunct – S. Menchaca had no report.
   ii. Treasurer – J. Alley
       Reported a balance of $1382.43. Still collecting dues.
   iii. President's Report – M. McMahon reported on:
       a) Faculty scholarships are available for the Fall Plenary (November 1-3). Will send out information. Application deadline is Oct 15th. One application per college. The AS President and AS President- Elect encouraged Senators to attend statewide events so that they could be more aware of how effective colleges operate.
   iv. President-Elect – L. Murphy
       a) We had a meeting of the Classified and Academic Senate Exes and Classified expressed a desire to have more joint events with faculty.

F. **Announcements**
   i. Academic & Classified Senate Happy Hour was great!

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58pm. The next meeting will be on Oct 16th. Please submit agenda items to both Marie McMahon and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Alex Mata and Juli Bartolomei