

**Minutes**  
**Miramar College Academic Senate**

Location: L-309

Nov 12, 2013 3:30-5:00pm

**Senators Present:** Buran Haidar, Daphne Figueroa, Gina Bochicchio, Erica Murrietta, Joan Thompson, Frederica Carr, Mark Hertica, Clara Blenis, Rebecca Bowers-Gentry, Marilyn Espitia, Isabella Feldman, Bob Fritsch, Naomi Grisham, Rich Halliday, Jeff Higginbotham, April Koch, Andrew Lowe, Eric Mosier, Jordan Omens, Wayne Sherman, M. Patricia Beller, Lawrence Hahn, Shawn Hurley, Lisa Selchau, Shayne Vargo

**Other Attendees:** Steve Rocha, Laura Murphy, Patricia Flower, Karinna Topete, Juli Bartolomei

**Absent:** Peter Elias, Sean Bowers, Dawn DiMarzo, Otto Dobre, Wheeler North, Dan Willkie, Johnny Gonzales

Meeting called to order at 3:34pm.

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

The agenda was approved with one change, to postpone the Staff Development Committee report. The previous minutes were approved unchanged.

**B. Senate Reports**

1. Treasurer – Erica Murrietta reported a balance of \$903.82, so we have enough for the two \$300 scholarships and \$300 for the faculty BBQ. She is still collecting more for carryover. In addition, she has collected approximately \$70 for a door prize/gift basket for the Holiday Ball. Faculty contributions are encouraged.
2. President's Report – Buran Haidar reported on the following:
  - i. The Holiday Barbecue is now planned for December 5<sup>th</sup>.
  - ii. MLK parade: January 19, 2014. Faculty participation in building the float and joining the parade is encouraged.
3. Past-President – Daphne Figueroa reported on continued meetings with the District-wide Equivalency Policies Task Group. This consists of Daphne, Academic Senate Presidents of the other two district colleges and Continuing Education, and representatives from Human Resources.

**C. Special Reports**

1. ASCCC Fall 2013 Plenary & Fall 2013 Resolutions – Buran reported on the resolutions of the ASCCC fall 2013 Plenary that included twelve addressing accreditation issues. She highlighted those that passed, failed, or referred to the Senate Exec. She reported on the breakout session of "Multiple Measures Task Force" and its work on an Academic Senate paper on multiple measures and on the role of faculty and senates in the assessment and placement process. All resolutions and their outcomes will soon be posted on the ASCCC website.

**D. Committee Reports/Information**

1. Three-year Instructional Program Review Cycle & CTE programs – Buran made a correction that this item is an "Old Business – Action Item"). Laura Murphy shared that, last semester, the Instructional Program Review/SLOAC Sub-Committee presented a proposal to change both instructional program review and its accompanying assessments to a 3-year cycle. Concern about a possible adverse effect of the 3-year cycle on CTE programs was raised and the Senate asked the IPR/SLOAC Sub-Committee to look into the matter. The item is brought back to the Senate for a vote with the IPR/SLOAC affirmation that CTE programs would not be negatively affected. The motion to support the 3-yr cycle was passed.
2. Staff Development Travel Funds – Rick Cassar: Postponed.

**E. New Business**

1. Revision of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) – Laura Murphy, the college-wide SLO Facilitator since fall 2012, presented a proposal to change Miramar's current ISLOs to match a framework recommended by the American Association of Colleges and Universities that is based on the LEAP "Liberal Education and America's Promise" Essential Outcomes. She presented a modified version of the LEAP outcomes to provide a better fit for Miramar College that has been discussed across the three Program Review committees. This new set of ISLOs will provide a better tie-in with CTE programs, Student Services and Administrative Services. Buran informed that the draft of the ACCJC standards references General Education (GE) outcomes and not ISLOs. At this time, we have District-wide GE SLOs and college-specific ISLOs. A motion was passed to suspend parliamentary rules, so this item could be voted upon. The Senate passed the motion to support the adoption of the modified LEAP Essential Outcomes as the Miramar ISLOs and explore the possibility of them becoming the district-wide GE SLOs.

**F. Old Business**

1. Program Review/Outcomes and Assessment Committee (Second Reading) – Buran reviewed the history of the CGC recommendation for a single Program Review/Outcomes and Assessment Committee, and she pointed out one additional change since its first reading. This consisted of deletion of the proposed goal "to review on a rotating basis a subset of program reviews and to provide feedback and recommendations", consistent with the removal of the similar goal from the updated Instructional Program Review/SLOAC Sub-Committee that was approved at the last Academic Senate meeting.

Buran summarized the events leading to the recommendation under consideration as: a) background discussions at the program review committees that were not acted on, b) recommendation of the CGC to form a task force/workgroup to “to periodically meet in order to merge and better interface the program review processes of all areas and Divisions on our campus” (added to the minutes for clarification) that would also address an observation made by our accreditation visiting team about the number of committees, c) CEC adoption of the CGC recommendation and formation of the Program review taskforce consisting of the three Program Review committees’ co-chairs and the new college-wide SLO Facilitator, d) Program Review Taskforce sun-shining a preliminary proposal to CGC for the formation of two successive subcommittees under PIEC, e) CGC first reading discussions of the Taskforce proposal recommending some editorial changes and urging consideration of having a single stand-alone committee instead of two layered subcommittees of PIEC, and f) CGC second reading discussions that produced the recommendation that is under consideration by the Academic Senate.

Discussion points of senators favoring the formation of a single Program Review committee included:

- i. Distinct function of the PIEC in the development of long-term plans to guide and be informed by the shorter-term Program Review processes.
- ii. Misconception about need for strict reporting relationships of governance committees instead of open communication between constituencies and their representatives serving on committees.
- iii. The recommended committee could be divided into “work groups,” one of which could work on assessment and outcomes, without forming a separate committee to conduct this work.
- iv. Ideally, outcomes should be linked to research; however, the lack of a campus-based researcher makes this solution problematic.
- v. Revisions to the task force proposal were appropriate because the CGC is the body that looks into how proposals fit into the existing governance structure and processes. If, later on, it is discovered that this model is unworkable, it can be changed.

Differing discussion points focused on opposition to the CGC recommendation led by L. Murphy, the college-wide SLO Facilitator and a member of the Taskforce. She questioned the CGC alteration of the Taskforce recommendation and expressed her opinion that it didn’t seem appropriate to disregard the recommendations of the task force that made the initial proposal. She also expressed that, by making major revisions to the original proposal without the task force’s approval, the CGC was overstepping its authority.

Additional concerns emphasized the lack of reporting ties between the prospective committee and the PIEC, support for a separate outcomes and assessment committee due to lack of a campus-based researcher, and concern about the large size of the recommended “uber” committee.

A last question to Laura Murphy was why the task force did not recommend two parallel subcommittees of the PIEC, instead of the layered arrangement. She responded that the members of the three program review committees have been largely unsuccessful at working on both program review and outcomes in their respective committees. They felt that a separate committee, dedicated to outcomes, was a necessity. Outcomes are integral to program review, and the task force felt the layered model allowed results from the Outcomes and Assessment Subcommittee to feed efficiently into the Program Review Subcommittee. The discussion ended at this point and the Senate voted on the motion to support creating the Program Review/Outcomes and Assessment Committee to replace the three current program review committees. The motion did not carry.

2. Benchmarking of College Performance Outcomes (Second Reading) – Buran presented a document entitled “Benchmarking for Miramar College Performance Indicators/Measurable Outcomes: Why, How, and What...” summarizing the combined methodology for benchmarking of college performance outcomes, which was collaboratively developed with the Campus Based Researcher, the campus Research Sub-Committee Chair. (*The benchmarking methodology document has since been posted on the Academic Senate Website*). The discussion of benchmarking methodology was triggered by changes in the 2013 ACCJC Annual Report requirements and it has additional applications for other indicator/outcomes of several college plans. The recommendation to examine the past five year values of separate indicators and to use the appropriate benchmarking methodology, and the use of a trend line based methodology to set standards where applicable and to reserve alternate methodologies for high volatility indicators was approved with one dissenting vote.

#### G. Announcements

1. Miramar College Holiday Ball: Dec 7, 2013
2. College Retreat: March 7, 2014 (Mark your Calendar)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02pm. The next meeting will be on December 3<sup>rd</sup>. Please submit agenda items to both Buran Haidar and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,  
Gina Bochicchio