

Minutes
Miramar College Academic Senate

Location: L-309

Oct. 21, 2014 3:30-5:00pm

Senators Present: Buran Haidar, Marie McMahon, Joan Thompson, Gina Bochicchio, Carmen Jay, Frederica Carr, Daphne Figueroa, Dan Igou, Josh Alley, Clara Blenis, Rebecca Bowers-Gentry, Rick Cassar, Otto Dobre, Isabella Feldman, Cynthia Gilley, Ann Gloag, Naomi Grisham, Rich Halliday, Mark Hertica, April Koch, Jennifer Leaver, Andrew Lowe, Eric Mosier, Laura Murphy, Wai-Ling Rubic, Shayne Vargo, Dan Willkie, M. Patricia Beller, Johnny Gonzales, Shawn Hurley, Thong Nguyen

Absent: Sean Bowers, Wheeler North

Other Attendees: Omar Montand, David Buser, Brett Bell, Gerald Ramsey, Howard Irvin, Sheryl Gobble, Laurie Vasallo-Dusa, Daniel Miramontez, Michelle Grimes-Hillman (ASCCC Exec Committee member), Kale Braden (ASCCC Exec Committee member), Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:33pm.

A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes

The agenda was approved.

The minutes from September 16th were approved with no changes. Approval of the minutes from October 7th was postponed to the next meeting.

B. Senate Reports

1. Treasurer – Joan Thompson reported a balance of \$1045.69, with 31 of 110 contract faculty having currently paid. She is still collecting dues by cash, check or payroll deposit.
2. President's Report – Buran Haidar yielded her Senate Report time to the two visiting members from the State Academic Senate Executive Committee members to inform and answer questions:
 - i. Kale Braden, Chair of the ASCCC Relations with Local Senates Committee, spoke about the function of that committee, and the State Senate as a resolution-based organization, with position papers developed at the committee level, which are then approved and adopted as official positions of the State Academic Senate. He pointed out the resources available at the ASCCC website (<http://asccc.org/>) including most recent papers, and the Rostrum articles for information about where there might be general State-wide agreement or disagreement among the 112 CCCs, and effective practices and suggestions of different ways of doing things. Big issues common to many campuses include: planning of AB86 Adult Ed Consortium, conversations about the SSSP and Equity Planning, interfacing and working collaboratively with administration, colleagues, including the union and others, and the Brown Act implications and vote recording.
 - ii. Michelle Grimes-Hillman, chair of the State Curriculum Committee, summed up curriculum issues as: deadline for Curriculum ADTs (Associates Degrees for Transfer) is December 2014, challenges of “unit bloat” in the curriculum, and the C-ID approval process is always a topic of conversation. Changes in staffing at the State Chancellor's Office impacting work at that level. ADT degrees are mandatory if you have a degree in the same TOP code (Taxonomy of Program number), but not necessarily just because you offer all the courses.
3. President-Elect – Marie McMahon: deferred her report to the end of the meeting.

C. Old Business

1. Accreditation Self-Study Editor – Buran reminded that the issue has been extensively discussed and today is the time for making a decision. She highlighted the importance of authentic accreditation self-evaluation that involves broad dialogue and engagement. Buran presented two alternative proposals: “Alternative one”, for having a Faculty Editor with Tri-chairs teams as writing teams to outline and collect evidence and write drafts of standards to be sent to a faculty editor and the steering committee. “Alternative two”, for having no faculty editor, the ALO writes the report, with the tri-chair teams outlining and collecting evidence to be sent as bulleted outlines to the ALO. Joan Thompson suggested that the ALO writes the report, and for bringing in an editor for the last three or four edits. The ALO, Daniel Miramontez, the Dean of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, Library and Technology, who was in attendance asked to present and informed the Senate that the timeline and process was discussed and decided upon at the campus accreditation organizational meeting on Oct 17th. He emphasized having a dedicated person that can speak with one voice and the importance of the report to be evidence-based, in accordance with accreditation expectations, which is the focus of the Standard Tri-chairs. He added that the process is for the standard tri-chair teams to first collect the evidence on a grid and then put it in a form or synopsis to be sent to him as the ALO to write the narrative. The ALO, a dedicated person that can speak with one voice, writes the Standard narratives then sends that back out to the tri-chairs for ongoing collaboration. Daphne Figueroa asked the Exec. Committee guests if there are guidelines from the ASCCC. Michelle Grimes-Hillman responded that colleges make these determinations locally. Kale Braden

responded that as someone who just served on an accreditation team and said that having the authentic faculty voice in the report is very valuable and there is a problem when the tone of the document is not consistent with the Accreditation visiting team evidence.

Marie McMahon expressed that the process presented at the accreditation workshop with the tri-chairs writing evidence and providing it the ALO would be the direct faculty voice in terms of content. She suggested that after we do this for a couple of rounds, it might be prudent then to ask the question if the editor is even necessary, and if what we are doing is reflecting the faculty voice. We can decide that later after we understand the process from all the tri-chairs. Laura Murphy reminded that the Steering Committee is made of two people including a faculty co-chair with release time to manage this process at that level. She pointed out that while it may not say that the co-chair will edit the entire document, the selected co-chair with reassigned time would be involved in compiling all these narratives into a cohesive document, with Daniel, as the faculty voice and representative. Buran asked to point out that the faculty co-chair has specific responsibilities that are management and organization in nature, it has no writing, no editing, or content revision responsibilities.

Buran asked for a motion to move forward and make a decision. Becca Bowers-Gentry made a motion to support “alternative two” for having no faculty editor as recommended or decided upon at the Oct 17th accreditation organizational meeting that was seconded by Marie Mc Mahon. More discussion for clarification ensued. A roll call vote was recorded by Juli Bartolomei. The motion did not pass (Yes: 12, No: 13, Abstentions: 4).

Next, a new motion was made and seconded to approve “alternative one” for having a Faculty Editor. More discussion followed including the faculty editor FTEF allocation and about having an editor only at the end of the process. Marie McMahon made a motion for a friendly amendment of the motion for “alternative one”: “to have the faculty editor for the last semester only”, which was clarified by Joan Thompson to mean “after the second and third revision”. The motion to amend was seconded and discussion continued with questions about process details of when and how the editor will be chosen, and emphasis that the vote is for whether we need a faculty editor or not, and that the details will be worked out later. It was pointed out that the procedures proposed for “alternative #2” that did not pass, were settled elsewhere. Laura Murphy pointed out that the tri-chairs have already been told they would not be writing, and changing that plan now would cause them to rethink their willingness to serve. The vote on the amendment did not pass, with a tied roll call vote (Yes: 15, No: 15) that was broken by Buran, as Senate President, voting against it.

Cyndie Gilley asked if it was true that the faculty editor did not have anything to do for the first semester last time and expressed concern about potential wasting of the faculty editor’s reassigned time. Daphne Figueroa made a new friendly amendment to support “alternative one” with the stipulation of “consultation between the Academic Senate and College President on working out the logistics for when to bring in the faculty editor”. The motion was seconded. Discussion ensued, David Buser, as a faculty tri-chair, asked if the Senate was going to decide how the procedure is going to work. He and others pointed out that “alternative one” (*that was presented to the Senate prior to Daphne’s friendly amendment*) had a significant workload when compared with “alternative two”. Buran clarified that the Senate is determining if we are going to have a faculty editor. Daphne’s friendly amendment, directing for “consultation,” was overwhelmingly supported with one abstention. Finally, the Senate voted to approve “alternative one” for having a faculty editor with the “consultation amendment” (Yes: 14, No: 13, Abstentions 3).

2. Fall 2014-Spring 2017 Technology Plan (Second Reading) – Buran asked for input regarding the plan and its Thin Client Computing pilot that had been a topic of discussion. Gina Bochicchio made a motion to recommend endorsing a Thin Client computing pilot that is limited to non-instructor- directed computers use (i.e. to public spaces like the library, ILC, etc). The motion was seconded and passed with unanimous approval. Daniel Miramontez addressed questions and provided information. Next, the Fall 2014-Spring 2017 Technology Plan was unanimously approved with the Senate-approved Thin Client Computing recommendation.
 3. SLO Assessment Plan* – Unanimously approved by consent
 4. CGC Recommendations*: PIEC, Curriculum Tech Review, Faculty Hiring – Unanimously approved by consent
 5. BRDS Recommendations*: 2014/15 IELM Fund Allocation – Unanimously approved by consent
 6. 2015-16 Proposed Calendar* (J. Mahler) (Second Reading) – Unanimously approved by consent
- (*) Consent Calendar approval

D. New Business

1. Student Equity Plan – Buran presented Howard Irvin, Dean for Matriculation & Student Development. She reported that the Academic Senate received the plan after the last Senate meeting on Oct. 7th and expressed that the Senate had not seen it before. Buran explained that the Student Equity Plan require Board of Trustees (BOT) approval and is due to the State Chancellor’s office in January, 2015. SDCCD Board meets on Dec 11 and Nov 6, and there is a deadline for its submission to the Board set for Oct. 28th. The Senate is being asked to approve a plan that it has not seen or reviewed, with a tight deadline. Buran objected to the process by which the Plan was developed with input from select

faculty without official Senate representation and communication for input or feedback. She emphasized her confidence with the content of the Plan given the involvement of knowledgeable faculty that would have been appropriate Senate appointees. Without having reviewed the Plan, she asked if instruction was involved with the development of the Plan and if instructional support was part of the plan. Daphne Figueroa expressed concern that the section on and the disproportionate impact based on gender, ethnic background, etc... did not include planned actions from our Basic Skills Subcommittee as it didn't have a chance to provide input. She asked that to be addressed before it goes to the Board. Gerald Ramsey, Miramar's VPSS, in attendance, responded that there is no restriction for adding activities and made assurances that the Basic Skills student issues will be addressed. Goals and objectives will be discussed and activities will come along the way as moving targets. Howard Irvin informed that this is just a plan; and that it will involve a continuous process. More input is needed as we can move forward. Basic Skills, ESOL, and all other areas of access will be open for discussion and dialog at the planned Student Equity workshop, on November 7th.

Buran asked if Senators would be O.K. with the Senate Exec reviewing the plan at its meeting on Oct. 28 to weigh in on it, on behalf of the whole Senate that did not review the Plan, for it to be submitted to the Board on Oct 28.

The Senate directed the Senate Exec to act on its behalf for review and approval of the Student Equity Plan.

2. CGC Recommendation-Governance Handbook Sections: Overall Structure, Committee Membership and Goals, and Appendices – Postponed to next meeting.
3. Proposed Consolidation of Academic Support within the School of Liberal Arts – Sheryl Gobble and Daphne Figueroa gave this informational item. The concern is that the H-building was not able to accommodate English classrooms. The Facilities Committee with input from the English faculty had agreed to build out the I-building to make room for English, which included the English lab. Now, with projected growth to 10000 FTES proposed by 2018, there are not enough classrooms for Liberal Arts classes. Can we consolidate all of the English labs into the PLACe and ILC? It would need a significant remodel and funding is uncertain. Sheryl and Daphne, and the faculty involved with the PLACe and English Center, want to know how we can support our students and wants people to think about ideas that would impact design. Brett said he would do his best to support this when it comes to fruition.

E. Special Reports

1. College Discretionary Allocation – Brett Bell reported approximately \$100K ongoing new money in the discretionary budget. We want to allocate this money to the campus. Plan was developed and approved at BRDS and approved at PIEC. The plan is to solicit input from the schools and then rank them. Allocate new resources to be ranked by program, department chair, dean then VP. If the modified form is approved, they will get the news out, via Division VP, and department chairs will identify needs. Daphne said that PIEC looked this over and they were pleased with the report. Brett also showed the proposed budget by object code.
2. Miramar College 2014-15 Adopted Budget – Informational item from Brett Bell. Posted on website

F. Committee Reports/Information

1. ASCCC Fall 2014 Resolutions for Area D Discussion – Send comments and recommendations to Buran.

G. Announcements

1. Area D Meeting: Oct 25th – Santa Ana College. Marie, Buran and Freddie will be attending.
2. Board Meeting: Governance Workshop, Nov. 6th, 4pm – District Office.
3. ASCCC Fall 2014 Plenary: Nov 13-15 – Irvine

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03pm. The next meeting will be on November 4th. Please submit agenda items to both Buran Haidar and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Gina Bochicchio and Juli Bartolomei