

**Minutes**  
**Miramamar College Academic Senate**

Location: L-309

Feb. 03, 2015 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, Sean Bowers, Rebecca Bowers-Gentry, Lisa Brewster, Rick Cassar, Isabella Feldman, Cynthia Gilley, Ann Gloag, Naomi Grisham, Rich Halliday, Mark Hertica, Jennifer Leaver, Andrew Lowe, Eric Mosier, Wheeler North, Wai-Ling Rubic, Shayne Vargo, Dan Willkie, M. Patricia Beller, Shawn Hurley, Thong Nguyen

**Absent:** Otto Dobre, Laura Murphy

**Other Attendees:** Jeffery Saikali, Sharai Forbes, Valri Nesbit, Kats Gustafson, Dave Giberson, Linda Woods, Laurie Vasallo-Dusa, Daniel Miramontez, Lou Ascione, Howard Irvin, Patricia Hsieh, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:34pm.

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

The agenda was approved after a reordering to move item E1 ahead of D1 due to time constraints of the presenter, Frederica Carr, and C3 ahead of C1. An additional reordering to move E1 between C3 and C1 was approved during the meeting. The previous minutes were approved unchanged by unanimous consent.

**B. Special Reports**

1. Professional Development: SSSP & Student Equity Plans – Howard Irvin discussed professional development funding related to the SSSP and Student Equity Plans. He listed the professional development activities that are funded by both. He informed that advisory groups of both plans will come up with a process about how to apply for funding and that he will inform all about when these open meetings will be held.

2. Online Instruction in CCC – Kats Gustafson and Dave Giberson (SDCCD Dean, Online & Distributed Learning and Instructional Design Coordinator, respectively) gave a report to the Senate about the 2014 Distance Learning Summit, a one-day mini conference that took place in Oct. 2014. It featured Pat James, the Executive Director of the Online Education Initiative from the State Chancellor's Office, as keynote speaker, and included nine breakout sessions for 88 attendees, including SDICCCA members. Dave said that the State will be providing about \$60 million over the next six years for online instruction, leading to considerable change. The highlight of the Summit was the student panel - four students providing no-holds-barred input about their online education experience.

Kats discussed the State Authorization Act and explained that cost and technology will prohibit students residing in some states and territories from taking our online classes. Active military members who move to these states are exempt. But active military residing in these states will be barred from registering, when they go back home. She also presented the OEI Course Review Rubric that was sent to senators prior to the meeting and the four elements of course design. It's recommended that instructors of online courses take a look at the rubric and apply it to their own courses as a self-evaluation. Questions can be addressed to Katie Palacios.

Daphne praised the summit, as someone who attended, and also informed the Senate that Link-Systems International Inc. that has the World Wide Whiteboard program, which the District has been using for the online tutoring pilot, got the contract for the OEI for online tutoring and the transfer will be seamless when the current contract expires - no break in service whatsoever.

3. College Administration – Patricia Hsieh reported that the CCC Board of Governors voted to change the language in Title V section 51016. Accreditation, which now states: "Each community college within a district shall be an accredited institution. Accreditation shall be determined only by an accrediting agency recommended by the Chancellor and approved by the Board of Governors. The Board shall approve only an accreditor recognized and approved by the U.S. Secretary of Education under the Higher Education Act of 1965 acting within the agency's scope of recognition by the Secretary." Dr. Hsieh added that the process for applying the new language is still unknown and will take time. The change will not impact our current accreditation process.

President Hsieh next distributed copies to the senators of an email communication between the Senate President and herself of summary notes about their meeting on Jan. 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

**C. Old Business**

1. Cultural and Diversity Plan: Tracking and Implementation (Amendment) – Buran Haidar explained the recommended amendments of the Diversity and International Education Committee (DIEC). The amended Plan was approved by unanimous consent.

2. Assigning Courses to Disciplines (update) – Buran reported that our Miramar Curriculum Committee reviewed the Senate-approved edits to the Mesa initiated Senate resolution, and it found that the approved edits would change the quoted language from the Disciplines Handbook. The Senate instructed Dan Igou to ask the Curriculum Committee to

add language to address the intent to address interdisciplinary assignment of courses for disciplines that do not require Masters degrees.

3. 2016 Accreditation Self-Evaluation (update): Process & Faculty Editor – Buran recapped to senators the extensive Senate discussions since the beginning of fall 2014, triggered by the College President forwarding a proposal with no role for a faculty editor, without consultation, for the 2016 Accreditation Self-Evaluation report. She reminded that, last fall, the final position of the Senate was to have a faculty editor and to direct for collegial consultation between the College and the Senate President about the logistics and when to bring the faculty editor on board. Next, Buran updated that proceeding with collegial consultation on this matter was hindered by the College President's misunderstanding that the Senate's position on having a faculty editor had changed since the word "faculty" was not included in the wording of the last friendly amendment of the final motion clarifying the position on the Senate. The President was invited to the Senate Exec on Dec. 16<sup>th</sup> to hear directly from its members about the will and the intent of the Senate. A Dec. 18<sup>th</sup> prescheduled meeting between her and Dr. Hsieh was cancelled by the latter. At the Jan 7<sup>th</sup> meeting between Buran and the College President, Dr. Hsieh was not open to discussing the faculty editor's role or how she wished to proceed with the consultation. Instead, Dr. Hsieh stated that she had already consulted with the Accreditation Steering Committee co-chairs, who made the recommendation to bring the faculty editor after the third draft of the self-Study report was completed, and that the faculty editor would be appointed to work from Dec. 2015 through April 2016, to ensure smooth reading for the report. Dr. Hsieh also stated to Buran that she supported the recommendation of the Steering committee co-chairs. Buran raised two points to Dr. Hsieh at that meeting: a) the proposal to bring on the faculty editor after the third draft had already been presented to the Senate Exec and to the Senate during the discussions, and that it was not supported, b) regardless of who writes the report, the faculty editor must have access to the primary materials submitted by all the tri-chairs.

Buran ended her report by summarizing where the matter stands at this point. She emphasized that: a) no collegial consultation took place with the representative of the Senate for input about the will of the Senate. The college President made a decision to accept the recommendation of the same individuals who developed the original accreditation process with no role for a faculty editor, before consulting with the Academic Senate President; b) going forward, we need to have an agreement about the principles for bringing a faculty editor as an authentic faculty voice that is not restricted to smoothing the reading of a finished report, per the Senate's will; and, c) per the definition of editing, the faculty editor would be involved in preparing the written report after its compilation in all activities of correcting, condensing, or otherwise modifying the compiled materials.

Rebecca Bowers-Gentry shared her perspective that, while the Senate did not adopt the timing for when to bring the faculty editor on, it was said that would be left open to the people who were helping with the process to make that determination, and that if during the discussions they felt that the best time would be after the third draft, that's something we can discuss at the Senate floor for consideration. Buran pointed out that while this perspective was voiced during the discussions, it was not supported by the Senate's final position, which at the end directed her to collegially consult with the College President on the appropriate timing of bringing the faculty editor.

Buran invited Linda Woods, the Senate representative as the faculty co-chair of the Accreditation Steering Committee, to explain to the Senate the modified accreditation proposal and timeline, which senators had already received, that was presented at the accreditation meeting on the previous Friday. Linda explained how the Steering Committee came up with the plan for the timeline since the beginning. As the past accreditation Steering Committee co-chair, she was tasked with figuring out what is best based on what went on in the last accreditation cycle. Most importantly, she did talk with the last self-study report faculty editor, Nam Sinkaset. Together they discussed when best to bring the faculty editor and his recommendation was to bring the faculty editor after the third draft, and accordingly that was fitted into the original timeline. Linda apologized on behalf of the Steering Committee if the impression was that they were trying to block the Senate from making a decision when they adjusted the timeline, as that was not the intent. Linda clarified that the first two drafts are meant to be ongoing Steering Committee conversations with the tri-chairs, and that the Board will only receive a vetted version of the self-study report. Time ran out, Buran asked for a motion to extend the time for further discussion of the modified timeline, none was made.

Linda asked why the recently modified timeline forwarded by the steering committee co-chairs was still considered a "proposal". Buran explained that the timing for bringing in the faculty editor is still the same as what was originally proposed that based on one person's experience, without taking into account the position of the Senate and input of others. Linda commented that some tri-chairs are concerned about whether or not they can continue their work without an approved timeline. Buran emphasized that bringing in the faculty editor does not alter the timeline of the work of the standard tri-chairs. Buran asked senators to expect to receive new ideas for consideration.

#### **D. New Business**

1. ASCCC Senate Rule and By Laws – Buran Haidar asked senators for input before she responds to the ASCCC survey. There was concern about the proposal to consider the ASCCC as "non-profit organization" instead of a faculty only

representative body, to proposed referencing the ASCCC Senate Exec as a “Board of Directors”, and to the possible addition of non-faculty, albeit a very valued Executive Director of the ASCCC Office, to the Senate Exec at the state level. Another concern is the impact of the proposed changes on diminishing the power of the faculty Senate leadership in consultations at all levels and with the Board of Governors. Wheeler North and Darrel Harrison will be invited to explain it better at the next meeting.

2. Board of Governors Nomination – Daphne Figueroa explained that the term for one of the two faculty members on the State Board of Governors is up, so there is a call for nominations for a new faculty member on the Board. Senate Exec recommended to support the endorsement of Buran Haidar and the Senate body agreed by unanimous consent.

#### **E. Committee Reports/Information**

1. Adjunct Faculty Senator Representation, Action Day & Equity – Gina Bochicchio introduced the topic of National Adjunct Action Day (rather than “Walkout Day,” as some others are calling it) on Feb 25<sup>th</sup>. She reported attending the planning meeting for that Action Day, where fliers were handed with planned events at other campuses but not at Miramar. She said the general impression was that Miramar lacked interest. Gina expressed her intent to show our adjunct faculty colleagues and everyone else that we do care. She encouraged everyone to wear the available stickers to show support and even attend the events at the other campuses.

Frederica Carr, adjunct faculty member of the Senate Exec, spoke passionately about her own personal experience as and expressed great concern over adjunct issues, which are also addressed in the AFT resolution that the Senate is asked to support (already passed by City and Mesa). Daphne said that she found it embarrassing and disgraceful that people think Miramar has a lack of interest and proposed that we do something for our adjunct faculty that day to show support and unity. Gina concurred with the feeling of embarrassment and said that we should provide a welcoming and safe atmosphere for adjuncts freely expressing their views. She said she’s willing to post fliers and do other things to show support for them that day. Marie, as Chair of Chairs, agreed that something positive should be done to change the perception. An *Ad hoc* group of faculty volunteered to work out the details of what can be done on the 25<sup>th</sup>, spread the word, and obtain stickers and other materials needed for the day.

A motion was made and approved to extend the time by five minutes to discuss the AFT resolution on Temporary Faculty. After going through the resolution’s points and some discussion about concerns about wording in the “resolved,” a motion was made to suspend parliamentary procedure to approve on a first reading. The motion passed and the resolution itself was passed by unanimous consent, with the clarification that the understanding is that it refers to positions, not people (the intent is not to convert all adjuncts to contract status).

#### **F. Senate Reports**

1. Treasurer – Joan Thompson reported a balance of \$1159.69.
2. President’s Report – Buran Haidar reported on concerns brought to her attention regarding the participation of administrators in the deliberations at Senate meetings, and expressions of feelings of intimidation by the presence of the college president. She also reminded Miramar’s Academic Senate has six adjunct senator positions, with three that currently filled by two biology and one chemistry adjunct colleagues, leaving three vacant positions to be filled. Four or five adjunct have already expressed interest in serving. Election to fill the three open spots will take place soon.
3. President-Elect – Marie McMahon requested to go first next time.

#### **G. Announcements**

1. (None)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm. The next meeting will be on February 17<sup>th</sup>. Please submit agenda items to both Buran Haidar and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,  
Gina Bochicchio and Juli Bartolomei