

Minutes
Miramar College Academic Senate

Location: L-309

March 03, 2015 3:30-5:00pm

Senators Present: Buran Haidar, Marie McMahon, Gina Bochicchio, Carmen Jay, Frederica Carr, Daphne Figueroa, Dan Igou, Josh Alley, Clara Blenis, Lisa Brewster, Rick Cassar, Isabella Feldman, Cynthia Gilley, Ann Gloag, Naomi Grisham, Rich Halliday, Mark Hertica, Jennifer Leaver, Andrew Lowe, Laura Murphy, Wai-Ling Rubic, Shayne Vargo, Dan Willkie, M. Patricia Beller, Sharai Forbes, Shawn Hurley, Valri Nesbit, Thong Nguyen

Absent: Joan Thompson, Sean Bowers, Rebecca Bowers-Gentry (proxy: N. Sinkaset), Otto Dobre, Wheeler North, Wendy Wilson

Other Attendees: Mara Sanft, David Buser, Patricia Hsieh, Roanna Bennie, Linda Woods, Daniel Miramontez, Namphol Sinkaset (proxy for R. Bowers-Gentry), Darrel Harrison, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:35pm.

A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes

The agenda was approved with two amendments: adding a report by Gina Bochicchio about results of the adjunct senator elections, to follow the approval of the minutes, and a New Business resolution on Faculty Co-chairing (Contract) Faculty Hiring Committees, requested by Daphne, if time permits.

The previous minutes were not available and will be approved at the next meeting.

Gina reported that Valri Nesbit (Political Science) and Sharai Forbes (English), and Wendy Wilson (Communication Studies) are the elected adjunct senators. The Senate welcomed Valri and Sharai who were in attendance.

B. Special Reports

1. College Administration – President Hsieh reported that Miramar’s request for additional classified classroom support positions (i.e. labs) was presented to the Chancellor who acknowledged its receipt. The President will continue to push for this. She informed that Miramar received an additional 165 FTES for the summer. Buran pointed out that additional FTES can’t be used for supplies to support instruction. Patricia informed that is working on clarifying the need to increase that funding as well. Her advice is to maintain the increase in enrollment numbers to show need. President Hsieh also shared that Miramar is the only campus within the district in the black for reaching their growth target and contributing to the overall District growth number.

2. Old Business

1. 2016 Accreditation Self-Evaluation Faculty Editor – Buran presented the proposal that was discussed at the Senate Exec on Feb. 24 with no objections. She highlighted the elements taken into consideration: the faculty editor will work alongside the Steering committee co-chairs, there will be no change to the work of tri-chairs committees’ or its timeline, the faculty editor would start at the beginning of fall 2015 and end at the end of spring 2016, the expected timeline for completion of the report, and a 0.2 FTETs to be allocated for each of these two semesters. She presented timelines for the announcement of the position in March, the application deadline after the first week in April, and the selection of the faculty editor the first week in May. Buran informed that on Feb. 25 she met with the College President and sought input about any changes, in good faith intending for the Senate to receive a single proposal. Buran summarized as President Hsieh’s response that was sent via email to the Senate Exec asserting: a) short notice for input prior to the next Senate meeting, b) the statement in the new Accreditation standards about the CEOs primary leadership role for accreditation, c) that appointing the faculty steering committee co-chair and the constituency representatives to the tri-chairs is the debut to the approved process to move forward following the above “quoted stated mandate”, and d) novel interpretations of roles of constituency appointees to workgroups that are assigned specific tasks, without consultation with the appointing constituencies. President Hsieh also included a counter proposal to hold a campus-wide group discussion to finalize the role, responsibilities, and duties of the (faculty) Editor “in accordance with our Accreditation process”, which disregards the autonomy of the Academic Senate as the independent representative and voice of the faculty and usurps the mandated “Collegial Consultation”. Buran projected President Hsieh’s email with Highlighted comments addressing individual points, which she is willing to send to all. The highlighted comments included that since the publishing of the new accreditation standards, the College President have selectively focused on the statement of standard IV.B.4,

“The CEO has the primary leadership role for accreditation, ensuring that the institution meets or exceeds Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies at all times. Faculty, staff, and administrative leaders of the institution also have responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements.”

to the exclusion of the next statement of standard IV.B.5

“The CEO assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures”

As such, the CEO is also bound to abide by California law and the **statutory** role of the Academic Senate, per AB1725 and its **Title 5 regulations**, as well as implementation of our **Board of Trustees Policy 2510**, which mandates that:

a. In issues involving the eight academic and professional matters listed below, the Miramar College President (as the designee of the Board) will **rely primarily** on the advice of the Miramar College Academic Senate.

7) Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports

Buran pointed out that President Hsieh’s counter proposal in effect is asking the Academic Senate to cede its purview to a campus-wide joint meeting. Laura Murphy asked if there is a list of duties of the faculty editor and concern about the overlap of duties with that of the steering committee faculty co-chairs expressed concern about the amount of release time being requested for both the faculty editor and the faculty co-chair of the steering committee. Buran reminded that the draft responsibilities were already sent to all senators. Rick Cassar recommended that the steering committee and Senate Exec get together, possibly with a mediator, and come up with something they all agree on to bring back to the Senate. Daphne asked a hypothetical question about what would happen if the Senate passes something that the College President might decide not to accept. Buran clarified that we would hope that Board policy would be followed and for the college President to rely primarily the Academic Senate on the issue of the roles of faculty in the Accreditation process. If the College President decides to disagree with the Senate’s position, the next step would be for the College President to write a measured explanation to the Board. Discussion ensued and a motion was made and seconded to have the Senate Exec meet with the accreditation steering committee co-chairs and to bring an agreed upon proposal to the next Senate meeting. A question was asked about the timeline and Buran explained that is crucial in order to maintain the timeline and meet the proposed deadline and she warned against tactics of delay. The motion passed with unanimous consent.

2. Academic Support & Student Success – Buran reminded that Academic Support and Student Success as academic and professional matter were presented to the Senate at the last meeting. She informed that an Academic Senate discussion about development of an Academic Support Program was discussed at the Senate Exec and was shared with the college president in good faith. She pointed out that a novel proposal to restructure tutoring services and to create new faculty positions, elements of academic support, was presented for the first time at the last Academic Affairs (AAC) meeting. Daphne explained the background and timeline which started as facilities issue only within the School of Liberal Arts, due to remodeling of the I-building to add more classrooms, about sharing space between the English Center, the PLACe, and the ILC, which was previously shared with the Senate. An additional discussion about restructuring and coordination of tutorial services was then brought up at Basic Skills Subcommittee the first day of February and was moved forward to the first meeting of AAC this semester. VPI Bennie co-chair of AAC recommended more discussions be had on the issue, so a group volunteers was to have those discussions and come up with points and ideas to bring forward to another venue or back to AAC. Two separate meetings were held among some of the volunteers and others led to the realization that what is being discussed is about educational program development that is an academic and professional matter. She reminded that a number of programs included on the draft list of programs that was reviewed at the past meeting belong in under such an academic support program. The group came to the conclusion that what is needed is a vision for academic support and points were forwarded to the Senate Exec. Buran reviewed the document about the Academic Support Program Development Principles and Big Picture: “WHY”–“HOW”–“WHAT” that was discussed at the Senate Exec and shared with the College President.. She informed that discussion included convening an Academic Senate Forum for the Senate to develop a vision with input from all constituencies for the campus academic support that is more comprehensive than restructuring tutoring services. The ultimate goal is to develop and implement a comprehensive campus Academic Support Plan. She recommended convening the forum on March 24, the date of the next the Senate Exec meeting. Discussion ensued about the importance of collecting input from all and the use of a survey instrument to solicit and gather input. Lisa Brewster recommended the survey be specific and suggested the use of a form for people to fill and to back input with data, and she accepted to set it up.
3. Program List in College Catalog – Buran presented an amended list with few recommended changes that included: changing “Biological Studies” to “Biology for Transfer,” making Physical Science and Physics one program, and assigning EDUC, DSPS, PERG, and LIBS to Interdisciplinary Studies. A motion to approve the amended list passed by unanimous consent.
4. Program Review Template in Taskstream – Buran solicited Laura Murphy’s input about the inclusion of a program benchmarking field in the template that was forwarded by AAC to the Academic Senate. Laura Murphy explained that was a federal requirement that comes with no language about how that needs to be done. The discussion at the

IPR/SLOAC committee was that the institutional level benchmarking would be provided to the programs for each to speak to those areas. Individual programs would not be expected to benchmark their programs. She affirmed that we will be using Taskstream starting fall 2015. Carmen Jay asked if there was any urgency on this item, as her department had not discussed it yet. Laura explained that there was. A motion to bless the template with the qualification that there is a section about benchmarking that will have a rewording passed with two abstentions.

5. Action Plan for BSI – Buran presented input that was received and pointed few suggested edits to emphasize including all individuals with cited responsibility, and informing listed individuals about their responsibility and involvement, and ensuring that all planned actions pertain to Basic Skills student without supplanting other plans. Discussion ensued about the importance of integrating all efforts and revisiting the committee membership. A motion to approve the Action Plan with the minor changes passed by unanimous consent.
6. BRDS Discretionary Allocation – Buran summarized comments received including the need to consult with individual responsible for listed budget items. She informed about the request to the college president to augment the Academic Senate budget due to the increase in faculty numbers. The proposal would be the same percent increase as the faculty increase, which would result in a budget of \$7500 instead of the current \$6200. A motion to approve the BRDS recommendation for the Discretionary Allocation was passed by unanimous consent.

D. New Business

1. Faculty (Contract) Hiring Committee Prioritization – Marie McMahon presented the updated Prioritized List for contract faculty hiring. Due to the retirement of the Catalog Librarian, difficulty in filling that position on an adjunct basis, and accreditation requirements, the committee felt it was important to move a new hire for Library to the top of the list. A discussion ensued about the process with which the committee came to that decision, and it was ultimately moved to refer this item back to Faculty Hiring for reconsideration. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

E. Committee Reports/Information

1. Adjunct Appreciation Day – Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back to the next meeting.
2. Honors Committee – Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back to the next meeting.
3. PIEC: College-wide Planning Summit – Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back to the next meeting.

F. Senate Reports

1. Treasurer – No report.
2. President – No report.
3. President-Elect – No report.

G. Announcements

1. None

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02pm. The next meeting will be on March 17th. Please submit agenda items to both Buran Haidar and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Gina Bochicchio and Juli Bartolomei