

Minutes – Miramar College Academic Senate
3:30-5:00pm **Oct 04, 2016** Location: M-110

Senators Present: Marie McMahon, Laura Murphy, Mary Kjartanson, Dan Igou, Mara Sanft, Jason Librande, Josh Alley, Gina Bochicchio, Barbara Clark, Mark Dinger, Anne Gloag, Rodrigo Gomez, Mary Hart, April Koch, John Landicho, Jennifer Leaver, Alex Mata, Jessica McCambly, Hau Nguyen, Wheeler North, Jordan Omens, Angela Romero, Wai-Ling Rubic, John Salinsky, Shayne Vargo, Wayne Bass, Paty Beller, Johnny Gonzales, Liz Hubert, Sara Kappus, Nirmala Kashyap

Absent: Joan Thompson (proxy: M. Kjartanson), Rich Halliday (proxy: D. Igou), Kandice Brandt, Otto Dobre, Daphne Figueroa (proxy: G. Bochicchio), Kevin Gallagher (proxy: B. Clark), Andrew Lowe (proxy: L. Murphy), Patty Parker (proxy: B. Clark)

Other Attendees: Patricia Hsieh, Gerald Ramsey, Naomi Grisham, Moorthy Palanki, Darrel Harrison, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:34pm.

A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes

The agenda was unanimously approved after a reordering request by North and Harrison to move D.iii and E.v to immediately follow Old Business, in that order. Motion: Omen/Igou

The previous Senate Executive Committee Special Election minutes were unanimously approved unchanged (Igou/Omens) with one abstention (Leaver).

The previous AS minutes were unanimously approved unchanged (Vargo/Librande) with two abstentions (Igou, Leaver).

B. Special Reports/Information

- i. Administration – P. Hsieh
None
- ii. Classified Staff – T. Hubbard
None
- iii. Associated Students
None

C. Old Business

- i. Administrative Procedures Review (2nd Reading) – D. Short

Sanft provided an update due to Short's jury duty commitment. Sanft reported that comments were submitted by faculty only on AP 5019; APs 5025, 5026, 5050, 5102, and 5260 had only minor wording changes as recommended by CRC.

Sanft reported no changes in content. Sanft requested approval of Administrative Policies 5019, 5020, 5021, 5022, 5025, 5026, 5050, 5102, 5222, and 5260. Sanft offered an alternative option to approve them all or pull one for further discussion.

- a) AP 5019: Instructional Program Review – A discussion ensued pertaining to the following verbiage:

“For the purposes of this procedure, a program shall be defined as a field of study with one or more related certificates and degrees, an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license or transfer to another institution of higher education.”

Bochicchio expressed concern that this was a new procedure w/o a policy. According to Short, this was written by the IPR committee. Bochicchio expressed concern that faculty did not want to generate a program review for each degree. Bochicchio asserted that the new AP 5019 could lead to mandated program reviews for all degrees conferred within a program. Murphy explained that, in 2014, the college looked at a broader definition for “programs,” and this definition was subsequently adopted by the college. The department could define their programs not by a degree, but by a series of degrees, certificates, or courses within a program (see AP 5019). Murphy reminded the Senate that this procedure was crafted to provide greater latitude in defining programs. Bochicchio asserted that the verbiage should state that there is a defined objective, as stated in Title 5, that drives program review and not the program itself. Bochicchio asserted that the department should decide on how to conduct their program reviews. Murphy stated that, by redefining “programs,” it gave the college more freedom to define programs. North explained that an academic program leads to a specific award, which affords the college the latitude to combine or separate programs in program review. North states that this is a clearly a 10+1 issue and faculty prevue. Sanft suggested/requested language modifications to promote clarity. Murphy expressed concern that the definition of “program” has now been defined outside of the confines of our college – that this is the District's definition of a program. Sanft stated that we have not received feedback from City or Mesa on this procedure. Motion to approve AP 5019 (North/Salinsky) passed with one abstention (Bochicchio).

- b) AP 5020: Curriculum Development

- c) AP 5021: Instructional Program Discontinuance – Sanft reported the highlighted change:

“Steps to monitor the impact on other areas including articulation, transfer agreements, and college finances, as well as student notification, transition and assistance in program completion.”

North reminded senators that, between 2008-2013, programs were being cut in spite of the fact that they were viable programs; the addition of this language may address this possibility. McMahon explained that, in the event of faculty load being adversely affected by program discontinuance, retraining may be offered to the affected faculty at the expense of the college, and the fiscal responsibility of this possibility needs to be identified in any administrative procedure for program discontinuance.

- d) AP 5022: Course Approval – Changes made specific to the number of units for unit limitations.
- e) AP 5025: Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education
- f) AP 5026: Philosophy and Criteria for Certificates
- g) AP 5050: Articulation
- h) AP 5102: Career and Technical Education Programs
- i) AP 5222: Remedial Coursework
- j) AP 5260: Prerequisites, Corequisites, Limitations on Enrollment and Advisories

Motion to approve all aforementioned Administrative Procedures passed by unanimous consent. (North/Vargo)

ii. IEPI Innovation and Effectiveness Plan: Update on Timeline – M. McMahon

McMahon reported that the timeline is unchanged and we are continuing to vet and approve the plan. It is on track to be submitted on time.

iii. Open Educational Resources (OER) – M. McMahon

McMahon voiced that it seems, at the moment, that no other college in our district is as advanced in its use of OER as Miramar College. In the second meeting with Stephanie Bulger, the Academic Senate Presidents were charged with surveying faculty to provide a needs assessment of required resources to assist in developing OER. McMahon asserted that administration was very interested and motivated in supporting OER engagement on all campuses. The Academic Senate Presidents suggested offering various resources to support faculty involvement, including ESUs to faculty interested in developing (curating) OER materials. It was suggested by faculty that it could also be in the form of stipends or reassigned time. There are also innovation grants to support Z-degrees and San Diego Promise. McMahon suggested the formation of a workforce/taskforce team/resource team to first assess where we are in terms of OER use and then to promote best practices. This could be used to promote and facilitate the portability of OER, as in increasing information sharing across campuses. McMahon suggested that the February Board of Trustees meeting at Miramar College would be the perfect forum for showcasing Miramar's current utilization of OER.

iv. Official Academic Senate Statement on SLOs – L. Murphy

Murphy reasserted the need to form a taskforce to formulate an Academic Senate Statement on SLOs. Murphy contends that this is not a requirement but is beneficial for the faculty to express the inherent value and our role in SLOs. City and Mesa both have one, as does the State Academic Senate. Murphy exhorted that it would be beneficial to state that we had discussed and agreed on the AS SLO statement. Bochicchio asserted that this could be a slippery slope and faculty might be tasked by administration to do more, as predicated in the SLO statement. Murphy explained that this is an opportunity for faculty to take control over the statement and how we want to utilize it moving forward. North restated the proposal to form a workgroup to craft a statement that we would bring back to senate and review. McMahon asserted that this is faculty purview and that the AS accreditation taskforce (which is open to anyone) could work on it.

v. Plan and Procedure for Program Discontinuance – L. Murphy

McMahon reminded senators that this item remains on the agenda for faculty discussion.

vi. Self-Evaluation Report (SER) Academic Senate Exec Approval (2nd Reading) – L. Murphy

McMahon reported that the Academic Senate approved the SER and will move forward to CEC.

D. Committee Reports/Information (Academic Senate or Shared Governance Committees)

i. College Accreditation Update – L. Murphy

Murphy reported that we are meeting our timeline and continue to encourage feedback.

ii. Instructional Program Review (IPR/SLOAC) – L. Murphy

RFFs due October 5, 2016.

iii. College Governance Committee Assessment Tool Update – W. North and L. Murphy

North reminded senators that CGC developed a self-evaluation tool with the focus on goal-setting. CGC met to make a recommendation on a timeline and development of an assessment tool compilation to evaluate the utility of the assessment tool. North posed the question of data storage.

E. New Business

i. BP and AP 5120: Transfer Center (1st Reading) – N. Grisham

Grisham met with City and Mesa transfer directors to finalize the BP. They also met to discuss and finalize the AP and incorporated main functions in the procedure. Grisham reported that all three colleges provided input. This will be brought back to the next meeting for a second reading.

- ii. **Gender Identity Bathroom Options – J. Leaver**
Leaver presented the students’ perspective on gender-neutral bathroom options. Leaver expressed their concern over District wording and the tone of the document. Leaver shared a resolution written by students, which was passed by the ASC. Leaver asserts that transgender students have a difficult time using our current restrooms. Leaver relates increased wait-times for bathroom use due to limited gender-neutral facilities. Leaver proposes changing a women’s restroom to an all-gender restroom by changing signage to “all gender.” Male restrooms may need to have the urinals removed. Leaver asserted that some students feel unsafe using male/female restrooms; they would prefer gender-neutral multi-use stalls. Leaver reports that 55% of transgender or non-binary, nonconforming students will avoid using restrooms because of harassment. Senators requested the percentage of transgender students on campus. This is the most important issue concerning LGBTQ students, according to Leaver.
- iii. **Waitlist: Procedural Changes – Discussion initiated at DGC and Campus Solutions – M. McMahon**
San Diego State changed their waitlist procedure, which resulted in eliminating crashers. It is currently being proposed to have the new enrollment system, Campus Solutions, be able to automatically add students to the roster after the first day of class. This would eliminate the instructor’s discretion in providing add codes. This may not advantage students, as they may be added after the first class session and will have already missed critical information, possibly impeding their academic success. Chairs have already rejected this proposal. Kjartanson implored Miramar faculty to come to consensus on the waitlist procedure, as it will be moved forward to Campus Solutions with City and Mesa input. This issue will be brought back to Senate.
- iv. **State ASCCC Scholarships for Adjunct Faculty to Attend ASCCC Events – M. McMahon**
McMahon reported that the Academic Senate Executive Committee nominated J. Librande for the plenary session scholarship.
- v. **Diversity Committee Resolution (1st Reading) – D. Harrison**
Harrison reviewed the resolution. Harrison asserted that the intent is to demonstrate Miramar’s commitment to diversity. Harrison asserted that the faculty needs to support diversity and integrate it into our hiring practices. Harrison reminded senators that Miramar faculty should look like the students they serve. McMahon suggested that the goal of the resolution could include a term like “recruitment into the hiring process” rather than just have “the goal of hiring diverse faculty.” Harrison will bring the report to Chairs to demonstrate the disparity in ethnicity in faculty and students. Murphy asserted that it is a slippery slope when we make judgments that are based on what people look like. Harrison maintained that we need to raise awareness of diversity when we hire. Senators discussed the definition of “diversity.” Harrison suggested that the schools/departments should craft their own definition of “diversity.” This item will be brought back to the next meeting for a second reading.

F. Senate Reports

- i. **Adjunct – J. Librande**
None
- ii. **Treasurer – J. Thompson**
None
- iii. **President’s Report – M. McMahon reported on:**
 - a) McMahon reported that we are in the process of determining a nomination/application for the ASCCC Exemplary Program Award. Application deadline is November 8, 2016.
- iv. **Vice President – L. Murphy**
None

G. Announcements

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01pm. The next meeting will be on Oct 20th. Please submit agenda items to both Marie McMahon and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Kjartanson and Juli Bartolomei