

Minutes – Miramar College Academic Senate
3:40-5:00pm **April 18, 2017** Location: M-110

Senators Present: Marie McMahon, Laura Murphy, Mary Kjartanson, Joan Thompson, Rich Halliday, Daniel Gutowski, Mara Sanft, Jason Librande, Gina Bochicchio, Rebecca Bowers-Gentry, Kandice Brandt, Barbara Clark, Anne Gloag, Mary Hart, Dan Igou, April Koch, Jennifer Leaver, Andrew Lowe, Jessica McCambly, Hau Nguyen, Wheeler North, Jordan Omens, Patty Parker, Kevin Petti, Wai-Ling Rubic, John Salinsky, Shayne Vargo, Paty Beller, Liz Hubert, Shawn Hurley, Laura Louie, Sabrina Menchaca

Absent: Josh Alley (proxy: J. McCambly), Mark Dinger, Otto Dobre, Kevin Gallagher (proxy: B. Clark), Rodrigo Gomez, Alex Mata (proxy: A. Koch), Najah Abdelkader

Other Attendees: Soodeh Nezam Abadi, Gerald Ramsey, Adela Jacobson, Juli Bartolomei

Meeting called to order at 3:45pm.

A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes

The agenda was unanimously approved after a reordering to move items Di and Dii to immediately follow the approval of previous minutes. (Bowers-Gentry/Omens)

The previous minutes were unanimously approved unchanged, with one abstention. (Murphy/Vargo)

B. Special Reports/Information

i. Administration – A. Jacobson

Jacobson, representing Hsieh, encouraged faculty to attend the commencement ceremony on May 19th. In order to accommodate seating, faculty who have not reserved yet will need to contact Rachel Martinez to confirm attendance. Jacobson encouraged faculty to contribute to Invest in Success (May 6th).

ii. Classified Staff – None

iii. Associated Students – None

iv. Resolution Packet Review in Preparation for Spring Plenary (April 20th – 22nd, 2017) – M. McMahon

McMahon briefly highlighted all resolutions in the packet by categories, itemizing specific discipline areas to call out, and solicited potential interest and input from relevant faculty discipline experts.

C. Old Business

i. Miramar College Professional Development Task Force (Update) – M. McMahon

McMahon provided an update of the timeline and priorities for the Professional Development Taskforce proposal, reiterating the pathway for this proposal that was determined in the previous Academic Senate (AS) meeting: As mentioned, this constituency-wide PD taskforce first takes its proposals to the College Governance Committee (CGC). It was presented to CGC on April 11th (however, it was an unofficial meeting) where discussions of re-naming, restructuring and broadening the Staff Development Committee into a more comprehensive Professional Development Committee ensued. The outcome was a general agreement of the benefits of more clearly delineating the committee's alignment with strategic planning, budget resource allocations and prioritizations across campus. McMahon outlined the proposal and goals of the committee (inclusion of the first 2 goals* of the Staff Dev committee which have not been effectively implemented):

- Provide assistance for Miramar College personnel in the development of personal growth plans.*
- Provide information about classes, conferences, workshops, and other programs for the betterment of classroom instruction, student support services and enhanced job performance.*
- Develop plans for disbursement of travel funds for faculty and classified staff.

In addition, it was suggested to include further Goals/Requirements:

- Recipients of Professional Development funds to identify “Deliverables” of activity regarding impact on student success or College.
- Link the completion of PD activity with a report on the positive contribution to the College.

It was also noted that clerical support for the PD committee would be provided by the clerical assistant of Assoc. Dean of Student Equity and Academic Success (SEAS) serving on this committee.

McMahon further delineated the proposed committee duties as defined by the taskforce:

- 1) Create a 3-year College Professional Development Plan.
- 2) Consider additional PD info from SPAS, Strategic Goals (Mission), and Initiatives (BSI, SEP, SSSP, SWP, IEPI).
- 3) For planning purposes, consider development of a Prof Dev field in Program Review (TaskStream) to directly survey and prioritize faculty, staff and administrators' needs.
- 4) Create and manage effective forms for processing Prof Dev requests for funding, including links to priorities, college planning and demonstrated outcomes. These include: Travel requests and Activities requests.

- 5) Identify, align and maximize appropriate funding sources to support requested activities and PD priorities.
- 6) Work with FLEX Coordinator to ensure FLEX activities are in alignment with faculty PD priorities and college plans.
- 7) Work with Faculty Coordinator and Assoc. Dean for Academic Support to ensure alignment with student support needs.

Faculty discussion regarding additional responsibilities of the applicant ensued. Murphy reminded senators that these requirements were not significantly different than what is currently required in terms of the effort involved or the need for documentation of evidence. Murphy stated that this was not yet a formal recommendation, which needed to take place at CGC on April 25th. Murphy invited all to attend and provide input and voice concerns. McMahon will send the Professional Development Taskforce recommendations to faculty prior to the April 25th CGC meeting.

- ii. Confidentiality of Personal Information Guidelines within SDCCD – M. McMahon
As in previous meetings, McMahon solicited faculty input regarding this issue.
- iii. Plan and Procedure for Program Discontinuance (Update) – M. Kjartanson
Kjartanson said that the Plan and Procedure for Program Discontinuance will move forward to Academic Affairs on May 18th.
- iv. Revision of the Academic Senate By-Laws: Clerical Changes (2nd Reading) – L. Murphy
Murphy reported that she has not received additional changes from faculty. Faculty discussion ensued and clarification was provided by McMahon. Motion to approve clerical changes unanimously approved. (Thompson/Clark)
- v. Faculty BBQ: End of Spring, Start of Fall or Every Other Year? – M. McMahon
The item will be brought back to the next meeting. Faculty BBQ will not occur this May.

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

- i. Budget Resource Development Subcommittee (BRDS): Discretionary Allocation Summary – B. Bell, G. Choe
Bell provided a history of the budget development process. The three phases of the process identified were: 1) Allocation of new resources, 2) Reallocation of existing resources, and 3) Budget development. Bell said that, this year, we had 67K to allocate to the College. Bell explained the approved worksheet utilized to document prior budget, prior expenditures and the current year budget. The document also encumbers a data collection point, allowing for departments and divisions to request and prioritize additional resources. Bell added that we now link requests for additional resources to our College-wide Strategic Plan. The documents have gone through all divisions, including Communications, Library & Technology, and Planning and Research Institutional Effectiveness. Bell summarized the allocation for additional requests as follows: \$68,178 requests for additional resources, but only had \$67,000 available, leaving a surplus of \$1,178 in requests for resources that cannot be allocated (all secondary requests). Bell reviewed the 2016-2017 Discretionary Allocation Summary and recommended that the Senate move it forward (see below):

2016-17 Division Discretionary Allocation
Summary Status as of 3/27/17

	Total	Total	Priority 1	Priority 1
School of FRIE & LT	3,000	4%	3,000	4.48%
Communications	3,000	4%	3,000	4.48%
Instruction	50,000	73%	50,000	74.63%
Student Services	9,178	13%	8,000	11.94%
Administrative Services	3,000	4%	3,000	4.48%
Total Requested	68,178	100%	67,000	100%
Amount Available	67,000		67,000	
Variance	(1,178)		-	

FRIE & LT		Communications		Instruction		Student Services		Administrative Services		Campus	
Total	3,000	Total	3,000	Total	50,000	Total	9,178	Total	3,000	Total	67,000
1	3,000	1	3,000	1	50,000	1	8,000	1	3,000	1	67,000
2	-	2	-	2	-	2	1,178	2	-	2	1,178
3	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	3	-
4	-	4	-	4	-	4	-	4	-	4	-
5	-	5	-	5	-	5	-	5	-	5	-
6	-	6	-	6	-	6	-	6	-	6	-
7	-	7	-	7	-	7	-	7	-	7	-
8	-	8	-	8	-	8	-	8	-	8	-
9	-	9	-	9	-	9	-	9	-	9	-
10	-	10	-	10	-	10	-	10	-	10	-
Total	3,000	Total	3,000	Total	50,000	Total	9,178	Total	3,000	Total	68,178
Variance	-	Variance	-	Variance	-	Variance	-	Variance	-	Variance	(1,178)

As this was the first reading, a motion to suspend the rules to move the proposal forward was unanimously approved. (North/Bowers-Gentry) Motion to move the proposal forward unanimously approved. (North/Bowers-Gentry)

- ii. Facilities Committee: Facilities Master Plan Ranking – B. Bell and L Gonzalez
Bell reviewed the Facilities Master Plan Ranking (see below) and explained that these requests were prioritized based on safety, environment and impact on instruction. Faculty discussion ensued. Bell explained that requests need to be in

program review, but items that would be a code violation are approved and generally taken care of by the District. Money will not come from departments unless it is requested. As this was the first reading, a motion to suspend the rules to move the Facilities Master Plan Ranking forward was unanimously approved. (North/Murphy) A motion to approve the Facilities Master Plan and move it forward was unanimously approved. (North/Thompson)

Facilities Master Plan Ranking

Priority	Project	Status	Safety / Environment	Instruction Impact	Program Review Yes/No	Facilities Master Plan	Strategic Goal
1	Campus-wide Wayfinding	New	1	1	No	Yes	I, II
2	Evaluate, Adjust or Modify Door Opener to PLACe L-101	New	1	1	Yes	No	II
3	C-1 Extend Concrete Pad & Cover to Store Haz Mat	New	1	1	Yes	No	I, II
4	Epoxy floor in C-100 Lab	New	1	1	Yes	No	I
5	I-building Restroom Renovation	New	1	1	No	No	I
6	J-1 Bleachers	New	1	2	Yes	No	II
7	Lighting for Stairway in C-1	New	1	2	No	No	I
8	F-1 Additional Hand Dryer	New	1	3	No	No	III
9	Renovate L-101 to accommodate Student Success Program	New	2	1	Yes	No	I, II
10	I-130. Convert Open Lab to Three Classrooms, ESL Computer Lab and Honors Center.	New	2	1	Yes	No	III
11	Add WiFi to C-100 Lab	New	2	1	Yes	No	II
12	I-102 Paint, Carpet, Outfit and Create Adjunct and Contract Faculty Office Space (re-use of S-5 Office Furniture)	New	2	1	Yes	No	II
13	Upgrade AV in J-1 for Commencement	New	2	1	Yes	No	II
14	Replace solid core doors at C-121 with glass doors. Will reduce noise from adjacent restrooms.	New	2	1	No	No	I
15	Hourglass Field Renovation	New	2	2	Yes	Yes	I, II
16	Demo Fence, Remove Landscaping at S-401 and North Campus Drive. Add Lab Vehicle Parking.	New	2	2	No	No	I
17	Student Art Gallery	New	2	2	Yes	No	II, III
18	Native/Drought Tolerant Plant Labels	New	2	2	No	No	II
19	Inviting Interaction Space in Compass Point (Student Honors Project)	New	2	2	No	No	II
20	A-200 Restrooms Renovation	New	2	3	Yes	Yes	I, II
21	Renovate Bathroom at Montgomery Field	New	2	3	Yes	No	I, II
22	C-100 Exterior Paint	New	2	3	Yes	No	I
23	A-200 Exterior Paint	New	2	3	Yes	No	I, II
24	Space	New	2	3	Yes	No	II
25	Delete C-105 Classroom and add Faculty Office Space	New	2	3	No	No	I
26	Install Soundproofing in J-1 Gym	New	3	1	No	No	II
27	I-122 Demo Classroom Lab Space and Create Veteran's Center	New	3	2	No	No	II, III
28	Identify and Create Gender Neutral Bathrooms	New	3	2	No	No	II, III
29	Inviting Interaction Space in H-bldg (Student Honors Project)	New	3	2	No	No	II
30	Inviting Interaction Space in M-building (Student Honors Project)	New	3	2	No	No	II
31	Inviting Interaction Space in S6 (Student Honors Project)	New	3	2	No	No	II
32	Add Electrical Outlets in Lobby of K-1 for Student Use	New	3	3	No	No	I, II
33	Replace Old Hand Dryers with New Standard	New	3	3	No	No	III
34	Organic Garden - between F-2, Tennis Courts and J-buildings	New	3	3	No	Yes	II, III
35	H-building Indoor Signage for Faculty Offices	New	3	3	Yes	Yes	II
36	A-1 & A-2 Removal of Dead Wood	New	3	3	No	No	I, II
37	College Only Field (No location identified. Under review at Joint Use)	New	3	3	Yes	No	I, II
38	Hooks for Purses in all Women's Washrooms	New	3	3	No	No	II
39	Add Sand Volleyball Courts (Adjacent to Tennis Court Parking Lot)	New	3	3	Yes	No	I, II
40	Quiet Room (no location identified)	New	3	3	No	No	I
41	Evaluate, Adjust or Modify Door Opener to S6 Office Corridor	New	3	3	No	No	I

iii. Faculty Hiring Taskforce: Revisions of AP for Employment of College Faculty (ver. 9) – M. McMahon
 McMahon reviewed the Faculty Hiring Taskforce revisions of the AP for Employment of College Faculty (see below). The additional language provided for the screening committee to elect a Chairperson or Co-chairperson(s). The Academic Senate Presidents would like to add additional language that could provide a public forum for the screening of high-level College searches. McMahon added that there are benefits and detractions but, if listed, could provide all colleges the option. McMahon said that City College is currently utilizing a public forum for their presidential selection as part of the process. Faculty discussion ensued.

1. All members of the ~~Selection~~ Screening Committee shall elect a Chairperson, or Co-Chairpersons, from those listed above in paragraph 3. a, b, or c. The ~~Committee chairperson~~ Chairperson ~~must be trained in a module on~~ must adhere to the procedures outlined in the Screening Committee Manual provided by hiring procedures, presented by District Human Resources, as well as Administrative Procedure 4200.1. The Chairperson and accepts the legal and logistical responsibilities as prescribed by District policy. ~~Responsibility of the chairperson is outlined in Personnel Manual Section 4210.~~

iv. College Governance Committee (CGC): Committee Assessment Tool Update – M. McMahon
 McMahon provided an update on the formal evaluation process of our college governance utilizing the CGC Committee Assessment Tool. McMahon shared with the senate that the use of the tool was to assist committees (particularly committee chairs) in understanding, creating and driving effective practices for college governance committees on our

campus. McMahon encouraged faculty to review committee information in the College Governance Handbook to determine committee composition and goals. McMahon discussed the fact that the contentious issue seemed to focus on attendance of committee members at meetings. McMahon assured faculty that the assessment tool was not intended to be used in a punitive manner, but to assure that all constituency groups are appropriately represented and have the opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns. McMahon indicated that, having worked through the accreditation process, although arduous and demanding, it has allowed us to vigorously examine our processes. It was clear from this experience that we can only identify gaps if we set out to find them, and this requires honesty. This in turn allows us to move forward with a comprehensive plan to mitigate the gaps we have identified, with the primary intention of making improvements to our shared governance system. Faculty voiced concern over the possibility of misusing the attendance sheet information and questions were raised regarding who would be examining these assessment tools and where this information would reside. McMahon and Murphy indicated that the CGC is the body with the charge of evaluating the effectiveness of college governance committees, in line with Accreditation Standard IV.A: Leadership and Governance; Decision-Making Roles and Processes. Therefore, the CGC is the venue for the examination of this information. It was also indicated that the CGC is in ongoing discussions about how to best store this information. McMahon invited and will accept language that can safeguard against punitive measures. In addition, McMahon indicated that the basic elements of this assessment tool were described and used in the Quality Focus Essay (QFE) and Actions Plans (APs) which were approved by the Academic Senate and submitted to the visiting Accreditation team. As such, we have already indicated to the team that we intend to use this assessment tool as part of the college governance evaluations.

- v. Debriefing from Accreditation Site Team Visit and Faculty Role in Future College Accreditation – L. Murphy
Murphy provided a faculty perspective of an evaluation of the accreditation process. Murphy outlined the roles of the faculty, including Tri-Chair teams and Faculty Editor, in setting up the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) document. Murphy stated that the Tri-chair teams were tasked with providing evidence and a narrative analysis but were not told to write standards. Murphy added that the directions were unclear and the teams had difficulty in answering standards that were not in their disciplines. Murphy cited that the reassigned time provided for the Faculty co-chair was disproportionate to the workload and meeting demands, as were the expectations of the uncompensated tri-chairs. Murphy stated that the Faculty Editor had 0.2 reassigned time to edit the ISER document in Spring 2016, but 1) there was not much to edit at that time and 2) the fluidity of the document demanded that editing be done throughout the process. Murphy said that the Faculty Co-chair was tasked with coordinating the preparation of the ISER, asserting that there was not ample support for faculty to complete the report. Murphy indicated that writing was clearly not a delineated expectation of the position, but writing, validating and editing became the major roles of the position. Murphy suggested a more proactive approach in preparation for future visits, including an ongoing faculty presence and representation, as well as reassigned time commensurate to workload. Murphy also strongly suggested that the VPI should have a more substantive role in the Accreditation Steering Committee moving forward. Murphy recommended that the AS should consider an accreditation point-person on a continual basis to keep abreast of the accreditation standards.

E. New Business

- i. High School MOU (Dual Enrollment) Review – M. McMahon
Due to time constraints, McMahon tabled the item for the next meeting.
- ii. Board Policy Revisions at District Governance Council (DGC) – M. McMahon
Due to time constraints, McMahon tabled the item for the next meeting.

F. Senate Reports

- i. Adjunct – J. Librande and D. Gutowski had no report.
- ii. Treasurer – J. Thompson (no report).
- iii. President’s Report – M. McMahon had no report.
- iv. Vice President – L. Murphy had no report.

G. Announcements

- a) McMahon reminded faculty to consider donating items for the “Invest in Success” silent auction.
- b) Please Support the Miramar Foundation in its effort to raise money for Student Scholarships—for example, payroll deductions, as indicated in Marty Walsh’s email to the campus last week.
- c) Attendance at commencement was promoted and accolades were dispensed to faculty who participated in the student awards ceremony.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:06pm. The next meeting will be on May 2nd. Please submit agenda items to both Marie McMahon and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Kjartanson and Juli Bartolomei