Present: Randy Barnes; George Beitey; David Buser; Peter Elias (Proxy for Dawn Burgess); Daphne Figueroa; Bob Fritsch; Sheryl Gobble; Lawrence Hahn; Mary Hart; Paulette Hopkins; Adela Jacobson; Mark Manasse; Marie McMahon; David Navarro (CC); Lynne Ornelas; Rod Porter; Susan Schwarz; Katinea Todd; Alan Viersen; Kirk Webley (proxy for David Navarro, ASE); Harvey Wilensky; Dan Willkie; Linda Woods.
Guest: Greg Newhouse.
I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m. by Randy Barnes.
II. Approval of Agenda: It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the meeting agenda of October 6, 2011.
III. Approval of Minutes: It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the Minutes of September 1, 2011.

## IV. Old Business: None.

## V. New Business:

A. Current Faculty Hiring Ranking. R. Barnes showed the ranking list from last school year which had Business and Math at the top of the list, and said there was a suggestion to approve last year's list for this year. L. Woods added that if this was done it would allow time to work through the criteria and the policy and not have to rush for the ranking. According to the timeline, the committee must decide today on the criteria and proposal changes. In response to a question from S. Schwarz, L. Woods clarified that the ranking list is shown is for the 2011-12 year, and was created by this committee in the 2010-11 school year. D. Willkie moved to leave the ranking list the way it is so we can fix everything else. The motion was seconded by M. McMahon and B. Fritsch.

Discussion ensued and D. Willkie pointed out that no one is being hired this year. He asked whether it would be worth all the work or should we live with what we did last year, and next year move forward from there? R. Barnes said that sometimes it's easier to set criteria when there is no money on the table to affect the decision that you're going to make and
sometimes agreement comes easier. M. Hart disagreed and said she thought it could be even more important then. R. Barnes asked for more discussion, and receiving none, called for a vote on the motion. D.
Figueroa asked to have the motion restated. D. Willkie asked to leave the ranking list for this year as it was for last year so we won't add any more rankings because no one will be hired and we know and agreed that the top three last year were Business and Math and they're still at the top and we know that whatever is done they'll most likely stay there, so it will allow us to fix the hiring shortfall this year and concentrate on that so that next year we can actually implement the new system. In response to a question from B. Haidar, R. Barnes clarified that the motion is basically that for next year we approve the list that's been approved for this year.
P. Elias said that if a department's new needs are not being represented, such as Child Development, there may be some serious consequences to that department, and then he would have to say no - he'd rather have the opportunity for a new ranking.
L. Woods pointed out Clause \#3 in the Faculty Hiring Policy so that everybody was aware of it, which says that "each school can alter any position from one discipline within the school to replace or new hire." She interprets that to mean that within a school you can swap around positions. D. Figueroa said she remembered that happening once where Business had a vacancy, decided it didn't need that position and agreed to give it over to Math or somebody else in the same school. It was mentioned that Business could give its position to Child Development since they're now in the same school, although that would necessarily be a point for discussion within the school itself. R. Porter said that that matter was not related to the motion on the floor, and L. Woods said she only wanted to be sure that everyone was aware of that policy in the procedure.

Discussion concluded. The seconds to the motion were repeated and a vote was taken. the motion was carried to adopt for this upcoming year the same ranking list approved last year. There were two "No" votes.

## B. Task Force Recommendations.

## 1. Schedule and Procedures for 2011-12 academic year

(Governance Handbook Page). The procedure and the calendar will still remain the same with the understanding that we are currently working on procedure that we will use for the 2012-13 academic year.
2. Criteria. Certain criteria are pre-filled by the Vice President of Instruction (VPI), the area dean, the area chair and the Chair of Chairs from information obtained from the VPI office. Discussion followed re whether to use the pre-fills on the criteria form, and/or how to determine the pre-fills, and the purpose of the presentations if they're to be used. The task force/work group (L. Woods, R. Porter, D. Figueroa, D. Navarro) will take the comments from this meeting, make some modifications and proposed adjustments to the criteria form, and bring this issue back to the next meeting for discussion.

## C. Things to consider - from September 1, 2011 , meeting.

## 1. Instructors on sabbatical or with release time assignments should be included when calculating full-time/part-time ratios. Pro rata assignments are defined by the union as part-time.

The ratio is determined by dividing the full-time working hours by the total FTEF. D. Figueroa said that Miramar College is not in violation of any state laws, even though the college ratio is not actually $75 / 25$, which was actually an ideal. It's up to our college to decide whether to count overload as full-time or part-time FTEF. Our goal is to strengthen our programs.

The issue of where to apply pro rata time is ambiguous. The union considers pro rata instructors to be part-time instructors; R. Porter thought that contract, pro rata and overload time should be considered full-time rather than adjunct/part-time. B. Fritsch recalled that traditionally it was that if five classes were taught by an adjunct instructor, it should equal one full-time instructor. R. Porter said that the task force will address this issue again and will bring its recommendations back to the committee on how to calculate that ratio.
2. Proposed positions should be by discipline. This was a suggestion made by D. Short during the spring 2011 semester. Discussed was whether we hire by state-mandated minimum qualifications or by discipline. After discussion, R. Porter agreed to talk further with D. Short regarding what the disciplines are and will bring the issue back to the committee.

# 3. Proxy for "dual-members." There are currently two committee members (D. Buser and D. Navarro) who are "dual-members" -- that is, they each have a vote as a department chair and a second vote as a member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee. It was suggested that if a proxy from a member's own department was used, it would give an unfair advantage to that department in the voting on ranking. It was suggested that the proxy be from a different department. It was clarified that this only applies to voting on the ranking. 

VI. Presentations: None.
VII. Information:
A. Summer Degrees Conferred. D. Figueroa said that 35 degrees were conferred by the District during summer 2011 wherein requirements for Health, Physical Education and/or Multicultural Studies were waived for graduation without notice to, or input from, the individual campuses and faculty. The Vice Chancellor of Student Services has apologized for the lack of notice and campus input and has assured that it will not happen again. D. Figueroa will discuss this at the next Academic Senate meeting and with the Academic Senate chairs at the Mesa and City campuses.
B. Instructional Division Plan. R. Barnes is currently preparing the Instructional Division Plan, and he invited committee members to serve on a working group to offer input and assist in preparation of the plan. He said that he would communicate with volunteers primarily by email so as not to add more meetings to their already-crowded schedules.
VIII. Reports: None.
IX. Other: None.
X. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Next Meeting: November 3, 201 1, 2:00-4:00 p.m., Rm. M-108.

