

Minutes
Miramar College Academic Senate
Location: H-105
February 05, 2013 3:30-5:00pm

Senators Present: Daphne Figueroa, Buran Haidar, Gina Bochicchio, Erica Murrietta, Joan Thompson, Mark Manasse, Lawrence Hahn, Peter Elias, Clara Blenis, Rebecca Bowers-Gentry, Otto Dobre, Isabella Feldman, Rich Halliday, Mark Hertica, Jeff Higginbotham, April Koch, Andrew Lowe, Wheeler North, Jordan Omens, Angela Romero, Wayne Sherman, Frederica Carr, Kathy Pickham

Other Attendees: Duane Short, Nina Jacobs, Jerry Buckley (VPI), Gene Choe, Juli Bartolomei

Absent: Sean Bowers, Dawn Burgess (proxy: P. Elias), Naomi Grisham (proxy: I. Feldman), Eric Mosier, Dan Willkie (proxy: G. Choe)

Meeting called to order at 3:35pm.

A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes

The agenda was approved, without changes. Approval of the minutes was postponed until 2/19, as there were some edits that had not yet been incorporated.

B. Senate Reports

- i. Treasurer – Erica Murrietta reported a balance of \$804.82. Expenditures include \$313.80 for the holiday BBQ and \$25 for petty cash. Setting aside \$600 for scholarships, that leaves a carry-over of over \$200. Daphne mentioned the need for volunteers for scholarship review and said, while it is typically Senate Exec members, any senator is welcome to participate.
- ii. President's Report – Daphne reported on the following:
 - i) Academic Senate Scholarship Review Board: 3 members of the Academic Senate Executive Committee have volunteered for this important activity and all voting members of the Academic Senate are encouraged to join in and participate.
 - ii) Committee/subcommittee vacancies include 1 MPEPS faculty and one non-teaching faculty for the Curriculum Committee, 1 faculty member for the Diversity and International Education Committee, 1 instructional faculty for the Student Services Committee and 4 vacancies for adjunct senators.
 - iii) The Board of Trustees site meeting is February 14th. The open door session begins at 3:30pm in L-108 and the site presentation will start at 4:00pm in L-105.
 - iv) ASCCC Academy is presenting a STEM Institute on Feb 22nd-23rd at the Paradise Point Resort in San Diego. All interested faculty are encouraged to register and attend.
 - v) The Academic Senate Election Meeting will be held on March 19th.
 - vi) A college-wide retreat will be held on Friday, March 22nd.
- iii. President-Elect – No report.

C. Special Reports – None

D. Committee Reports/Information

- i. BRDS/PIEC Prioritization of RFF's – Buran presented the prioritized list of equipment requests and explained how the requests were prioritized. The funds used were in the unrestricted category, as the college is saving IELM funding, which is restricted, for emergencies. The list now needs to go to all the constituencies for approval. All requisitions must be sent out by March 15th. The motion to approve the prioritized list was approved.
- ii. CGC Recommendations & Handbook Changes – Buran presented the three recommendations listed below. The motion to pass these, along for further study, was approved.
 - i) Institutionalizing and documenting review processes for services and areas not currently part of the existing program review process, such as the Office of Instructional Services and School Administrative Services.
 - ii) The formation of a campus-wide Program Review Task Force or work group (including the new SLO Facilitator) to meet periodically to merge and better interface the program review processes in all areas.
 - iii) Institutionalizing a staff development activity about participatory governance open for all constituencies to attend and having the President's Convocation held on that day.

Daphne presented a list of recommended committee changes, including the Technology Committee (membership changes), Basic Skills Subcommittee (membership changes), Research Subcommittee (updated goals and procedures and membership changes), and Website Subcommittee (changes in wording and terminology). All were approved.

- iii. Faculty Hiring Committee Prioritized Hiring List – Daphne presented the prioritized faculty hiring list for 2012. She explained that this was done every year, regardless of whether or not we have funding for hiring. Math is number 1 on the list. Daphne pointed out that the Hiring Committee is aware that improving the process is very necessary, especially vis a vis non-instructional faculty, such as counselors and librarians. Jerry Buckley said that he is investigating how the SDICCCA colleges do their hiring and will present that to the Hiring Committee at their next meeting. A lively discussion ensued. Comments included the following:
- i) The faculty hiring prioritization process still has not yet been integrated into the Program Review and Strategic Planning processes.
 - ii) One of the ranking criteria is the rank on the previous year's list. This penalizes the ranking of replacement hires, as they were unlikely to have been on a previous list.
 - iii) Candidate faculty hires that had been withdrawn from the running by their departments were ranked higher than active prospects.
 - iv) There are no criteria that take into account external demands which may drive hiring needs, such as the Student Success Task Force.
 - v) The Academic Senate as a whole has not seen the process used to create the list and has had no opportunity to add its input. In response to this, it was pointed out that the Academic Senate is represented on the Faculty Hiring Committee by the Senate Executive Committee members.

Mark Manasse made a motion to approve the list as is with the understanding that the Hiring Committee work on improving the ranking rubric. Sandy Slivka seconded the motion. Others protested and said that we should send the list back to the Hiring Committee for revision. Buran Haidar put forward a friendly amendment to approve only the math position as number one, independent of the rest of the list. Many people in the room indicated their approval of this idea. Mark, the originator of the motion, approved the friendly amendment. Sandy, who seconded the original motion, did not approve, so the amendment was not adopted. The original motion was then voted on with a show of hands. The vote was 12 in favor and 10 against, so the motion was approved.

- iv. PIEC Proposed Changes to Mission, Vision & Values – This was a first reading of this item. Buran explained that, according to our accreditation requirements, we agreed to periodically review our Mission Statement. The campus has agreed to do so every three years. In addition, this year, the PIEC recommended also reviewing and revising the corresponding Vision and Values statements. This version was recommended by the PIEC. One big change is that the new mission statement no longer includes “lifelong learning”, as the emphasis on this part of our mission has been greatly reduced at the state level. The proposed new mission statement is more concise, but much of the verbiage that was deleted from the previous mission statement was included in one of the revised values statements. There were 3 alternate versions of these statements, with which PIEC worked to make their final recommendation. These will be sent out to all, per request at CEC, but since PIEC recommended the version shown, it will be the one voted upon by all constituencies. Finally, Buran showed us the core institutional student learning outcomes for the college. PIEC has recommended that these be included in the catalog on the same page as the Mission, Vision and Values.

E. New Business

- i. C-ID Articulation Procedure – Duane Short discussed the newest chapter in the SB-1440/C-ID drama. SB 1440 is the state law that mandates development of Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). These are degrees that, upon completion, provide admission benefits into the CSU system. ADTs define the courses within them by Course Identification (C-ID) numbers, a supra-numbering system standardized by the state. These C-ID numbers have descriptors, which outline the course content, outcomes and requisites. Once one of our courses receives a C-ID number from the C-ID system, all three campuses are obliged to accept any course with that C-ID number as equivalent. This is different from our present articulation process in 2 ways: 1) Course articulation will no longer be a unilateral process, since we must now accept any course with a C-ID, and 2) Course articulation involves our sister campuses, since our courses have a common course outline of record.

As part of the ongoing SB-1440 process, we are now required to prove that the courses that compose our ADTs match the C-ID descriptors. Therefore, we will have to send any courses in the ADTs through the system to obtain a C-ID. The sticking part is, once we do that, we obligate Mesa and City to accept that course from all other institutions having that C-ID number. CIC (District Curriculum Committee) has developed a process that will hopefully resolve the issue. Duane is presenting the process so that the Miramar Academic Senate can approve the process.

Once an ADT from our college is approved by the CRC (District Curriculum Review Committee) and CIC, the articulation officers (AOs) are obliged to submit the courses through the C-ID system where there are 3 possible outcomes: 1) Approved – the course receives a C-ID designation, 2) Conditionally Approved – course is conditionally approved for the requested C-ID designation, but is missing some important elements; discipline faculty, curriculum committees and AOs work together to make the requested changes and resubmit within the year, 3) Not Approved – the submitted course is not approved for C-ID designation; it was found to have significant fundamental variations

from the C-ID descriptor. The colleges have one year to complete one of the following actions: resubmit the course with the requested major modifications, remove the course from the ADT(s), or deactivate the ADT(s) in which the course is included. At this point, the AOs from the 3 campuses will gather input from the discipline faculty of the respective colleges and work together to determine the best course of action. If the three campuses cannot reach concurrence, CIC will make the final decision.

At this juncture, this process will only occur for courses that already are included within an ADT.

After a brief discussion, it was moved to approve the implementation of this process and the motion was passed.

F. Old Business

- i. Resolution in Support of Amending Waiting Period to Retake Assessment/Placement Exam (Second Reading) – This resolution was introduced by Mark Manasse at the last meeting. This would change the waiting period for the assessment test from 3 years to 1 year. It was motioned and seconded to approve the resolution and the motion was passed.

G. Announcements – None

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 pm. The next meeting will be on February 19th. Please submit agenda items by 02/13/13.

Respectfully submitted,

Gina Bochicchio and Juli Bartolomei