

**Minutes**  
**Miramar College Academic Senate**  
Location: M-108  
December 04, 2012 3:30-5:00pm

**Senators Present:** Daphne Figueroa, Buran Haidar, Gina Bochicchio, Erica Murrietta, Mark Manasse, Lawrence Hahn, Peter Elias, Francois Bereaud, Isabella Feldman, Rich Halliday, Mark Hertica, Jeff Higginbotham, April Koch, Andrew Lowe, Eric Mosier, Wheeler North, Sandra Slivka, Dan Willkie, Ana Bravo, Frederica Carr

**Other Attendees:** Jerry Buckley (VPI), Laura Murphy, Patricia Flower, Salley Deaton, Paulette Hopkins, Marie McMahon, Juli Bartolomei

**Absent:** Joan Thompson (proxy: E. Murrietta), Clara Blenis (proxy: R. Halliday), Sean Bowers, Dawn Burgess (proxy: P. Elias), Otto Dobre, Naomi Grisham, Jordan Omens, Angela Romero, Nam Sinkaset (proxy: G. Bochicchio), Dan Gutowski, Ric Matthews

Meeting called to order at 3:38pm.

**A. Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes**

The agenda was approved with a re-ordering to allow Laura Murphy and Salley Deaton to go first with item Eii – Options for Process Management Software for SLOAC, Program Review, Integrated Planning & Accreditation. The previous minutes were approved unchanged.

**B. Senate Reports**

- i. Treasurer – Erica Murrietta reported a balance of \$1120.62, with 49 faculty members having contributed. This allows \$400 for the BBQ and \$600 for scholarships with a comfortable margin.
- ii. President's Report – Daphne reported on:
  - i) Holiday BBQ this Thursday, 12/6/12, 11:30am to 1pm, A-100 patio location. For side dish/donations, email Joyce, Terrie or Shaunna.
  - ii) Committee vacancies: Student Services Committee needs one instructional faculty and the Curriculum Committee needs one MBEPS faculty. In addition, the Academic Senate needs 2 adjunct faculty senators.
- iii. President-Elect – No report

**C. Special Reports**

- i. None

**D. Committee Reports/Information**

- i. None

**E. New Business**

- i. Resolution in Support of Amending Waiting Period to Retake Assessment/Placement Exam (First Reading) – Daphne explained that the current waiting period before retaking the assessment/placement exam is 3 years. Students are often not aware that they can re-take the online test if they originally took the paper test and vice-versa. The Basic Skills Subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee has brought forward a proposal to reduce the waiting period to one year. We need the support of our sister campuses for this to be possible, as it a district-wide process. Several senators brought up the cost of administering the test, which drove the 3-year waiting period. Isabella, a counselor, pointed out that our goal was to get students to finish in 2-3 years, so a 3-year wait doesn't make sense. Mark Manasse explained that, in order to limit the amount of time a student has to spend at the community college, we are using a multi-pronged approach, which includes making study materials available on the school's website, etc. An admittedly optimistic goal is to have this happen by next fall. This item will be brought back for a second reading at the first February Academic Senate meeting.
- ii. Options for Process Management Software for SLOAC, Program Review, Integrated Planning & Accreditation – Laura Murphy, Miramar College SLOAC Facilitator, and Salley Deaton, City College Business Faculty. Laura Murphy introduced Taskstream – accountability management software for our reporting requirements, including, but not limited to, SLOs and other objectives, program review and accreditation. The limitations of our current system include the following:
  - i) It does not allow for dialogue about SLOs beyond the course level, which is a necessary component for improvement in teaching and learning to occur.
  - ii) It does not provide comprehensive curriculum mapping, i.e. how course objectives support program objectives and how program objectives support institutional objectives.
  - iii) It does not have the capability to include and integrate other reporting requirements, such as program review and accreditation.
  - iv) It leads to redundancy in reporting.

It was decided that we needed a commercial software system to resolve the problem. Laura was tasked with researching alternate management systems. Of four identified systems, Taskstream seems to be the most cost-efficient for our school, and our sister campuses are using it. It provides benefits such as:

- i) Enhanced SLO management
- ii) Curriculum Mapping
- iii) The capacity to customize program reviews with auto-populated data
- iv) Templates for recurring reports such as accreditation
- v) Committee workspace management (minutes, agendas, etc.)
- vi) Multitier access at appropriate levels
- vii) Capability to generate surveys
- viii) Single repository for all processes that is integrated, transparent and provides institutional memory.

We will have a “Sandbox”, which is a try-out period, starting next week. The user can look but cannot change anything.

At this juncture, Laura introduced Salley Deaton, from City College. Salley is a very enthusiastic proponent of Taskstream and gave many examples of how it is used at her institution. Examples included:

- i) Program SLOs Assessment Cycle (already included in Taskstream). This gives a visual picture of how course SLOs support the program SLOs and how each program SLO supports Institutional Student Learning Competencies, institutional priorities and the school mission.
- ii) Separate forms for Departmental Program Review, which can be added to the Departmental Academic and Master Plans
- iii) IT planning form
- iv) WASC report template
- v) Documentation of what happens at committees
- vi) Appendix, with a section for adding attachments, and much, much more.

Wheeler asked if Taskstream can show that the planning on one end drives decision-making on the other end. Salley says that, functionality-wise, Taskstream can handle it but, in the end, it depends upon the support of the stakeholders. Laura noted that customizing Taskstream for our needs was very important. This does not have to be done “up front”; we can have Taskstream support staff work with our users to customize the program as we go along. There is a cost for Taskstream and for its customization. Yearly fee is \$10,000, which includes support and customization. This fee is valid for as long as the current contract with the District is operational. The original startup fee was \$135,000 for 5 years for the two districts. It is not known what costs will be when that contract expires. Freddie asked if Taskstream had created any cost savings at City, and could one say that it had paid for itself? Salley responded positively, due to the wealth of information now easily available for learning objectives planning, grant-writing and, most importantly, accreditation. Jeff asked how Mesa compares to City. The response was that Mesa did not originally customize and is only now in that process, so there isn't much similarity. Daphne asked Jerry Buckley if President Hsieh has identified a funding source. There is money available, and it may be possible for the District to pay for it. Would this mean that all three schools would have to do everything the same? Daphne said that, since we are accredited as separate institutions, we don't have to worry about that issue.

The President wants us to make a decision before the end of the semester. Sandy made a motion to provisionally recommend going ahead with the purchase/implementation of Taskstream. If we find out anything negative in the meantime, we can revisit the issue. Buran seconded the motion, and it was approved.

- ii. Recommendation for 0.20 FTEF Senate Reassigned Time – Daphne stated that the Academic Senate has 1.0 of FTEF for reassigned time. 0.2 FTEF from that is used for the Environmental Task Force Coordinator, presently Laura Gonzalez. Laura has indicated that it is no longer necessary, and she will be on sabbatical in Spring 2013. The Academic Senate Executive Committee suggests we use the 0.2 to pay for half of the Basic Skills Coordinator reassigned time. Currently, 100% of the 0.4 FTEF is paid for by the Basic Skills grant funding. Making this change would show that the Academic Senate considers this to be an important position, plus it opens up Basic Skills grant funding for other uses, such as tutoring. Wheeler made the motion, it was seconded and approved.
- iii. Grant Review Process – Daphne explained that Mesa created a resolution concerning the grant review process. All of the college and Continuing Education Academic Senates endorsed the concept of this resolution. Jerry Buckley described the current grant review process here at Miramar. It was pointed out that Miramar brings in more grant money than any other campus. Daphne and the other Academic Senate Presidents have expressed concern because campus processes have no input from the Academic Senate. The Chancellor asked each college President to review their process, which was done at CEC. After Jerry's explanation of our existing administrative process, he stated that, in his opinion, what we don't want is to start a new process that overlays the existing process, because often time is of the essence. After his presentation, the floor was opened for questions.

Wheeler expressed concern about long term obligations that remain after the grant expires. Sandy pointed out that, if the grant process becomes even more complex, nobody will write a grant. Daphne says this discussion will help faculty know and understand the grant process and become more aware so, perhaps, they can go out for funding. Although the District has a great handbook and a lot of info on the website – so the information is available – there needs to be more training in this area. Buran pointed out that the faculty, as a body, needs to be more aware of the process.

Other concerns were about increased workloads of faculty and staff and possible curriculum changes. Jerry said that the Deans and VPs tried to establish goals of our faculty based on program review, so the district grants office can send us only the ones that are of interest. The discussion on this topic will be continued.

**B. Old Business**

- i. Revision of Textbook Adoption & Procurement Policy – Mark Hertica, the district committee representative on textbook affordability, was not here, but Daphne said that there has been some concern about faculty getting incentives for textbook adoption. A discussion ensued about whether desk copies are considered an incentive. Since Mark was not there to clarify, the discussion was postponed.
- ii. Technical Assistance Visit and/or Other Alternatives – The Chancellor has decided to take over this idea and is working with the State Academic Senate to prepare something for the entire district, albeit with a different name.

**C. Announcements**

- i. Faculty BBQ: This Thursday from 11:30am-1pm at the A100 patio.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 pm. The next meeting will be on February 5<sup>th</sup>. Please submit agenda items by 01/30/13.

Respectfully submitted,

Gina Bochicchio and Juli Bartolomei