



ACADEMIC • SENATE

Minutes

Thursday, February 22nd, 2024

2:00 – 3:45 p.m.

Present: Manuel Mancillas-Gómez, Karen Marrujo, Hanaa Alkassas, Lindy Brazil, Dan Curtis, Jane Gazale, Rita Ghazala, Moriah Gonzalez-Meeks, Karla Gutierrez, Rachel Jacob-Almeida, Raad Jerjis, Jonathan Martin, Joan Rettinger, Miriam Simpson, Jennifer Tomaschke, Asma Yassi

Absent: Lindy Brazil, Camille Jack, Rachelle Panganiban

Other:

Recorder: Aiden Lovewell

The Senate minutes are recorded and published in summary form. Readers of these minutes must understand that recorded comments in these minutes do not represent the official position of the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate expresses its official positions only through votes noted under "Action." In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act guidelines, Senators voting "nay" or abstaining will be identified. All other present members will be assumed to have voted "aye."

I. Call to Order/Introductions: Manuel Mancillas-Gómez, Academic Senate President, called the meeting to order at 2:00pm. The visitors then introduced themselves. Jessica Robinson, the Cuyamaca College President, Nicole Salgado, the Cuyamaca VP of Administrative Services, Josh Franco, and Desiree Klaar all attended as guests.

II. Approval of Minutes: February 8th, 2024 – Senate reviewed the minutes from February 8th, 2024. Senate to approve minutes. **Motion/Second:** Rachel Jacob-Almeida/Rita Ghazala. **Nays:** None. **Abstentions:** Dan Curtis. **Motion Passes.**

III. Announcements –

A. Academic Senate Election Coordinator:

The Senate discussed the academic senate election coordinator position. A call-out will be sent later today. All nominations will go through the coordinator and then Katie Cabral will conduct the voting.

B. Call-out for David Lizarraga proxy as part-time senator of instruction:

The Senate discussed the call-out for a proxy for the part-time senator of instruction position. As of now this position is still vacant. AUTO, OH, and Environmental Health also have vacancies that need to be filled so call-outs will be sent out for all of these later today.

IV. Action – None

V. Information (First readings and updates for future action) –

A. Budget Report:

Tabled until the next meeting.

B. “F” Instructional “A”/Admin services Buildings:

Jessica Robinson and Nicole Salgado gave context to the progress and development of the F and A-buildings. 10-12 years ago a plan was developed to have a new F-building funded through matched state funds and would be built in the parking lot across from B-building. This new F-building would still house the VPI suite and would primarily be used for instruction. The remaining faculty from the old F-building would be assimilated into a newly revitalized A-building. The data center that is currently housed in the F-building, which includes servers and IT equipment, would be moved to the H-building. This move would include costs of new fiber optics and rewiring of the entire system. This data center move was originally estimated to cost around \$300,000. Unfortunately, due to several factors including the pandemic, costs are different now. This data center move is now estimated at \$5.8 million. The second factor is that Cuyamaca College is not going out for a bond this year due to analysis that a bond would not be viable based on proactive research. Cuyamaca will not be receiving as much state matched funds as originally thought with the exact amount currently unknown and there are other district concerns around the district buildings. This whole situation puts Cuyamaca in a dilemma where if we move forward as originally planned, it will put the college in a position where we would be spending more than we have. On the other hand, if we just leave things as is then we will have our part of the matched money back but if we don't accept state money it looks poorly on the college. Our goal is to continue with the building of the new F-building but this puts into question what will happen with the revitalized A-building. The board president expressed a great need for both colleges to re-look at their facilities based on how many classes are being taught online as we are over 50% completely online and over 50% of students taking at least one class online. There is a difference in opinions around if we have too much or not enough space as well concern over the age of some of our facilities. The current plan is to have a space-use analysis which means that we would bring a 3rd party in to look at our spaces including instructional, lab, office, storage spaces, etc. to see if are they being used as intended as well as how efficiently the space is being used. This analysis would also look at our projected growth as a college, which Grossmont has done already. The process would include bringing the 3rd party in and having focus groups with 2 months to do this work, then a report will be produced showing where we are, where we're going, and what we need. There has been a temporary pause on the A-building so we can properly plan for this project and not waste money and resources on a paused project. Both Jessica Robinson and Nicole Salgado have assure the Academic Senate that while there isn't time today to address all questions and concerns over this issue, they will be returning to Academic Senate to continue the discussion and properly address all questions.

Manuel expressed concerns over costs for this assessment, specifically the project management costs as well as concerns around the comments from the board regarding questioning the need for new buildings with so many online students. There is always unforeseen concerns with instructional building projects like the issues with the lifts in the automotive department and a lot of these projects have overrun (additional scope of service) costs, and this was an issue with the G building with approximately \$3.4mil in overrun, and with OH with approximately \$2mil in overrun costs. Manuel expressed strong concerns over the project management aspect of these projects being run improperly.

Moriah gave some context to the F and A building project and expressed that the Academic Senate should be asking to follow up with questions next time when President Robinson and Nicole Salgado return to speak more on this issue.

Joan Rettinger noted that the current facilities system isn't sustainable for even minimal growth.

Josh Franco noted that the board has project proposals that we can investigate and that we shouldn't be afraid of capital projects or be afraid of asking questions. The district needs to be held accountable for the way that these funds and data are processed and assessed. Being informed is essential.

Karen Marrujo noted that there was a promise to be more transparent around budget issues and it doesn't feel like that promise is being taken seriously if leadership cannot or will not create enough of a space for us to have constructive dialogue around this. Karen noted that the senate should consider a resolution on reaffirming the value of in-person classes, equity in class caps, shared governance, etc. as these are the things that we know we need to service students as best as possible.

Moriah noted that this becomes a cycle of needing to grow enrollment through these avenues like in-person classes, then leadership doesn't invest in the needs to facilitate these in-person classes, then we don't build enrollment, and the cycle continues.

Miriam Simpson noted that the space assessment should have feedback from the senate and that the senate should look at other colleges and the law then create a document around what the faculty needs for these spaces.

The senate expressed the feeling that the district does not trust faculty to tell the district what they need from them.

C. Advocacy Workshop:

Desiree Krupenkin, a student and ASG Vice President at Cuyamaca College, presented the current staff situation at the Together We Rise Center and the results of the Advocacy Workshop held at the center with faculty and students. She explained that there are two community liaisons that are being told by HR over email that they are, and have been, getting overpaid for their work and will need to repay the difference between how much they have been making and how much they should have been making the past few months. This would affect the students in multiple areas of the college as these community liaisons are essential in several areas of the college including the Queer Center and Together We Rise Center. The reductions in pay schedule include Natalia Sigala going from a 37 to a 27 and having \$6,000 in overpay and Joseline Pichardo going from a 31 to a 21 and having \$4,000 in overpay. There was a meeting with students on Tuesday with students deciding to do an email campaign towards the Chancellor and it has proven effective. The senate brainstormed what kind of response they deemed necessary and what would be appropriate. The conclusion was to produce a letter of no-confidence in Linda Beam.

Raquel asked if there was any movement on this issue at all. Manuel noted that there is fear of retaliation.

Karen noted that the appropriate paperwork and processes were followed and were approved. Three months later this has become an issue only after the supervisor (Jesus Miranda) of these

two community liaisons left. The two liaisons shared that the way that Linda Beam talked to them was not professional or appropriate.

Raquel asked if there could be repercussions to the students if we did a letter of no confidence.

Moriah noted that these two employees are at-will employees which makes them vulnerable in this situation. She also noted that it is upsetting that former students could be put into this position. The salary placement aspect of this is another issue. The community liaisons advocated for a higher salary schedule and received it, then when their supervisors left they were told that they should not have been placed that high and then are being asked to repay money and take a pay cut.

Josh Franco asked why the vice chancellor of HR would go after the least protected staff for \$10,000. It signals that priorities are not where they should be. A vote of no confidence is at least a signal that what they're prioritizing is being seen.

Karen asked what the logistics of creating a vote of no confidence entail and if we should join with Grossmont on this? Manuel said that Grossmont is on board and it would be a resolution.

The senate noted that student perspective should be included in the resolution.

D. Teaching and Learning Coordinator:
Tabled.

E. Learning-Aligned Employment Program LAEP:
Tabled. Asked Charlene Alsbaugh to come to the meeting who was told not to come by the Dean. The senate asked if we could have the Dean come to explain instead.

VI. President's Report –

A. Camera Placement Update:
Tabled

B. Faculty Evaluation Workgroup:
Manuel noted that meetings will be starting soon and to stay tuned.

C. Retention and Persistence Part 2 of IEPI Strategic Enrollment Plan:
The district received a \$200,000 grant from IEPI to develop Part 1: Budget Transparency and Part 2: Retention and Persistence. The IEPI peer review team will come for their 3rd visit on February 29th, from 1pm to 2pm in I-209.

VII. Vice President Report –

Karen Marrujo gave her Vice Presidents report. Several people were appointed. 1 to hiring committee, and several to other committees. The full VP report is available on the Academic Senate website.

VIII. Part-Time Officer-at-Large Report –

None.

IX. Committee Report – None

Jane Gazale discussed the upcoming March 2024 Curriculum Board packet. The committee was not able to vote on these items because the deadline was pushed from January 24th to February 2nd. Because of the extensions, curriculum had to discuss some of the items and approve them in one session. Asking Academic Senate to suspend the rules to vote these through now so these items can make it into the 24-25 catalog.

Vote to suspend rules. **Motion/Second:** Karen Marrujo/Asma Yassi. **Nays:** None. **Abstentions:** None. **Motion Passes.**

Vote to approve March 2024 curriculum board packet items. **Motion/Second:** Moriah Gonzalez-Meeks/Jonathan Martin. **Nays:** None. **Abstentions:** None. **Motion Passes.**

X. Public Comments – None

Adjourned at 3:45pm