

COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, February 9, 2016 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

Members: Hsieh, Bell, Hopkins, Ramsey, McMahon, Arancibia, Hubbard, Allen, & Light

Attendees: Ornelas, Jacobson, Ascione (absent), Irvin, & Miramontez

McMahon called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

A. Approval of the Agenda

Motion to approve made by Hsieh, seconded by Bell, and approved by all.

B. Approval of Previous Minutes

Motion to approve February 2, 2016 minutes made by Bell, seconded by Hsieh, and approved by all.

C. Guests/Introductions

McMahon welcomed Arancibia, and introduced Laura Murphy and Briele Warren (for Steve Quis).

D. Updates from the Chancellor's Cabinet

Hsieh reported on enrollment and presented an attachment from the Chancellor's Cabinet meeting. She highlighted how all of the colleges increased their course offerings, but that not all of the colleges and CE increased FTES across the board. Miramar College is in the positive, but it is not enough to bring the whole District up. The District goal is 1% above its base. Miramar met the growth target allocated by the State, but if there is leftover money the District will not be eligible to utilize it.

Because not all of the colleges are growing even after the added sessions, the Chancellor's Cabinet had increased discussions on the topic. Hsieh showed the Enrollment Analysis Highlights attachment, and noted that she needed information from Hopkins regarding the ADJU course (only offered by Miramar). The graph on the attachment alerts the colleges to take a close look at where they are at in terms of the big picture. Hsieh commented that the Music and Spanish courses have negative growth District-wide. The Chancellor had said to look at program adjustment after Mesa expressed an interest in moving some of their programs to other colleges. Hsieh said that she needed to get a better picture of the programs at Miramar so that the College could be prepared with good responses should any questions be raised. Hsieh also mentioned that she would scan this particular attachment and send to the CEC members.

Murphy asked if another college could tell Miramar to offer a new program. Hsieh responded that the current interest is regarding moving an existing program, not establishing a new program, and this is why Miramar needs to be prepared. Hsieh stressed that she wants to rely on the Deans, and Vice Presidents to discuss the topic with their faculty and give Hsieh the best advice and input to bring forward. Arancibia asked if they could receive a desegregated version of the attachment. Hsieh said they did not have one from the District, but that the College's research office could provide the information. Hopkins also said that the information could be access in the G-Drive data.

Arancibia raised a concern that such an approach of isolating programs to specific colleges could eventually result in the formation of a school for liberal arts, a separate school for transferring, etc. Hsieh replied that the focus of Miramar's discussion should be on analyzing the data provided instead of program adjustment.

Ornelas asked if the courses listed on the attachment were also offered at other colleges. Hsieh said that the only one exclusive to Miramar was ADJU. Hopkins asked for the definition of enrollment in terms of the attachment, and Hsieh said that she would send attachment to the CEC members for digesting. Hsieh asked Miramontez to send Warren information to send out to the CEC as well.

Hsieh mentioned that the Chancellor wanted to bring up online courses from 11% to 15%, and Hsieh had commented that Miramar's newly added courses in spring 2016 were not necessarily online-centered (such as the sciences). The College does have a vision for it, but Hsieh needed help from the faculty and Department Chairs to find out what courses they want to and could offer online. Hsieh asked the Vice Presidents and Deans to please review their own area data, and Hsieh will send the information to Vice Chancellor Neault.

Hubbard noted that while it was wonderful that the College is growing, they are not increasing in staff support, and that the people who are currently there are swamped. Hsieh said that all of the constituency leaders have advocated for it at the District Governance Council, and that it has not happened. McMahon said that she agreed that the staff were overburdened, and that District-wide the campuses are not even restored to what they used to have. Hsieh said that unfortunately, the CEC was not the forum where a decision could be made. She asked the constituency leaders to continue to bring the concern to the District's attention.

Hsieh then presented the Spring 2017 Accreditation Preparation & Visit Timeline. She noted that the Miramar timeline is based on the District timeline, and she drew to everyone's attention the "Report on Institutional Set Standards to the Board of Trustees" section, with a due date of April. Hsieh communicated that the decision on this topic was to make a presentation to the Board, and now it has been changed to April 14th. Also, the status report to DGC is currently for the week of April 11th, or may even be May. The status report to the Board of Trustees is May 12th, and it very likely will be Hsieh along with the Steering Committee and other colleges to make the report to Board. The Board will approve/accept it on December 10th. One college indicated they would not be ready, but for now they are looking at the December 10th date.

Hsieh then presented the College Promise Planning attachment. She explained that it is a semi-final draft that will go to the Board, and the label will be "SDCCD College Promise Program Framework." The pilot component numbers had been reduced due to funding situations, and Hsieh noted that she would scan the document and send it to the CEC. The numbers were determined from each college's enrollment off of San Diego Unified School District graduates. They will stick to the criteria that they will only award to students coming from SDUSD and students from outside SDUSD enrolled in special programs at Miramar (such as Automotive or Fire Technology). Hsieh commented that funding will be an issue with the College's small Foundation. The framework will go to Board on Feb 18th, and will start for the 2016-2017 year.

Hsieh said that she also received a Basic Skills attachment at the Chancellor's Cabinet that was sent to Hopkins and the Deans.

Hsieh mentioned the District has a Board Policy from 1998 (or around that time), saying that the District will cover employees' physical exam expenses related to employment, and since this has not been enforced, it will be corrected moving forward.

Lastly, Hsieh brought up the topic of weapons on campus, and how individuals who have the authority to carry concealed weapons should comply with a policy once it is approved by the Board. She shared that the District now has a policy that she has special interest in because of the large number of Public Safety personnel who have the authorization to carry concealed weapons when they are on campus. The policy is that anyone who carries a weapon or parts of a weapon to the College will need to report it to the Chancellor or District designee (whom she believes is Vice Chancellor Manis). Hsieh asked Hopkins to alert Dean Beitey on the matter, but that they will not take any action until the Board has officially approved the policy. Once it has been approved, it will need to be enforced. Hopkins said that she thought the weapons reporting was to College Police, and Hsieh said that it would need to be the Chancellor or designee. However there are no procedures on the matter at this point. Bell asked if this policy pertained to concealed weapons or any weapons. Hsieh responded that it was for both concealed or any. Hubbard asked if this policy was specific to employees, and Hsieh replied that it was applicable to employees, students, and everyone on campus. The specific language for the policy would be shown at the next DGC meeting.

E. New Business

1.) Follow-up on DE Presentation by Laura Murphy at 2/2/16 CEC Meeting (Hopkins)

Hopkins reported that they had sent the information to the District, and Murphy said that they were already receiving responses to the questions. The information will be sent to the College, and they will incorporate it into the drafts. Murphy commented that in general, this sort of process probably should have happened at the beginning to identify which portions were District, but at least now they are on it and will give it to the College by February 17th.

2.) IPR/SLOAC Proposal (Hopkins & Kjartanson) ([attachment](#))

Hopkins presented an attachment, and reported that the Academic Affairs had approved both the attachment and the proposal. Hopkins proposed moving the Instructional Program Review deadline from the fall to the spring. Murphy said that these conversations came out of the program review process, and the recommendation was to move the Instructional Program Review deadline to the spring. Murphy showed on the attachment how this change would affect various procedures and other deadlines on campus relating to funding requests and outcomes and assessment cycles. The attachment allowed people to think about what kinds of resources would be needed, and the timelines that they have from 2015-2019. Paulette noted that the Chairs and the Senate are closely engaged in this topic, so they are bringing it for approval so they can move forward.

Miramontez asked about the last row on the attachment that discusses the annual report, and Murphy confirmed that it was the last reporting cycle.

Hsieh asked if the change would impact annual report. Hopkins responded it would not – it just ensures that things are accomplished soon.

Murphy said that she is working with BRDS and Bell to simplify the Request for Funding/Resource Request process in the Program Review workspace. McMahon commented that this idea was positively received in terms of streamlining. Arancibia also agreed that it was positively received. McMahon asked for a motion, and a consensus was given by all.

Hsieh asked for follow up on whether they should receive notice from the accrediting commission at any time (with regard to SLOs), and Hopkins responded that the Deans and Chairs were working on outstanding course/program assessment issues. The Deans and Chairs were a little behind, and they are still working on it. Hopkins noted that there are factors affecting course completion. Hsieh wanted to caution that every year when their annual report is submitted, the information is put in Miramar's file. When the team is here, they will see until 2010. The best scenario is that everything is making progress. Hopkins said the numbers might be going down because the College looked at completion differently than before, but that it can be explained. Murphy said she did not think it would be an issue, because they can explain it. Hsieh said if they have a legitimate reason, to make sure they have the explanations included in the self-study.

Miramontez noted that Hopkins had contacted his office to set the deadlines. Arancibia raised a concern about courses that are only offered every three years, and other enrollment patterns, and Murphy agreed that it is a current problem. Hopkins responded that this needed to be discussed in planning, and Arancibia said that within a given major, many students would not be able to finish in two years. Ornelas said that they have strategies in place to address this. McMahon mentioned that the College has established criteria for sparing low enrolled classes (the Strategic Enrollment Management document from Academic Affairs), such as Capstone courses required for the major, etc.

Hubbard asked if there was a list put together about deactivations, and if it could be distributed. Hopkins responded that they could, but she was not sure about how appropriate it would be. Arancibia said that the information would be important to see. McMahon commented that the discussion would need to be continued in another arena.

3.) Assessment of Evaluation for College Governance Committees (McMahon)

McMahon reported that the CGC is proposing to develop an assessment of college governance committees. She wanted to project a little further in the future, and when they evaluate a committee in terms of its effectiveness and how it happens, she wanted to talk about who would be doing the work of assessment and gathering the information. She thought that the CGC has the charge of organizing and proposing the evaluating processes, but the other aspect is the work involved. Hsieh noted that the important thing is what is done with the data after it is presented.

F. Old Business

1.) Accreditation (Miramontez)

Miramontez reported that the Steering Committee and Faculty Editor are working on Round 2, and that they had a meeting. They also talked about DE and a game plan for compliance with commission policies. They worked on a functional map – a delineation of what the colleges are responsible for versus the District (by standards) – and talked about information gaps and strategies to close those gaps.

2.) 2016 Planning Summit (Miramontez)

Miramontez made an important note is that the 2016 Planning Summit is happening on March 11th, and that the RSVP notice had been sent out (with responses needed by February 19th).

3.) Performing Arts Center Capital Campaign (Ascione)

Allen said that Ascione was in another meeting, so Hsieh made the report. Hsieh said that Ascione had followed up on her suggestion to have him serve on the Neighborhood First Coalition Board, who will be holding an election and vote at their meeting in March. Ascione had been invited to attend their February meeting. The group is put on by community individuals, who had approached the Chancellor years ago regarding building a performing arts center at the College. Now the group is becoming active again, and the topic has been on their agendas as an ongoing item. In the best interest of the College, Hsieh commented that it is important to have a representative serve at those meetings, and to let them know what the College's plans are and where the College is going for this project. That way when the capital campaign is underway, the community will support the campaign.

4.) Implementation of Cultural & Ethnic Diversity Plan (Hsieh, Hubbard, & Patacsil) ([attachment](#))

Hubbard indicated that there was no report.

G. Place Holders

1.) February 2016 On-Campus Board Meeting Presentation Topic (Hopkins & McMahon)

Hopkins reported that the Board meeting was next Thursday, February 18th. Ornelas said the rehearsal was this Thursday, February 11th at 2:00 p.m. Hsieh asked everyone to attend the Board Open Door session at 3:00 p.m. on February 18th.

H. Reports

(Please limit each following report to two minutes maximum. If you have any handouts, please email them to Briele Warren ahead of time to be included for distribution electronically.)

- **Academic Senate**

McMahon reported that the first Academic Senate meeting was held the previous week, and that the second meeting was this week.

- **Classified Senate**

Hubbard shared that the Classified Senate had met the previous week.

- **Associated Student Council**
Light commented that the Associated Student Council will be having first meeting on Friday, February 19th.
- **District Governance Council**
McMahon reported that the next District Governance Council meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 17th.
- **District Strategic Planning Committee**
McMahon commented that the date is still April 15th.
- **Budget Planning and Development Committee**
Bell reported that the Budget Planning and Development Committee had their meeting the previous Wednesday. The governor had sunshined his proposal, and they are now in the advocacy stage of their budget process for the State. The business officers have met to discuss strategies related to advocacy, growth, and COLA that the Chancellor had proposed. They would have a final budget proposal next month.
- **College Governance Committee**
McMahon shared that the College Governance Committee was going to hold their first meeting today after the CEC meeting.

Announcements

There were no announcements made.

I. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 2:29 p.m.

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2019 Strategic Goals**

Goal 1: Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.

Goal 2: Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.

Goal 3: Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.

Goal 4: Develop, strengthen and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.

Please see <http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/plan> **for San Diego Miramar College 2013-2019 Strategic Plan.**

As a courtesy, please let the College and Academic Senate Presidents know if you will be unable to attend the meeting.