

# COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, March 25, 2014 • 2:00 – 3:30 P.M. • L-108

**Members:** Hsieh, Bell, Ramsey, Haidar, Figueroa, Allen, Hubbard, Ledbetter and Akbari

**Attendees:** Trevisan, Beitey, & Jacobson

- A. Approval of the Agenda
- B. Approval of Previous Minutes
- C. Guests/Introductions:
- D. Updates from the Chancellor's Cabinet
- E. New Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Initiator
1	Employee Lounge	1	Hsieh & Bell

## F. Old Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Initiator
1	Strategic Enrollment Management – Next Step (Due to CEC on 3/25/14)	1	Hsieh & Haidar
2	College Hour (Due to CEC 3/18/14, Rep Names by 3/25/14, Survey by 3/28/14) (attachment)	2	Hsieh & Miramontez
3	Progress on Draft San Diego Miramar College Student Equity Plan	2	Ramsey
4	2014 ACCJC Annual Report (Draft Report due 3/4/14. Due to CEC on 3/25/14 for acceptance) (3/25/14) (attachment)	1	Hsieh, Miramontez
5	Status Regarding 3/27/14 On Campus Board Meeting	1	Beitey & Trevisan
6	2014-2015 College Annual Planning Calendar (Due to CEC on 4/15/14)	1	Miramontez & Figueroa
7	Update from Program Processes Task Force (College completion due date 12/10/13) – Review (attachment)	1	Haidar
8	Progress on Student Support & Success Program Implementation (attachment)	2	Ramsey
9	Updated College Operational Plans (Due to CEC on 5/6/14) (attachment)	1	Miramontez & Figueroa
10	Completion of Updating College's Master Educational Plan (Due to CEC on 5/6/14)	1	Hsieh
11	Environmental Scan Recommendation (Due to PIEC on 3/14/14 and to CEC on 4/15/14) (attachment)	1	Miramontez & Figueroa
12	Revised Miramar College ISLO's (3/25/14) (attachment)	1	Haidar

## G. Reports

*(Please limit each following report to two minutes maximum. If you have any handouts, Please e-mail them to Lexie West ahead of time to be included for distribution electronically.)*

- Academic Senate
- Classified Senate
- Associated Student Council
- District Governance Council
- District Strategic Planning Committee
- District Budget Committee
- College Governance Committee

## H. Announcements

## I. Adjourn

---

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

**For courtesy, please let the President know if you cannot attend the meeting.**

## Proposal for College Hour at San Diego Miramar College

With the completion of the Student Services building this coming summer, students will now have a place to congregate while they are at Miramar College. This is an opportunity to provide meaningful engagement on the college campus, which will ultimately lead to student success.

The Student Support (Re)defined report by the RP group highlights 6 factors for success identified by students that support the idea of College Hour:

The Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges (RPGGroup) strengthens the ability of California community colleges to undertake high quality research, planning and assessments that improve evidence-based decision making, institutional effectiveness and success for all students.

1. *Engaged: Students actively participate in class and extracurricular activities*
2. *Connected: Students feel like part of the college community*
3. *Valued: Student skills, talents, abilities are recognized. Opportunities to contribute on campus exist.*
4. *Nurtured: Somebody wants to and helps students to succeed*
5. *Directed: Students have a goal and know how to achieve it*
6. *Focused: Students stay on track*

In addition, College Hour would support the College Goals

**Goal 1:** Focus college efforts on student learning and student success through quality education that is responsive to change.

If student's have identified success as relating to engagement, connection and being valued, then we need to meet the student needs by conducting business differently. College hour can address many of the 6 factors identified by students.

**Goal 2:** Deliver instruction and services in formats and at sites that best meet student needs.

The excuse we hear from students often is that the classes overlap with office hours or workshops and they can't get involved. This would provide an opportunity for students to meet with faculty, attend workshops, and perhaps even enjoy lectures in areas they never thought about.

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

If there is purposeful, meaningful interventions in the way of continuing with classes such as College Hour, more and more departments could add on activities and services

that help enhance the college experience for students and the community. Student clubs can engage in more activities, individuals can highlight their own talents.

**Goal 4:** Initiate and strengthen beneficial partnerships with business and industry, other educational institutions, and community.

College Hour can be a time for lectures, outreach, tabling, and admissions information sessions, career information sessions, from partner universities, industries, and community.

Some ideas for College Hour:

- Workshops
- Office hours
- College visits and employee tabling opportunities
- Brown bag lunch meetings with various discipline faculty
- Student Club meetings
- Poetry readings, music, bands, fun stuff
- Department showcase
- Community engagement

Even if we started with 1 or 2 days a week, we could provide enough activities that would allow for purposeful engagement with students. An hour perhaps between 12:30-1:30 is too short of a time to head home, but long enough to participate in any of the activities above. We know the peak period for classes is between 10-2. Ideally, a time within the peak period would keep students here and engaged in the college process.



Western Association of Schools and Colleges  
**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges**

| [Help](#) | [Logout](#)

**2014 Annual Report  
 REVIEW**

San Diego Miramar College  
 10440 Black Mountain Road  
 San Diego, CA 92126

**General Information**

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm logged into the correct institution's report	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Daniel R. Miramontez
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	619-388-7308
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	dmiramon@sdccd.edu
5a.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the section of the college catalog which states the accredited status with ACCJC:	<a href="http://studentweb.sdccd.edu/docs/catalogs/2013-2014/miramar.pdf#view=Fit&amp;pagemode=bookmarks">http://studentweb.sdccd.edu/docs/catalogs/2013-2014/miramar.pdf#view=Fit&amp;pagemode=bookmarks</a>
5b.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the colleges online statement of accredited status with ACCJC:	<a href="http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/accreditation">http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/accreditation</a>
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	Fall 2013: 12,080 Fall 2012: 11,487 Fall 2011: 12,920
7.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses for fall 2013:	11,525
8.	Headcount enrollment in pre-collegiate credit courses (which do not count toward degree requirements) for fall 2013:	1,715
9.	Number of courses offered via distance education:	Fall 2013: 136 Fall 2012: 131 Fall 2011: 141
10.	Number of programs offered via distance education:	12
11.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Distance Education:	Fall 2013: 3,523 Fall 2012: 3,575 Fall 2011: 4,025
12.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	Fall 2013: n/a Fall 2012: n/a Fall 2011: n/a

13.	Were all correspondence courses for which students enrolled in fall 2012 part of a program which leads to an associate degree?	No
-----	--	----

### Student Achievement Data

#	Question	Answer									
14a.	What is your Institution-set standard for successful student course completion?	72 %									
14b.	Successful student course completion rate for the fall 2013 semester:	74 %									
15.	<p>Institution Set Standards for program completion: While institutions may determine the measures for which they will set standards, most institutions will utilize this measure as it is core to their mission. For purposes of definition, certificates include those certificate programs which qualify for financial aid, principally those which lead to gainful employment. Completion of degrees and certificates is to be presented in terms of total numbers. Each student who receives one or more certificates or degrees in the specified year may be counted once.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, what is it?</td> <td>1063</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?</td> <td>601</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?</td> <td>469</td> </tr> </table>		a.	If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, what is it?	1063	b.	If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	601	c.	If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	469
a.	If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, what is it?	1063									
b.	If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	601									
c.	If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	469									
16a.	Number of students (unduplicated) who received a certificate or degree in the 2012-2013 academic year:	1,068									
16b.	Number of students who received a degree in the 2012-2013 academic year:	601									
16c.	Number of students who received a certificate in the 2012-2013 academic year:	467									
17a.	If your college has an institution-set standard for the number of students who transfer each year to 4-year colleges/universities, what is it?	840									
17b.	Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2012-2013:	745									
18a.	Does the college have any certificate programs which are not career-technical education (CTE) certificates?	Yes									
18b.	If yes, please identify them:	CSU-GE Breadth; IGETC-GE									
19a.	Number of career-technical education (CTE) certificates and degrees:	89									
19b.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees which have identified technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other standards, including those for licensure and certification:	84									
19c.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for licensure passage rates:	1									
19d.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for graduate employment rates:	19									

20.	2011-2012 examination pass rates in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study:				
	<b>Program</b>	<b>CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)</b>	<b>Examination</b>	<b>Institution set standard</b>	<b>Pass Rate</b>
	Medical Lab Technician	1504	state	80 %	100 %
21.	2011-2012 job placement rates for students completing certificate programs and CTE (career-technical education) degrees:				
	<b>Program</b>	<b>CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)</b>	<b>Institution set standard</b>	<b>Job Placement Rate</b>	
	See attached Table		0 %	0 %	
22.	Please list any other instituion set standards at your college:				
	<b>Criteria Measured (i.e. persistence, starting salary, etc.)</b>	<b>Definition</b>			<b>Institution set standard</b>
	Persistence Rate (53% -Fall 2012-Fall 2013)	Annual persistence rate is the percentage of official census enrolled first-time to college students in a fall term who received a grade notation then enrolled in at least one course in the subsequent spring and fall terms and received a grade notation.			48%
23.	Effective practice to share with the field: Describe examples of effective and/or innovative practices at your college for setting institution-set standards, evaluating college or programmatic performance related to student achievement, and changes that have happened in response to analyzing college or program performance (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).				
	<p>One of the innovative practices we utilize has been the creation and expansion of the Basic Skills (BSI) English Center and Instructional Assistant (IA) Program. IAs work both inside BSI English/ESL classes as well as in the English Center under the direction of faculty members. This program not only improves BSI students' success, retention, persistence, and GPAs, it also provides IAs with classroom experience to complement their graduate curriculum. This program strengthens their preparation to teach Basic Skills in the future. Similar to other BSI projects at Miramar, to receive funding, this project had to apply by stating how the goals of the project connected to Miramar's Strategic Plan, BSI Action Plan, as well as to the Effective Practices of the BSI grant. Projects are then rubric-group-rated. Additionally, each BSI Project works directly with the researcher and unsuccessful projects have been culled and defunded by the BSI Committee. As external validation, this innovation was awarded Advanced Certification from the National Association of Development Education (NADE), the highest possible certification offered by NADE. Miramar is currently only the second campus in California to hold this distinction.</p>				

**Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment**

Note: Beginning fall 2012, colleges were expected to be at the proficiency level of Student Learning Outcomes assessment ( see the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III, Student Learning Outcomes). At this time, colleges are expected to be in full compliance with the Accreditation Standards related to student learning outcomes and assessment. All courses, programs, and student and learning support activities of the college are expected to have student learning outcomes defined, so that ongoing assessment and other requirements of Accreditation Standards are met across the institution.

#	Question	Answer
	Courses	

24.	a.	Total number of college courses:	766
	b.	Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	529
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:		69.1
Programs			
25.	a.	Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs as defined by college):	27
	b.	Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	27
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:		100
Student and Learning Support Activities			
26.	a.	Total number of student and learning support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation):	18
	b.	Number of student and learning support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	18
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:		100
27.	URL(s) from the college website where prospective students can find SLO assessment results for programs:		<a href="http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/slos">http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/slos</a>
28.	Number of courses identified as part of the GE program:		179
29.	Percent of GE courses with ongoing assessment of GE learning outcomes:		100 %
30.	Do your institution's GE outcomes include all areas identified in the Accreditation Standards?		Yes
31.	Number of GE courses with Student Learning Outcomes mapped to GE program Student Learning Outcomes:		179
32.	Number of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:		5
33.	Percentage of college instructional programs and student and learning support activities which have Institutional Student Learning Outcomes mapped to those programs (courses) and activities (student and learning support activities).		100 %
34.	Percent of institutional outcomes (ILOs) with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:		100 %
35.	Effective practice to share with the field: Describe effective and/or innovative practices at your college for measuring ILOs, documenting accomplishment of ILOs in non-instructional areas of the college, informing college faculty, staff, students, and the public about ILOs, or other aspects of your ILO practice (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).		
	<p>Over the past several years, we have continued to develop our ILO assessment methods to better reflect all aspects of the college student learning experience, most notably non-instructional areas. In the past, we had difficulties integrating non-instructional functions and outcomes into our ILO structure. In the 2012-2013 year, we used a college-wide retreat and convocations for cross-division discussion and input on our ILOs. This allowed us to identify gaps with respect to non-instructional areas and resulted in modification of our ILOs to more closely align with the AACU's Essential Learning Outcomes. We also developed and piloted an ILO survey that addresses the range of outcomes expected of our degree students and will distribute it college-wide in the coming year. Course and program SLOs are currently mapped</p>		

to ILOs, and we are working on additional mapping using more comprehensive software (Taskstream), currently in the implementation phase. This will allow us to look at all college activities that support our ILOs, highlighting areas that might need improvement. In addition, we are planning on expanding our informative capabilities, especially for the public, with online reporting using the new software platform.

**Each of the following narrative responses is limited to 250 words. As you develop your responses, please be mindful of success stories that can be reported in the last question of this section. We look forward to including this information from colleges in our report to the Commission and the field in June.**

Please discuss alignment of student learning outcomes at your institution, from institutional and course to program level. Describe your activities beyond crosswalking or charting all outcomes to courses in a program (often called "mapping"), to analysis and implementation of alignment in the planning of curriculum and delivery of instruction. Discuss how the alignment effort has resulted in changes of expected outcomes and/or how students' programs of study have been clarified. Note whether the described practices apply to all instructional programs at the college (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

36. Currently, course and program SLOs have been mapped to ILOs, with courses forming the basis for student learning. In our work on alignment and mapping of program SLOs, we found the need to revise instructional program SLOs to more accurately measure student success at the level of the degree and certificate. We are in the process of making these changes, and will then be able to align the revised program SLOs with appropriate course and institutional outcomes. As we include both program and course level SLO data in program review, faculty can directly identify strategies and actions to increase student success. This has allowed us to identify bottlenecks, key informational deficits and multi-course outcomes for individual programs, and to adjust scheduling and instruction across disciplines to improve in these areas. We have also used surveys, at the course, program and institutional level, to get student feedback, which is valuable in modifying delivery of instruction to meet student need.

Describe the various communication strategies at your college to share SLO assessment results for usage by internal and external audiences. Explain how communications take into account how the information is expected to influence the behavior or decisions of particular audiences. Discuss how communication of student learning outcomes assessment information and results impacts student behavior and achievement (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

37. Our focus in communicating outcome assessment has been primarily at the internal level, as we move towards continuous quality improvement. Outcome assessment discussions have become standard at convocations, retreats, and meetings. We have also organized a group to function as SLO Liaisons for instructional and non-instructional programs. These Liaisons are a point of contact between the SLO Facilitator and faculty/staff and have improved overall awareness/alignment of outcome assessment practices between the instructional and non-instructional areas. Students are made aware of course SLOs on syllabi, and program and institutional SLOs are published in our catalog. This allows students to focus in on key themes in courses and identify critical outcomes for success. In addition, with ILO surveys, students are individually asked to assess how their experience at Miramar aligns with the outcomes at the institutional level. Currently, we have posted results of program outcome assessment on our college website. With the adoption of the Taskstream software, we anticipate the ability to easily produce additional reports appropriate for varied audiences.

Explain how dialog and reporting of SLO assessment results takes place at the departmental and institutional levels. Note whether practices involve all programs at the college. Illustrate how dialog and reporting impact program review, institutional planning, resource allocation, and institutional effectiveness (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

38. We have relied on department meetings to dialog on instructional SLO assessment at the course and program levels, as this is a faculty driven process. The results of these course level analyses are reported by all faculty using a homegrown database. Summaries of faculty discussions regarding outcomes assessment are entered by lead faculty and are available to department chairs. Summary reports of assessment are provided to faculty and administration through college committees, such as Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate. Both course and program level changes that result from these discussions are reported in program reviews, and any resource requests must be linked to outcomes and strategic plan goals. For non-instructional areas, specifically student support services, administrative services and instructional support services, outcomes and assessment are reviewed by the faculty/staff and committees in their area, and results are included in their



	<p>division program reviews. With the implementation of the Taskstream software, we will be able to map all division level outcomes to our revised ILOs and use collective data to measure success and guide planning in ways that that will increase institutional effectiveness.</p>
39.	<p>Please share with us two or three success stories about the impacts of SLO practices on student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. Describe the practices which led to the success (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>One significant achievement with regards to SLO practices affecting institutional effectiveness has come from the college-wide efforts to assess the impact of all facets of the college on student learning. Our Spring 2013 retreat resulted in significant changes to the way we approach outcomes assessment at the institutional level, and resulted in a modification of our ILOs. Starting in Spring 2014, we adopted the AAC&amp;U’s LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, with the inclusion of verbiage that highlights the role that non-instructional areas play in student learning. This has greatly increased the communication between instructional and non-instructional areas with regards to factors affecting student learning and success. Another significant success story is the impact of outcomes assessment at the program level, as seen in our Basic Skills programs in English and Math. Both areas have used the analysis of outcomes, as well as student achievement data, to create projects that have led to increased student success in these Basic Skills areas. Specifically, English created the “English 049 Coordination Project,” which resulted in increased success and completion rates for students who were engaged in the identified interventions.</p>

**Substantive Change Items**

**NOTE: These questions are for monitoring purposes only and do not replace the ACCJC substantive change approval process. Please refer to the Substantive Change Manual regarding communication with the Commission.**

#	Question	Answer
40.	Number of submitted substantive change requests:	2012-13: 0 2011-12: 0 2010-11: 0
41a.	Is the institution anticipating a proposal for a substantive change in any of the following change categories? (Check all that apply)	No changes planned
41b.	Explain the change(s) for which you will be submitting a substantive change proposal:	N/A

**Other Information**

#	Question	Answer
42a.	Identify site additions and deletions since the submission of the 2013 Annual Report:	N/A
42b.	List all instructional sites other than the home campus where 50% or more of a program, certificate, or degree is offered:	N/A
43.	List all of the institution’s instructional sites out of state and outside the United States:	N/A

Go To Question #: 2 ▼

**REVIEW/EDIT**

The Annual Report must be certified as complete and accurate by the CEO (Dr. Patricia Hsieh). Once you have answered all the questions, you may send an e-mail notification to the CEO that the report is ready for certification.

Only the CEO may submit the final Annual Report.

[Send e-mail Notification to CEO to certify report](#)

---

[ACCJC | Contact Us](#)

© 2010 ACCJC

CTE Programs	CIP CODE	Certificate or Degree	2013-14 Perkins Performance Goal **	Employment Percentage Rate*
BIOTECHNOLOGY AND BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	1504	Both	<b>74.95%</b> <u>All CTE Programs</u>	NA
ACCOUNTING	5203	Degree		57.69
BANKING AND FINANCE		Both		40.00
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	5202	Both		87.10
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	5202	Both		75
REAL ESTATE	5215	Certificate		66.67
OFFICE TECHNOLOGY/OFFICE COMPUTER APPLICATIONS	5204	Both		42.86
COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS	1101	Both		100
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	3105	Both		46.15
DIESEL TECHNOLOGY	4706	Both		94.12
AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	4706	Both		84.09
AERONAUTICAL AND AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	4706	Both		64.52
APPLIED DESIGN – FINE & APPLIED ARTS	5004	Both		NA
EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES	5100	Certificate		66.67
CHILD DEVELOPMENT/EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION	1907	Both		69.01
PARALEGAL	2203	Both		64.52
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE	4301	Both		84.82
FIRE TECHNOLOGY	4302	Both		84.43
AVIATION AND AIRPORT MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES	4901	Both		75

\*Note: Data obtained from the Perkins IV Core Indicators of Performance by Vocational TOP Code report for Miramar College, 2013-2014 Fiscal Year. Source: CCCCO MIS Database, EDD Base Wage File, CSU Chancellor's Office, UC Office of the President, 2000 Census

\*\* Note: Institution's set standard for graduate employment rates same as Perkins Performance Goal – Core Indicator reports:13/14.

**Draft San Diego Miramar College Program Initiation, Institutionalization, and Discontinuance Processes  
November 2013**

Prepared by the *ad hoc* Program Processes Taskforce (PPT)  
Convened by the College Executive Committee (CEC)

**Table of Contents**

I.	Introduction .....	2
	Taskforce Membership .....	2
II.	Definitions .....	3
	A. Instructional Program & Services.....	3
	B. Student Services.....	3
	C. Administrative Services.....	4
III.	New Program Initiation Process using Internal or external Resources .....	4
IV.	Program Institutionalization .....	7
	Institutionalization of Current Programs funded by External Resources .....	7
V.	Program Vitality and Discontinuance .....	7
	Summary of Tasks to be forwarded to governance committees/group .....	8
VI.	Appendix .....	9
	A. Guidelines for SD Miramar College Resource Development Process and Procedures.....	9
	B. GRANT CONCEPT APPROVAL FORM .....	11
	C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM.....	12

## I. Introduction

The initiation of a new program, significant program expansion, and other initiatives, as well as institutionalization or discontinuance of such efforts can have broad short and long-term impact on college operations and personnel.

In April 2013, the Academic Senate forwarded to the College Executive Committee (CEC) a Senate-approved request to form a taskforce to develop formal processes for approval of initiation and institutionalization of internally-funded programs and grant-funded programs, and for program discontinuance. The CEC approved the formation of the Program Processes Taskforce (PPT) and its membership to develop processes and to forward its recommendations to the CEC. The PP Taskforce was convened and held meetings in May 2013 and forwarded the recommendations included in this document.

### Taskforce Membership

#### Administration Representatives (3)

- Patricia Hsieh, College President
- Brett Bell, Vice President Administration
- Gerald Ramsey, Vice President of Student Services & Acting Vice-President of Instruction

#### Academic Senate Representatives (3)

- Buran Haidar, Academic Senate President
- Daphne Figueroa, Academic Senate Past-President
- Wheeler North, Aviation Faculty

#### Classified Staff Representatives (2)

- Joyce Allen, Classified Senate President
- Terrie Hubbard, Classified Senate member

#### Associated Student Council (ASC) Representative (1)

- Emalina Ledbetter, ASC President

## II. Definitions

Definition of programs varies for instructional, student services and administrative services programs. The Taskforce explored definitions and it was agreed that the Program Review Committees of the College divisions will review and revise their definition of program, as appropriate to guide the College Program Processes, in accordance with the Title 5 definition.

*(Forward to the Program Review Committees)*

### A. Instructional Program & Services

Alternative definitions explored by the taskforce for consideration during the review/revision of the Current SD Miramar College definitions, included:

1. *Title 5 § 55000*. Definition  
“**Educational program**” is an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education.
2. ASCCC Curriculum Institute presentation, 2011  
An **Instructional Program** is defined as a discipline and as an organized sequence or grouping of courses leading to a defined objective such as a major, degree, certificate, license, the acquisition of selected knowledge or skills, or transfer to another institution of higher education.
3. Other  
An **Instructional Program** is defined as a state approved degree or certificate or a series of basic skills courses that serve as a pathway to degree or certificate completion. *(Foothill College)*

*Current Miramar College PR/SLOAC committee definitions of:*

- **Program:** An instructional “program” is a field of study that includes at least one award and at least one subject area. Programs are designated by “grey box” sections in the Degree Curricula and Certificate Programs chapter of the San Diego Miramar College Catalog with the exception of Interdisciplinary Studies which is a grey box section but is not a program.
- **Instructional Service:** An instructional service is an organizational unit that has its own distinct mission, separate budget, and at least one full-time employee.

### B. Student Services

*Alternative non-limiting definitions explored by the taskforce for consideration during the review/revision included:*

1. A **Student Services Program** is defined as an offering of student services that primarily serve a non---instructional function and/or does not qualify as an Academic Program as defined above.*(Foothill College)*
2. A **Student Services Program** is defined as a unit providing non-instructional student services

of guidance and counseling at all levels, for new and for transfer students. (Definition discussed at the PP Taskforce meeting on 05/28/13)

3. Instructional PR/SLOAC-approved definitions 102511 part of "[SLO Glossary of Terminology](#)"

<b>Student Support Program</b>	Non-instructional services, such as advising, counseling, learning resources, financial aid, tutoring, mentoring, etc., that facilitate student success and provide strategies for students to overcome the many factors in life that may disrupt their education and reduce their success
--------------------------------	--

### C. Administrative Services

*(Alternative non-limiting definitions for consideration)*

1. An Administrative Services is defined as an offering of support services, primarily supporting faculty and/or staff, indirect student support, and/or does not qualify as an Instructional Program as defined above. *(Foothill College)*

## III. New Program Initiation Process using Internal or external Resources

The initiation of a new program and significant increase in a program or other work area can have broad short and long-term impact on college operations and resources. The new program initiation process is developed to ensure that all proposed programs align with the San Diego Miramar College Mission, its Strategic Plan, and its Educational master Plan to meet substantiated student need. And that before the program is in development stages, the college has the capacity to commit short-term and long-term resources to an additional program while maintaining fair and equitable distribution of resources to serve students in existing programs.

Taskforce members recognized the importance of setting up a process for prioritization of new program development and the PP Taskforce will be working on developing further details of the process to include identification of a "Program Prioritization Group" for College approval. *(PP Taskforce, Fall 2013~~4~~)*

Proposed membership of "Program Prioritization Group" by the Program Processes (PP) Taskforce

College President  
VPs  
PR Co-chair  
PIEC Co-chair

Academic Senate President  
Curriculum Chair  
PR Faculty Co-Chairs (Instruction & Student Services)  
PIEC Faculty Co-Chair

Classified Senate President  
ASC President

1. Program areas or Schools identify new programs, significant program expansions, or other initiatives to meet emerging student needs. This identification could be based on program review data, changing demographics or workforce needs, or developing technologies, etc...
  - a. To address initiation of a new program, program expansion, or other significant initiative using internal resources, the proposal must be addressed in the Program Review report, by filling the section on “New Program Proposal”, a new section to be added to the Program Review annual update and three-year reports. *(Forward to the Program Review Committees)*
  - b. To address initiation of a new grant-funded program, program expansions or other initiative funded by external resources, the proposal must align with the program goals as specified in the Program review report or its annual update and the college Mission and the Strategic Plan goals, and in-keeping with the College-approved program prioritization. Proposals for new grant-funded must be submitted using the College Resource Development Process and Procedure (Section VI. Appendix A, B, C & D)
  - c. All proposals for new internal/external funded programs must briefly address, as applicable:
    - Demand for the program external and internal.
      - Projection of number of students served, articulation, or transfer data
      - Employment data and other relevant information for CTE programs
    - New curriculum development, course offerings, and learning outcomes
    - Opportunity to realign or strengthen existing programs through: shared Curriculum with other programs, and cross-listing of courses
    - Faculty and Classified Staff and administrative workload and availability
    - Use of college facilities and services
    - Technology and Informational Technology
    - Supplies and Equipment
    - Health and safety considerations
  - i. New internally funded programs.
    1. All new internally funded program proposals are forwarded for discussion to the “Program Prioritization group”, for a preliminary recommendation to evaluate that the proposal matches the College priorities for new programs and to ascertain that the College has current adequate and potential future resources (budget including FTEF allocation, faculty, staff, technology, facilities, and other services) or current and future capacity (special safety considerations, impact on resource allocation to other college programs) to offer this new program.
    2. The recommendations of “Program Prioritization group” based on the long-term enrollment planning are next forwarded to the College constituencies following the college participatory governance process.
    3. After the new program proposal has been approved by the CEC, the program faculty



and Deans will then proceed with the development of the program curriculum through the Curriculum Committee and other college processes, as applicable.

ii. New externally funded programs

Development of all new externally-funded programs will follow the three steps of the college-approved Resource Development Process and Procedure (Appendix IV). Step one, completion of the initiation process; step two, completion of the concept approval process; and, step three, completion of the submission approval process. Steps one and two are intended as a “Quick Check” for the following purposes and outcomes

**Purposes**

- Establishing that the proposal fits with College mission and that other college mission efforts will/will not be disrupted by the proposal implementation.
- Identifying the proposal champion(s) and timeline to develop full proposal.

**Outcomes**

1. Proposal does not fit college mission or will be exorbitantly disruptive to other college operations.
2. Proposal does fit college mission and will affect other college areas, or will require external grant (e.g. new program or work effort that will increase or reallocate FTEF, staffing and other resources, will impact other service areas such as increasing demand on student services.)

If outcome is #1 – do not develop proposal

If outcome is #2 – engage process for full proposal development of new program and grant (as applicable)

**The** College Executive Committee (CEC) will be the oversight governance body for the “quick check” for the following reasons:

- Meets weekly
  - Four constituent leaders can be reached even quicker if needed
  - Approval is only to proceed with proposal development
  - Urgency shall not be a legitimate criteria for circumventing due process
  - Keeps constituent leaders directly in the loop on any items that may bear significant impact
  - Provides opportunity for high-level feedback to improve proposal
2. All new internally and externally-funded programs will complete a program review report after the first year and begin assessing student learning outcomes on an annual basis once the courses have been taught. All new initiatives will submit an annual update in the program review report of the appropriate area.

## IV. Program Institutionalization

### Institutionalization of Current Programs funded by External Resources

Program areas or Schools will submit a proposal for institutionalization of programs funded by external resources to ensure that the programs and initiatives, after the external resources is discontinued, still meet substantiated student need, and that the college is able to the commit long-term resources to the program, as it maintains its commitment to serve students in the existing programs

1. Program Directors, Deans and/or appropriate manager will submit a request for institutionalization, at least one year prior to the ending date of the external funding, to the “Program Prioritization Group” for consideration and recommendation to the CEC for approval and College adoption.

Institutionalization of externally-funded programs will be considered alongside existing program with considerations that include among others factors:

- a. Continued external or internal demand
  - b. Quality of outcomes
  - c. Size, scope, and productivity of the program
  - d. Costs and other expenses associated with the program
2. Institutionalization of programs with course offering and/or services beyond the grant funding period will take place in accordance with the college-approved prioritization and resources.

Institutionalization of instructional programs with course offerings will be considered together with other existing programs serving all students. No additional course offerings or scheduling of grant-funded programs can take place beyond the grant funding period prior to approval of the VP and College President, in accordance with the college-approved prioritization.

The institutionalization of services beyond the grant-funded period will focus on integrating such services within our existing college services and resources, pending successful renewal of the grant funding. Otherwise, grant initiated services and their delivery format will be re-evaluated for consideration in accordance with the college-approved prioritization and resources.

## V. Program Vitality and Discontinuance

This section is under development in accordance with SDCCD Board of Trustees Policy BP 5020:

“The Board hereby directs the Chancellor to develop procedures for the approval of courses of instruction and of educational programs that satisfy the requirements of the Education Code and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. The procedures for the development and review of all curricular offerings, including their establishment, modification or discontinuance shall remain flexible to permit timely response to change.

Furthermore, these procedures shall assure:

- a. The Colleges and Continuing Education faculty and Academic Senates assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.
- b. The Colleges and Continuing Education curriculum committees are recognized as the primary decision-making bodies that offer recommendations regarding courses, degrees and certificates to the Curriculum and Instructional Council (CIC), the Board of Trustees, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, as appropriate.
- c. Regular review and justification of courses, degrees and certificates.
- d. Opportunities for training for persons involved in aspects of curriculum development
- e. Consideration of job market and other related information for vocational and occupational degrees and certificates.

## **Summary of Tasks to be forwarded to governance committees/group**

*(Cross-referenced to sections of the Program Processes document draft)*

### **Forward to Program Review Committees**

- Review and revise Program Definitions as necessary (Section II)
- Develop a new section for a new program, program expansion, or other significant initiative to be added to the Program Review annual update and three-year reports. (Section III.1.a)

### **Forward to the proposed "Program Prioritization group"**

- Develop a process for new program prioritization with guidelines, criteria, timeline, and rubrics for evaluation of requests for program initiation/institutionalization (Sections III. & IV.B.2 ). The College's prioritized new programs identified by the new process developed by the Program Prioritization group will guide the prioritization of faculty needs and classified staff needs of these programs.

## VI. Appendix

### A. Guidelines for SD Miramar College Resource Development Process and Procedures

---

#### **Step One: Prepare Grant Funding Concept for Submission to the CEC**

Faculty, and/or administrator who identify a potential grant will:

- Meet with the respective Department Chair and Dean to discuss the proposed grant to ensure that acquiring the grant is consistent with Department, School and College goals and priorities and that the Department and School are committed to both the short and long-term grant commitments.
- Where grants span more than one School, multiple Department Chairs and Deans will be required to review the concept, before it is submitted to the CEC.
- If needed due to affecting more than one Department and/or School, the Dean or manager will then present the concept to the Deans' Council for consideration. If the concept is recommended to move forward for approval it will be submitted to the CEC for Concept Approval.
- Where matching resources are required from the college as a whole it is recommended that the matching resources have been explored and identified as potentially available prior to meeting with the CEC.

#### **Step Two: Submit and Present the Grant Concept Approval Form to the CEC**

The Grant Proposer will:

- Prepare the Grant Concept Approval Form, Project Description form, and supporting documents, and submit all the materials to the CEC for consideration.
- Meet with the CEC and present the forms and materials.
- Respond to CEC direction and either provide additional information or work to complete the grant proposal.

The CEC will:

- Review all submitted materials.
- Discuss the proposal and either give further direction and ask questions or approve the Concept for further development and submission.

(NOTE) The CEC will provide written guidance to the initiator as to key issues to address, if any. In providing direction the CEC will consider the college program link, the extent college

resources are required for match and/or grant implementation, amount of grant funding, timing of grant application and other key factors as it determines are appropriate. In consideration of these items, the CEC can indicate the concept is not sufficient to move forward, or is sufficient and sign off on the Grant Concept Approval form.

DRAFT

## B. GRANT CONCEPT APPROVAL FORM

Date:	Prepared by: Email/Phone:
Project Title	<input type="checkbox"/> New Project <input type="checkbox"/> Continuing
Project Description	Describe project on attached Project Description page
Project Director	Department(s): School(s):
Project Period	
Funding Period (if different than above)	
Funding Source	
Funding Amount	\$ Match Requirement: \$ Indirect ___ % Amount \$
College Commitment	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, If yes, please list and describe in detail on the attached PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM
Partners / MOUs	
Application Deadline	Date: <input type="checkbox"/> Postmarked <input type="checkbox"/> Received
	Acquire Prior to Presentation at CEC Meeting
Concept Approval Date:	Approval Signature – Chair(s)/Supervisor(s)/Lead person(s)
Concept Approval Date:	Approval Signature – Dean(s)
	Acquire Upon CEC Concept Approval
Concept Approval Date:	Approval Signature - Appropriate Vice President
Concept Approval Date:	Budget Approval - Vice President Administrative Services
Concept Approval Date:	Approval Signature - Academic Senate President
Concept Approval Date:	Approve Development and Submission of Grant Proposal - President
	Concept and Approval Form Included in CEC Minutes

## C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

Project Title	
Project Director	
Project Description:  This section is intended to be no longer than one page. It shall include an overview of the proposed grant that summarizes the basic goals and objectives to be achieved. The overview should be sufficient to give the reader a basic understanding of the proposal. In addition it must demonstrate a relationship between those goals and San Diego Miramar College Strategic goals and the respective Department Goals as contained in their Program Review. Finally, the overview should identify proposed outcomes and/or products.	
Description of College Commitment:  This section shall include a description of <b>all</b> college commitments. In addition to those areas identified on the Concept Approval Form, such commitments could include*: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Development of new curriculum/degrees/certificates:</li><li>• Commitment and/or use of college facilities:</li><li>• Work from Faculty/Staff/Managers:</li><li>• Commitment of other instructional areas, student services, or administrative resources:</li><li>• Provision of matching funds (indicate source and amount):</li><li>• Commitment to institutionalize all or even a portion of the program at grant completion:</li><li>• Research needed</li><li>• Other:</li></ul>	
(*) Please include supporting documents.	

**Information and Timeline Related to MM High School<sup>1</sup>**  
February 2014 - working and living draft (last update 2/21/14, 2/27/14)

1. MMHS established date for Outreach/Assessment to visit MMHS for purposes of FYE/Jump Start Orientation and assessment scheduling. ***This year's date is March 18, 2014 and was MMHS' decision.***
  - a. An earlier date was requested by SDMC, but HS counselors prefer a date closer to 4-year admissions notification dates
  - b. Historically MMHS counselors and staff work with their students prior to SDMC's arrival to ensure that admission applications have been submitted (Jay Leach, Counselor is point of contact)
    - i. Attendance of students has been exceptionally high (about 300 of a 500 student class)
    - ii. Of the 300 students (i), the percentage that have actually completed the SDCCD admissions application, at the time of SDMC's visit, has been historically low, approximately 20%, which causes major processing delays
    - iii. MMHS is encouraged to let us know how we can help improve the number in ii, above.
2. Assessment will occur for all student from March 11 – 31
  - a. To ensure that the maximum number of students are serviced, scheduled times dedicated to HS students (available to all feeder HS) have or will be established (target date for finalizing the assessment schedule is 3/7/14)
    - i. 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. twice p/week - Miramar (initial proposal is Tuesday & Wednesday but details are not complete)
    - ii. Pending HS response of available times some sessions will be scheduled at HS (facilities challenge)
    - iii. A Saturday schedule (Miramar) is under review for MMHS [w/plans to use the services of existing MMHS counselor, as an adjunct counselor]
3. Month of April
  - a. Continued assessment (as needed)
  - b. Pre-ed planning
  - c. Initial acceptance notifications to students
4. Month of May
  - a. Continued assessment (as needed)
  - b. Continued assessment (as needed)
  - c. Continued pre-ed planning
  - d. Summer registration
5. Month of June
  - a. Jump Start Orientation
  - b. Summer session begins
  - c. Continued assessment (as needed)
  - d. Final ed-planning

---

<sup>1</sup> MMHS is referenced specifically but most dates apply to other feeder high schools as well



## Draft Revised Miramar ISLOs

Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World

Study in sciences, math, social sciences, humanities, histories, language and the arts; ***or a specialized field of study***

Intellectual and Practical Skills

Communication

Critical Thinking

Problem Solving

Quantitative Literacy

Information Literacy

Personal and Social Responsibility

Local and global civic knowledge and engagement

Intercultural knowledge and competence

Ethical reasoning and action

Foundations and skills for lifelong learning

***Pursuit of high quality, collegiate educational and extracurricular experiences***

***Successful navigation of the postsecondary education system to achieve educational goal(s)***

Integrative and Applied Learning

Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

***Demonstration of applied skills required for the student's chosen career field***

**Environmental Scan on Communities Served  
by San Diego Miramar College**

**Fall 2014-Spring 2017**

**By:**

**Research Subcommittee**

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Section I. Demographic Information.....</b>	<b>4</b>
Total Population Through 2013 .....	4
Community Level Population Census 2000 and 2010 .....	4
Total Population: Changes to the Year 2050 .....	5
Community Level Population: Changes to the Year 2050.....	5
Ethnic Composition of the Total Population Census 2010 .....	7
Changes in the ethnic composition of the total population through 2050.....	10
<b>Section II. Educational Information .....</b>	<b>11</b>
School Age Population: Changes Through 2012-13.....	11
Academic and Demographic Indicators .....	12
Transfer Influence .....	13
<b>Section III. Economic Trends .....</b>	<b>14</b>
The Employment Base .....	14
<b>Section IV. Political and Social Trends Impacting Miramar College.....</b>	<b>17</b>
Importance of Monitoring Political and Social Trends.....	17
Accountability .....	17
Accreditation .....	17
Budget .....	18
Enrollment Management .....	19
Student Success Act (SB 1456).....	19
Associate Degree for Transfer (SB 1440) .....	19
Enrollment Growth and Facilities Planning.....	19
Future Trends .....	20
Granting 4-year degrees in community colleges (SB 850).....	20
Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) .....	20
Importance of These Political and Social Trends.....	20

## **Introduction**

This scan is meant to provide a comprehensive look at the external environment impacting Miramar College. In general, it summarizes the demographic, educational, and economic changes at the state and national levels, and at a more specific level provides data on San Diego County and the zip codes served by Miramar College that are shaping the future of the college.

The Miramar College Community Environmental Scan also serves as a companion piece to the Miramar College Fact Book, a comprehensive internal overview produced by District Office of Institutional Research and Planning that describes the college's internal structure across an array of sections (headcount, persistence, student completion, productivity and efficiency, and human resources). Together, these two documents provide important information about the changing forces affecting Miramar College as it moves forward in the 21st century. By monitoring these external and internal changes, Miramar College will be in a better position to inform its planning and decision making processes as a means to best serve its student population.

DRAFT

## SECTION I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

### TOTAL POPULATION THROUGH 2013

San Diego County displayed a 2.8% change in population between 2009 and 2013. This is consistent with the change in population in both California (2.7%) and the United States (3%) within the same time period.

### TOTAL POPULATION THROUGH 2013

**Table 1. Population in San Diego County, California, and the U.S. from 2009-2013**

Area	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	% Change 2009 - 2013
San Diego County	3,064,436	3,095,313	3,115,810	3,128,734	3,150,178	2.80%
California	36,966,713	37,253,956	37,427,946	37,668,804	37,966,471	2.70%
United States	307,006,550	308,745,538	311,582,564	313,873,865	316,128,839	2.97%

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2001-2010, with 2000 & 2010 Census Counts. Sacramento, California, November 2012; State of California, Department of Finance, E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2013, with 2010 Census Benchmark. Sacramento, California, May 2013; U.S. Bureau of the Census.

### COMMUNITY LEVEL POPULATION CENSUS 2000 AND 2010

At the community level, the District assigned zip-codes showed that the greatest increase in population between the 2000 and 2010 census was 92131 and 92122 (23% & 24%, respectively). The actual zip code service area within Miramar College showed a similar trend. Overall, there was a 4% population increase for actual Miramar College zip code service area and a 10% population increase for District assigned zip-codes between the 2000 and 2010 census.

**Table 2.1. Population for Miramar College District Assigned Zip Codes -Census 2000 and 2010**

Service Area Zipcode (Assigned)	2000	2010	% Change 2000 - 2010
92126	74,388	73,037	-1.82%
92131	28,010	34,326	22.55%
92122	34,891	43,382	24.34%
92121	3,828	4,253	11.10%
Total	141,117	154,998	9.84%

Source: SANDAG, Current Estimates, September 2012.

Note: Zip code 92145 (MCAS Miramar) is a district assigned zip-code that has been omitted from analyses due to unreliable population size

**Table 2.2. Population for Miramar College Actual Zip Codes Served-Census 2000 and 2010**

Service Area Zipcode (Actual)	2000	2010	% Change 2000 - 2010
92126	74,388	73,037	-1.82%
92129	49,620	51,208	3.20%
92064	48,104	47,904	-0.42%
92131	28,010	34,326	22.55%
92128	43,670	47,393	8.53%
Total	243,792	253,868	4.13%

Source: SANDAG, Current Estimates, September 2012.

### TOTAL POPULATION: CHANGES TO THE YEAR 2050

San Diego County is expected to grow 28% between 2010 and 2050. This projected change for San Diego County is less than the projected change for both California (35%) and the United States (42%) within the same time period.

### Total Population: Changes to the Year 2050

**Table 3. Population Projections for San Diego County, California and the U.S. through 2050**

Area	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	Projected Change to 2050
San Diego County	3,102,745	3,333,995	3,530,896	3,749,240	3,969,663	27.94%
California	37,309,382	40,643,643	44,279,354	47,690,186	50,365,074	34.99%
United States	310,233,000	341,387,000	373,504,000	405,655,000	439,010,000	41.51%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, The Next Four Decade The Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050; State of California, Department of Finance, P-1 State and County Population Projections, July 1 2010-2060, Sacramento, California, January 2013.

### COMMUNITY LEVEL POPULATION: CHANGES TO THE YEAR 2050

At the community level, the District assigned zip-codes are all expected to grow (42% on average) between 2010 and 2050. The greatest projected growth is expected to occur in zip code 92126 (57% increase). The actual Miramar College zip code service area showed a similar trend. Overall, there is a 33% expected growth in population for the actual Miramar College zip code service area between the 2000 and 2010 census.

**Table 4.1. Population Changes for Miramar College District Assigned Zip Codes through 2050**

Service Area Zipcode (Assigned)	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	Projected Change to 2050
92126	73,037	86,502	108,718	113,128	114,737	57.09%
92131	34,326	36,123	36,688	37,673	38,984	13.57%
92122	43,382	51,636	52,251	57,475	60,319	39.04%
92121	4,253	4,938	5,012	5,676	6,314	48.46%
Total	154,998	179,199	202,669	213,952	220,354	42.17%

Source: Final Series 12-2050 Regional Growth Forecast, SANDAG, October 2011.

Note: Zip code 92145 (MCAS Miramar) is a district assigned zip-code that has been omitted from analyses due to unreliable population size

**Table 4.2. Population Changes for Miramar College Actual Zip Codes Served through 2050**

Service Area Zipcode (Actual)	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	Projected Change to 2050
92126	73,037	86,502	108,718	113,128	114,737	57.09%
92129	51,208	63,633	65,116	66,805	68,567	33.90%
92064	47,904	54,127	57,990	59,248	59,894	25.03%
92131	34,326	36,123	36,688	37,673	38,984	13.57%
92128	47,393	52,408	53,435	54,503	55,085	16.23%
Total	253,868	292,793	321,947	331,357	337,267	32.85%

Source: Final Series 12-2050 Regional Growth Forecast, SANDAG, October 2011.

## ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE TOTAL POPULATION CENSUS 2010

In 2010, both White (40%) and Asian/Pacific Islander (24%) ethnic groups comprised the largest proportions of the Miramar College student population. Both San Diego County and California displayed similar trends for Whites (48% & 40%, respectively). However, the Latino proportion of the population was second largest in the county and state (32% & 38%, respectively) relative to the Latino proportion of the Miramar College student population (18%).

### ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE TOTAL POPULATION CENSUS 2010

**Table 5.1 Proportions of the Population by Ethnicity in San Diego County and California: Census 2010**

Area	African American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Latino	American Indian/Alaskan Native	White	Other	Unreported	Total
Miramar College	734	2,994	2,292	93	4,988	587	802	12,490
San Diego County	148,728	347,334	999,392	14,121	1,501,675	N/A	91,494	3,102,745
California	2,188,296	4,958,854	14,057,596	163,040	15,024,945	N/A	916,651	37,309,382

Source: San Diego Community College District Office of Institutional Research and Planning Fact Book 2012; State of California, Department of Finance, P-1 State and County Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity, July 1 2010-2060, Sacramento, California, January 2013.

*Note. Miramar College Asian/Pacific Islander category includes Filipino headcount.*

**Table 5.2 Proportions of the Population in Percentage by Ethnicity in San Diego County and California: Census 2010**

Area	African American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Latino	American Indian/Alaskan Native	White	Other	Unreported	Total
Miramar College	5.88%	23.97%	18.35%	0.74%	39.94%	4.70%	6.42%	100.00%
San Diego County	4.79%	11.19%	32.21%	0.46%	48.40%	N/A	2.95%	100.00%
California	5.87%	13.29%	37.68%	0.44%	40.27%	N/A	2.46%	100.00%

Source: San Diego Community College District Office of Institutional Research and Planning Fact Book 2012; State of California, Department of Finance, P-1 State and County Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity, July 1 2010-2060, Sacramento, California, January 2013.



Across both District assigned and actual zip codes served, Asian/Pacific Islander and White populations account for the greatest proportion of ethnic groups within the Miramar College service area. In particular, the majority come from zip code 92126.

**Table 6.1.1 Miramar College Community Population by Ethnicity for District Assigned Zip Codes: Census 2010**

Service Area Zipcode (Assigned)	African American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Latino	American Indian/Alaskan Native	White	Other	Total
92126	3,153	32,110	10,157	197	23,761	3,659	73,037
92131	766	7,693	2,925	76	21,398	1,468	34,326
92122	635	13,393	4,083	56	23,612	1,603	43,382
92121	60	1,430	411	4	2,172	176	4,253
Total	4,614	54,626	17,576	333	70,945	6,906	155,000

Source: SANDAG, Current Estimates, September 2012.

Note: Zip code 92145 (MCAS Miramar) is a district assigned zip-code that has been omitted from analyses due to unreliable population size

**Table 6.1.2 Miramar College Community Population in Percentage by Ethnicity for District Assigned Zip Codes: Census 2010**

Service Area Zipcode (Assigned)	African American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Latino	American Indian/Alaskan Native	White	Other	Total
92126	4.32%	43.96%	13.91%	0.27%	32.53%	5.01%	100.00%
92131	2.23%	22.41%	8.52%	0.22%	62.34%	4.28%	100.00%
92122	1.46%	30.87%	9.41%	0.13%	54.43%	3.70%	100.00%
92121	1.41%	33.62%	9.66%	0.09%	51.07%	4.14%	100.00%
Total	2.98%	35.24%	11.34%	0.21%	45.77%	4.46%	100.00%

Source: SANDAG, Current Estimates, September 2012.

Note: Zip code 92145 (MCAS Miramar) is a district assigned zip-code that has been omitted from analyses due to unreliable population size

**Table 6.2.1 Miramar College Community Population by Ethnicity for Actual Area Zip Codes Served: Census 2010**

Service Area Zipcode (Actual)	African American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Latino	American Indian/Alaskan Native	White	Other	Total
92126	3,153	32,110	10,157	197	23,761	3,659	73,037
92129	1,269	15,586	5,077	92	26,566	2,618	51,208
92064	725	4,867	7,513	149	33,101	1,549	47,904
92131	766	7,693	2,925	76	21,398	1,468	34,326
92128	1,047	10,172	4,007	90	30,300	1,777	47,393
Total	6,960	70,428	29,679	604	135,126	11,071	253,868

Source: SANDAG, Current Estimates, September 2012.

**Table 6.2.2 Miramar College Community Population in Percentage by Ethnicity for Actual Area Zip Codes Served: Census 2010**

Service Area Zipcode (Actual)	African American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Latino	American Indian/Alaskan Native	White	Other	Total
92126	4.32%	43.96%	13.91%	0.27%	32.53%	5.01%	100.00%
92129	2.48%	30.44%	9.91%	0.18%	51.88%	5.11%	100.00%
92064	1.51%	10.16%	15.68%	0.31%	69.10%	3.23%	100.00%
92131	2.23%	22.41%	8.52%	0.22%	62.34%	4.28%	100.00%
92128	2.21%	21.46%	8.45%	0.19%	63.93%	3.75%	100.00%
Total	2.74%	27.74%	11.69%	0.24%	53.23%	4.36%	100.00%

Source: SANDAG, Current Estimates, September 2012.

## CHANGES IN THE ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE TOTAL POPULATION THROUGH 2050

The Latino population is projected to increase from 32% in 2010 to 43% in 2050 within San Diego County. In contrast, the White population is projected to decrease from 48% in 2010 to 37% in 2050 within San Diego County. California State shows a similar trend. In particular, the Latino population is expected to increase from 38% in 2010 to 47% in 2050. The White population is expected to decrease from 40% in 2010 to 31% on 2050.

## CHANGES IN THE ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE TOTAL POPULATION THROUGH 2050

**Tables 7.1 Projected Population by Ethnicity in San Diego County and California through 2050**

		African American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Latino	American Indian/Alaskan Native	White	Unreported	Total
San Diego County	2010	148,728	347,334	999,392	14,121	1,501,675	91,494	3,102,745
	2020	146,833	389,908	1,177,297	15,174	1,486,731	118,053	3,333,995
	2030	148,221	419,796	1,342,175	15,518	1,462,254	142,932	3,530,896
	2040	150,909	440,923	1,521,124	15,868	1,459,608	160,807	3,749,240
	2050	149,727	453,421	1,698,127	16,006	1,480,776	171,608	3,969,663
California	2010	2,188,296	4,958,854	14,057,596	163,040	15,024,945	916,651	37,309,382
	2020	2,258,934	5,584,041	16,573,840	175,465	14,877,111	1,174,252	40,643,643
	2030	2,341,428	6,196,025	19,020,889	182,307	15,107,321	1,431,384	44,279,354
	2040	2,386,806	6,679,413	21,446,262	186,492	15,328,584	1,662,630	47,690,186
	2050	2,350,153	7,011,109	23,512,393	186,818	15,460,624	1,843,977	50,365,074

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, P-1 State and County Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity, July 1 2010-2060, Sacramento, California, January 2013.

**Tables 7.2 Projected Population in Percentage by Ethnicity in San Diego County and California through 2050**

		African American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Latino	American Indian/Alaskan Native	White	Unreported	Total
San Diego County	2010	4.79%	11.19%	32.21%	0.46%	48.40%	2.95%	100.00%
	2020	4.40%	11.69%	35.31%	0.46%	44.59%	3.54%	100.00%
	2030	4.20%	11.89%	38.01%	0.44%	41.41%	4.05%	100.00%
	2040	4.03%	11.76%	40.57%	0.42%	38.93%	4.29%	100.00%
	2050	3.77%	11.42%	42.78%	0.40%	37.30%	4.32%	100.00%
California	2010	5.87%	13.29%	37.68%	0.44%	40.27%	2.46%	100.00%
	2020	5.56%	13.74%	40.78%	0.43%	36.60%	2.89%	100.00%
	2030	5.29%	13.99%	42.96%	0.41%	34.12%	3.23%	100.00%
	2040	5.00%	14.01%	44.97%	0.39%	32.14%	3.49%	100.00%
	2050	4.67%	13.92%	46.68%	0.37%	30.70%	3.66%	100.00%

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, P-1 State and County Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity, July 1 2010-2060, Sacramento, California, January 2013.

## SECTION II. EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

### SCHOOL AGE POPULATION: CHANGES THROUGH 2012-13

Public school enrollments for San Diego County and California remained relatively stable between 2008/09 and 2012/13. The public school enrollment projections for San Diego County and California also look stable between 2013/14 and 2017/18.

Enrollments for Poway Unified School District displayed a 6% increase between 2008/09 and 2012/13. San Diego Unified School District showed a 1.5% decrease during the same time period.

**Table 8. Public School Enrollment in San Diego County and California, 2008-2009 to 2012-2013**

	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	% Change 2008 - 2013
San Diego County	496,702	496,918	497,916	498,003	499,850	0.63%
California	6,252,031	6,192,121	6,217,002	6,220,993	6,226,989	-0.40%

Source: State of California, Department of Education, Data Quest (<http://dq.cde.gov/dataquest/>).

**Table 9. Public School Enrollment Projections for San Diego County and California to 2017-2018**

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	% Change 2013-2018
San Diego County	501,924	501,927	503,525	503,821	504,575	0.53%
California	6,240,603	6,234,415	6,228,343	6,221,940	6,225,098	-0.25%

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, California Public K-12 Graded enrollment and High School Graduate Projections by County, 2012 Series, Sacramento, California, November 2012.

**Table 10. Public School Enrollment in Miramar College Feeder High School Districts, 2008-2009 to 2012-2013**

	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	% Change 2008 - 2013
Poway	33,305	33,797	34,135	34,569	35,196	5.68%
San Diego Unified	132,256	131,417	131,784	131,016	130,270	-1.50%

Source: State of California, Department of Education, Data Quest (<http://dq.cde.gov/dataquest/>).

## ACADEMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC INDICATORS

**Table 11.1. Miramar College District Assigned Feeder High Schools by Ethnicity**

School	African American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Latino	American Indian/Alaskan Native	White	Other	Two or More Races	Total
Mira Mesa High	163	1,246	537	6	410	1	211	2,574
Scripps Ranch High	124	626	386	6	991	0	139	2,272
University City High	112	320	622	3	675	2	99	1,833
Serra High	193	253	831	7	535	2	106	1,927

Source: State of California, Department of Education, Data Quest (<http://dq.cde.gov/dataquest/>).

**Table 11.2. Miramar College District Assigned Feeder High Schools in Percentage by Ethnicity**

School	African American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Latino	American Indian/Alaskan Native	White	Other	Two or More Races	Total
Mira Mesa High	6.33%	48.41%	20.86%	0.23%	15.93%	0.04%	8.20%	100.00%
Scripps Ranch High	5.46%	27.55%	16.99%	0.26%	43.92%	0.00%	6.12%	100.00%
University City High	6.11%	17.16%	33.93%	0.16%	36.82%	0.11%	5.40%	100.00%
Serra High	10.02%	13.13%	43.12%	0.36%	27.76%	0.10%	5.50%	100.00%

Source: State of California, Department of Education, Data Quest (<http://dq.cde.gov/dataquest/>).

Mira Mesa high school had the greatest amount of graduates in 2011/12 academic year (593) relative to other district assigned feeder high schools. Scripps Ranch high school (70%) displayed the highest UC/CSU eligibility rate relative to the other district assigned feeder high schools.

**Table 12. Miramar College District Assigned Feeder High Schools: Academic Indicators**

School	2012 API Base	2013 API Growth	Graduates (2012-13)	UC/CSU Eligible (2012-13)	To UC/CSU Eligible (%)	Dropouts (2012-13)	1 Yr Drop Rate (2012-13)
Mira Mesa High	860	846	593	318	54%	6	0.2
Scripps Ranch High	900	914	531	373	70%	1	0.0
University City High	N/A	N/A	416	246	59%	5	0.3
Serra High	772	781	365	164	45%	3	0.1

Source: State of California, Department of Education, Data Quest (<http://dq.cde.gov/dataquest/>).

## **TRANSFER INFLUENCE**

Being located within San Diego State University's service area often leads to out-of-area students either starting off their education at Miramar College or transferring from other colleges to finish their education at Miramar College. Specifically, the development of Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT's) could impact how students are selecting their educational pathway. In addition, development of agreements such as Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAG), Memorandum of understanding (MOU), could also impact enrollment at Miramar College. There is also a need to watch for legislation that could impact "transfer" as well.

DRAFT

### SECTION III. ECONOMIC TRENDS

#### THE EMPLOYMENT BASE

Civilian labor force increased 3.4% between 2009 and 2013. In particular, the employed labor force increased nearly 6%, while the unemployed labor force decreased 20% between the same time period. The unemployment rate displayed a decreasing trend from 2009 to 2013.

**Table 13. Civilian Labor Force, Employment, and Unemployment for San Diego County**

Measures	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	% Change 2009-2013
Civilian Labor Force	1,554,900	1,574,100	1,582,200	1,599,200	1,608,300	3.43%
Employed	1,405,600	1,408,200	1,423,500	1,456,300	1,488,700	5.91%
Unemployed	149,300	165,900	158,700	142,800	119,500	-19.96%
Unemployment Percent	9.60%	10.53%	10.03%	8.93%	7.40%	N/A

Source: California Employment Development Department

The industry that showed the greatest increase in employment between 2012 and 2013 was construction (4%). The industry that displayed the greatest decrease in employment between 2012 and 2013 was information (about 1%). Overall, there was a 1% increase in industrial employment within the same time period.

**Table 14. Employment by Industry in San Diego County: 2012 and 2013**

Industry	August 2012	August 2013	Difference	% Change
Mining and Logging	400	400	0	0.00%
Construction	57,600	60,100	2,500	4.34%
Manufacturing	94,300	91,600	-2,700	-2.86%
Trade, Transportation & Utilities	206,800	209,700	2,900	1.40%
Information	24,700	24,500	-200	-0.81%
Financial Activities	70,700	71,200	500	0.71%
Professional & Business Services	217,800	221,300	3,500	1.61%
Educational & Health Services	152,900	157,500	4,600	3.01%
Leisure & Hospitality	169,500	170,900	1,400	0.83%
Other Services	49,800	49,900	100	0.20%
Government	218,500	217,800	-700	-0.32%
Total	1,263,000	1,274,900	11,900	0.94%

Source: California Employment Development Department

Registered nursing is the top San Diego County occupation which requires an associate degree or post-secondary vocational training and is projected to grow approximately 18%, from 20,940 in 2010 to 24,850 in 2020. The occupation with the greatest projected growth between 2010 and 2020 is manicurists and pedicurists (33%). The occupation with the least projected growth between 2010 and 2020 is first-line supervisors of production and operating workers (3.6%).



**Table 15. Projected Growth in Top 10 San Diego County Occupations Requiring an Associate Degree or Post-Secondary Vocational Training**

Occupation	2010	2020	Difference	% Change
Registered Nurses	20,940	24,850	3,910	18.67%
General and Operations Managers	20,580	22,620	2,040	9.91%
Nursing Aides, Orderlies, and Attendants	8,710	10,630	1,920	22.04%
Construction Managers	6,170	7,270	1,100	17.83%
Licensed Practical and Licensed Vocational Nurses	5,350	6,490	1,140	21.31%
Hairdressers, Hairstylists, and Cosmetologists	4,550	6,000	1,450	31.87%
First-Line Supervisors of Production and Operating Workers	4,210	4,360	150	3.56%
Preschool Teachers, Except Special Education	4,130	4,600	470	11.38%
Dental Assistants	3,660	4,170	510	13.93%
Manicurists and Pedicurists	3,330	4,440	1,110	33.33%

Source: California Employment Development Department

Note. Top 10 occupations are based on 2010 data. Additional CA labor market information is available at <http://www.coeccc.net>

Teaching is the top San Diego County occupation which requires a four-year degree and is projected to grow approximately 12%, from 16,620 in 2010 to 18,600 in 2020. The occupation with the greatest projected growth between 2010 and 2020 is market research analysts and market specialists (50%). The occupation with the least projected growth between 2010 and 2020 is secondary school teacher (6.6%).

Occupation	2010	2016	Difference	% Change
Teachers and Instructors, All Other	16,620	18,600	1,980	11.91%
Accountants and Auditors	11,120	13,360	2,240	20.14%
Management Analysts	9,160	11,520	2,360	25.76%
Software Developers, Applications	8,630	11,240	2,610	30.24%
Secondary School Teachers, Except Special and Career/Technical Education	8,470	9,030	560	6.61%
Elementary School Teachers, Except Special Education	7,400	7,890	490	6.62%
Software Developers, Systems Software	5,950	8,230	2,280	38.32%
Financial Managers	5,450	6,400	950	17.43%
Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists	4,840	7,250	2,410	49.79%
Recreation Workers	4,760	5,610	850	17.86%

Source: California Employment Development Department

Note. Top 10 occupations are based on 2010 data. Additional CA labor market information is available at <http://www.coeccc.net>

## SECTION IV. POLITICAL AND SOCIAL TRENDS IMPACTING MIRAMAR COLLEGE

### Importance of Monitoring Political and Social Trends

National, state and local level initiatives and priorities in the political, fiscal, and social arenas greatly influence direction setting for Miramar College. There are several key issues which are likely to impact local policy. These include issues related to: accountability, accreditation, budget, enrollment management, general enrollment growth as it relates to facilities planning, and future trends such as granting 4-year degrees in community colleges and Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs).

### Accountability

To date accountability remains a top priority for California, particularly at the system office and legislature. The Student Success Task force (SSTF) recommended the implementation of a new accountability framework, which would be built on the existing reporting system, the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC). As a result, the Student Success Scorecard was implemented in 2012/13 which serves as a performance measurement system intended for colleges, districts, and the public to track student progress and success, and to help inform quality improvement efforts (California Community College Chancellor's Office, 2013).

The Student Success Scorecard is a four-tiered accountability framework, where each level targets a different audience or user. The first level provides a high level overview for legislators and policy makers which summarize a number of system level aggregations of data and annual performance. The second level (scorecard itself) measures progress and completion at each college for various demographic groups of students which include those with different levels of college preparation. Level two is the core of the framework which takes into account many of the SSTF recommendations. The third level is the ability to drill down into the scorecard metrics through the existing State Chancellor's Office Datamart online query tool. The fourth level is the most detailed and allows researchers to download datasets (via Data-on-Demand) pertaining to each metric for their particular college (California Community College Chancellor's Office, 2013).

### Accreditation

Currently, Accrediting Commission for the Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) is undergoing draft revisions to their Standards in efforts to move colleges toward increased emphasis on student learning and achievement, streamline the structure of the standards, emphasize institutional transparency in data driven decision-making, among other guiding questions (Accrediting Commission for the Community and Junior Colleges, WASC, 2013).

Proposed changes to the Standards include the following:

- A) Operational changes to Standard 1
  - 1) Now features three sections (Mission, Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Institutional Integrity).
  - 2) Section on Mission has expanded which includes the foundation role mission plays in defining a college.

- 3) Academic Quality has been singled out as a subsection.
  - 4) Institutional Integrity is now a separate section.
- B) Operational changes to Standard 2
- 1) Has two major subsections (Instructional Programs, and Student Support and Library and Learning Resources):
    - a. Instructional Programs section delineates responsibilities and expectations for assuring academic quality and sets expectations for degree requirements.
    - b. Student Support and Library and Learning Resources defines expectation affecting co-curricular programs and athletics, and defines expectations for academic advising and student pathways to completion.
- C) Operational changes to Standard 3
- 1) Maintains four sections (Human Resources, Physical Resources, Technology Resources, and Financial Resources).
  - 2) Human Resource section define expectations for qualifications for all personnel who have responsibility for academic quality.
- D) Operational changes to Standard 4
- 1) Standard now has four sections (Decision-Making Roles and Processes, Chief Executive Officer, Governing Board, Multi-College District and Systems).
  - 2) Defines specific expectations for delineation and distinction of roles and responsibilities in governance.
  - 3) Section on Multi-College Districts or Systems defines specific expectation for the functional relationship between a district or system and a college.

## **Budget**

For the past five years California has faced a budget crisis that has negatively impacted higher education. In particular, the San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) has lost a total of 33 million which has resulted in cuts to both instruction and student services. As a response to this problem, California voters passed Proposition 30 in November 2012. With the implementation of this proposition, SDCCD has received funds to help offset its 33 million dollar loss. With the new revenue, SDCCD was able to add a significant amount of class sections. The new sections will serve 15,000 additional students in the 2013-14 academic year. Furthermore, new full-time faculty members will be added throughout the year to meet student need as well as plans to partially reinstate summer sessions beginning in 2014 (SDCCD Press Release, 2013). Projections for the next several years indicate that as the state budget begins to stabilize as a result of Proposition 30, SDCCD will be able to rebuild in the future as more funds become available over time.

## **Enrollment Management**

### **Student Success Act (SB 1456)**

The Student Success Act of 2012 was established to implement the recommendations of the Student Success Task force (SSTF) along 8 focus areas: 1) Increase college and career readiness, 2) Strengthen support for entering students, 3) Incentivize successful student behaviors, 4) Align course offerings to meet student needs, 5) Improve education of basic skills students, 6) Revitalize and re-envision professional development, 7) Enable efficient statewide leadership and increase coordination among colleges, and 8) Align resources with student success recommendations (Academic Senate Presentation, 2013).

To date, the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) has been implemented across the state. SSSP is meant to re-purpose and re-focus matriculation on core services such as orientation, assessment, and counseling/advising to assist students in developing education plans. In particular, of the \$ 2,978,736 SSSP funds coming to the SDCCD, Miramar College will receive \$ 723,290 in 2013-14 to implement these services in efforts to improve student success (SDCCD Press Release, 2013).

### **Associate Degree for Transfer (SB 1440)**

In 2011, a joint initiative by the California Community Colleges (CCC) and California State University (CSU) was implemented with the goal of simplifying and streamlining the transfer process between the two systems. This new initiative allows for community college students who complete an associate degree designated for transfer to receive guaranteed admission to the CSU system with junior status and are given priority consideration when applying to their local CSU campus.

Both systems have worked collaboratively to approve a framework for associate degrees for transfer open to community college students willing to participate in the program. In particular, Miramar College has approved the following associate degrees for transfer: Administration of Justice, Anthropology, Communication Studies, History, Kinesiology, Mathematics, Physics, and Sociology (California Community College Chancellor's Office, 2013) Furthermore, the following programs are currently going through the approval process: Art History, Business Administration, English, Philosophy, Political Science, Spanish, and Studio Arts.

## **Enrollment Growth and Facilities Planning**

Projections indicate that Miramar College will face a growing student population over the next decade. To help accommodate this growth, voter-approved bond measures (Propositions S and N) are providing new construction and renovation projects throughout the district. In particular, Miramar College has 24 construction projects that are either currently completed, in construction, or in design. This includes eight new instructional and career training facilities, five major renovations, parking facilities, public safety enhancements, numerous infrastructure projects and new campus support and operational facilities. Most recently Miramar College

completed the Heavy Duty Advanced Transportation Technology (Diesel) project and the Student Services Center which houses student support services such as admissions, counseling, transfer center, EOPS, and financial aid. Future projects include the new Fire Science and EMT Training Facility, Science Building Renovation/Addition, and new Facilities for CE in the renovated A-100 Building.

## **Future Trends**

### **Granting 4-year degrees in community colleges (SB 850)**

Currently there is a push in California for the California Community College system to offer baccalaureate degrees in specialized fields of studies due to the impacted enrollments at local universities. This concept has been endorsed by the chief executive officers of the San Diego and Imperial Counties Community Colleges Associates (SDICCCA). Furthermore, there are plans to author state legislation which would require the amendment of California's Master Plan of Higher Education (SDCCD Press Release, 2013).

Twenty-two other states already offer baccalaureate degrees as their community colleges which serve as a basis for the proposal in California. In fact, the California Community Colleges State Chancellor's Office has convened a study group of representatives from higher education to study the matter and is expected to issue a final report in early 2014.

CTE areas will most likely be potentially impacted (e.g., automotive, nursing, and Administrative of Justice).

### **Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)**

In recent years there has been a trend in delivering education by using a new platform called Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). Given this new platform there was a need within our district to examine this phenomenon. Therefore, the Chancellor, in consultation with District Governance Council, convened a task force to examine the merits and applicability of MOOCs within our district (SDCCD MOOC's Taskforce Report Update, 2014). In all, the task force affirms the faculty-driven local curriculum development and approval process is well established at each respective SDCCD institution and at the district.

## **Importance of These Political and Social Trends**

These social and political trends are likely to have an important influence on setting the policy agenda for Miramar College for the upcoming year and beyond. All have important implications for budget planning, program planning, research, evaluation and communication across the college and with the large community of which it is an integral part.

Review of Educational Master Plan for Discussion at PIEC February 2014 (Draft)

<b>Divisional Plan</b>	<b>Status/Comment</b>	<b>Next Update Due/Comment</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Status as of 2/21/14</b>
Instructional Services	Last annual updated 2012/13	Update of the 3-year plan (Fall 2014-Spring 2017)	VPI	In progress-review format of plan
Student Services	Last annual updated 2012/13	Update of the 3-year plan (Fall 2014-Spring 2017)	VPSS	In progress- review format of plan
Administrative Services	Last annual updated 2012/13	Update of the 3-year plan (Fall 2014-Spring 2017)	VPA	In progress- review format of plan

Draft – Review of Operational Plans for Discussion at PIEC **February 2014**

Operational Plans	Status/Comment	Next Update Due/Comment	Responsible Party	Status as of 2/21/14
Human Resources	Updated 7/12/12	July 2015	VPA	N/A
Technology	2010-13	Now	Dean, PRIE, Lib & Tech	Initial review by Tech comm on 2/25 for update
Marketing & Outreach Plan	2006-12	Now	PIO	Ready to go to constituency groups for review
Matriculation Plan	Committee recommended suspension of update / revision on 5/2/12; on 10/15/12 decided to extend suspension and to revisit in late spring 2013 pending State guidance	Now (in progress)	VPSS	Updated 1/13/14; out for circulation approval on 1/21/14.
Student Equity Plan	Updated 12/2012 (draft); Update to be submitted Nov. 2013	Now (in progress)	VPSS/Dean of Student Affairs	In circulation for review.
Basic Skills Plan	Updated 2012-13	Spring 2014	Dean Lib Arts	In Progress
Career & Technical Education Plan	Updated April 2013	April 2014	Dean, BTCWI	In Progress
Student Learning Outcome (SLO )Plan	Last updated March 2013	?	SLO Facilitator	? PIEC co-chairs to review
<del>Student Services SLO Plan</del>	<del>Updated annually PIEC co-chairs to review</del>	<del>Now</del>	<del>VPSS/ Student Services/PRSLCAG Sub-comm</del>	<del>? PIEC co-chairs to review</del>
Cultural and Ethnic Diversity Plan	Reviewed annually	?	Diversity Committee	Email co-chairs to find out status
Facilities Plan	Identified goals for this year	?	VPA/Facilities Comm	Goal is to update this term