



SAN DIEGO MIRAMAR COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

J-225

Tuesday, February 14, 2012

1:00 – 2:00 P.M.

Members: Hsieh, Bell, Buckley, Figueroa, Harrison, Bohm, Conrad, Allen, and Hubbard

Attendees: Trevisan, Jacobson, Woods and Schwarz

- 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	Update on Oct 2012 Accreditation Follow Up Report	1	Hsieh
2	City & Mesa’s Self-Study Section III.A.1.C.	1	Hsieh
3	College Governance Changes to PIEC & BRDS – Sign-off	5	Figueroa
4	Civility & Mutual Respect Policy	1	Figueroa
5	BRDS Recommendations for Funding RFF’s	5	Figueroa

F. Old Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Initiator

G. Reports

(Please limit each following report to two minutes maximum. If you have any handouts, Please e-mail them to Sara Agonafer 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

H. Announcements:

I. Adjourn

*** San Diego Miramar College 2007 – 2013 Strategic Goals**

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

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

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*

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

Goal 5: *Refine the college’s integrated planning process*

Please also see <http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/plan> for San Diego Miramar College 2007-2013 Strategic Plan Folders

DART 2012 Accreditation Follow-Up Report Timelines as of 02102012

Date	Task
Th. April 19, 2012	Editor send Draft 1 to College ALO and Faculty Self-Study Co-Chair
Wed. April 25, 2012	Post Draft 2 on College Accreditation Website for Review
Tues. May 2, 2012	Public Forum M110 3:30-5:00 Academic Senate
Mon. May 7, 2012	Draft 3 to Recommendation Committee Leads
Wed. May 16, 2012	Draft 4 to Recommendation Committee Leads
Fri. May 25, 2012	Post Draft as of May 26, 2011 on College Accreditation Website for general comments
Th. June 20, 2012	Feedback to Editor, ALO and Linda Woods.
August 10, 2012	Report Cover created by PIO office
Mon. August 13, 2012	Post Final Report in its entirety for Review on College Website and share with Board Members and Chancellor Cabinet
Tues. August 28, 2012 (3:30-5:00pm, Rm M-110)	Adoption of Final Accreditation Follow-Up Report by Academic Senate
?	Adoption of Final Accreditation Follow-Up Report by Classified Senate
?	Adoption of Final Accreditation Follow-Up Report by Associate Student Council
Tues. September 4, 2012	Adoption of Final Accreditation Follow-Up Report by College Executive Committee
Tues. September 4, 2012	Final Agenda Item Deadline for Sept. 22 Board Meeting
Thurs. September 20, 2012	Adoption of Final Accreditation Follow-Up Report by Board Member at Board Meeting
	Joan Mize/Sandi Trav Production Cover.
Mon. October 15, 2012	Final Accreditation Follow-Up Report due to ACCJC

Questions for ACCJC/WASC Leadership:
DRAFT
2/10/12

What type of evidence would be acceptable by October 2012 to demonstrate adequate capacity for a culture of evidence that supports planning processes, resource allocation, and evaluation of institutional effectiveness?

- A. Will evaluation of our planning process at the completion of this academic year satisfy 2010 Recommendation 1?

What, specifically, is acceptable to the commission as evidence of compliance with standard III.A.1.c., related to modifying faculty evaluations to include a component addressing student learning outcomes?

- A. Does an evaluation instrument that tests the participation of a faculty member in the student learning outcome and assessment process meet this standard?
- B. Would language and evidence supplied by our sister colleges be adequate to prove compliance with this standard?
- C. Are all institutions in a multi college district held to the same interpretation of accreditation standards? What if they are not?
- D. What if ACCJC visiting site team findings and recommendations conflict within a multi college district?
- E. What does the commission recommend for institutions in multi college districts, governed by legally binding union contracts, that need to modify negotiated processes in order to comply with accreditation standards?

What type of evidence would be acceptable by October 2012 to demonstrate adequate stability of the college's administrative leadership?

If a college's integrated planning process includes a local master plan or plans projecting staffing needs, financial requirements, capital and supply needs does it comply with standard I.B.3. and standard III.?

Working Group Members

04 rec 4 integrated planning	10 rec 4 administrative turnover	10 rec 3 evaluation	10 rec 1 culture of evidence
Jerry Buckley	Daphne Figueroa	Farina Akhunzadah	Daniel Miramontez
Buran Haidar	Victor Bohm	Joyce Allen	Mike Dubose
Carol Smith	Susan Schwartz	Brett Bell	Buran Haidar
Alex DeRosa	Sam Shoostary	Joan Thompson	Terrie Hubbard
PIE			PR/SLOAC
			SS PR
			Research Committee

DRAFT Proposed District Policy: **Civility and Mutual Respect**

It is the policy of the San Diego Community College District to foster an environment which maximizes student learning and employee performance, and a climate of civility among all employees and students of the District.

As members of the San Diego Community College District community, we are expected to treat other community members with civility and respect, recognizing that disagreement and informed debate are valued in an academic community. Harassment by any student, employee, or Trustee, of any other student, employee, or Trustee for whatever motive is harmful to the environment desired by the District and therefore will not be permitted by the District.

Individuals covered by these policies include faculty, staff, managers, supervisors, students, and members of the Board of Trustees.

Unacceptable behaviors. Demeaning, intimidating, threatening, or physically or emotionally violent behaviors that affect the ability to learn or work in the District environment are not consonant with the standards of civility and respect as expected in the District and are unacceptable.

Retaliation. Retaliation for reporting violations of this policy, for seeking to have prohibited conduct corrected, or for participating in an investigation is prohibited.

Violation. A District community member who has violated this policy is subject to disciplinary action in accordance with established disciplinary procedures. A member of the Board of Trustees who has violated this policy is subject to public censure by the Board.

Restraining Order. Any District community member who has obtained a restraining order against another District community member is encouraged to provide a copy of the order to Campus Police for enforcement on campus.

Visitors. Visitors, vendors, and the families of students, staff, and faculty are expected to comply with the provisions of this policy. Noncompliant behavior may lead to removal from the campus.

This policy shall in no way be construed to restrict any type of constitutionally protected speech or activities.