

COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, February 6, 2018 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • K1-107

Members: Hsieh, Bell, Hopkins, Ramsey, McMahon, Murphy, Hubbard (absent), Allen, Bermodes, & Johnson

Attendees: Beitey, Barnard, Ascione, & Miramontez

Meeting called to order at 1:30pm

- A. **Approval of the Agenda:** Hsieh approves agenda, Bell seconds. Motion passes.
- B. **Approval of Previous Minutes:** Murphy moves to approve previous minutes with change in G. Old Business, #1. McMahon states that verbiage should say “the Academic Senate was very unlikely to agree with solution rather than “will not” agree with solution.” Bell seconds. Motion passes.
- C. **Guests/Introductions:** Grisham, Zhang, Morton, Padilla, Sacro, Teresh, Kjartanson, Warren. McMahon notes that this is an unusual format to meet in K-107 as opposed to president’s conference room. Hsieh reminds everyone that this is an open meeting and that at the Jan. 25 Guided Pathways Dialogue meeting she noted that this is an open meeting and wanted to accommodate all who wanted to attend.
- D. **Updates from the Chancellor’s Cabinet:** Hsieh says there are no major items to discuss. Hsieh’s office has sent out all the handouts via email for the entire college to see and if there any questions please direct them to her office.
- E. **New Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p>Academic Senate Guided Pathways Plan Proposal (attachment)</p> <p>McMahon displayed the document on the K-107 monitors and only page 1 was ever shown for the purposes of reminding CEC where this document was left at the end of Fall 2107 semester. The document was never discussed or reviewed. The purpose of the Academic Senate president placing these items on the agenda was to inquire about the next steps, since the GP Self-Assessment remained in an unresolved state. McMahon did not present anything-the document was projected, but only page 1 was shown and it was never discussed or reviewed. McMahon shared that this proposal was created in Academic Senate and approved by that constituency body. This proposal was then sent to the other constituency groups for input and feedback, following the governance process; however, there has been no feedback by the other constituency bodies who have received this proposal. This proposal was sent out in December 2017. McMahon stresses that this is a proposal for a plan to move forward and is the only plan proposed by any constituency group at this time. Hsieh comments that this plan was sent out on Dec. 12, 2017 at 6:14pm to all the constituency leaders only, but there were no formal meetings for the constituency groups to go over this proposal because of the end of the semester. Hsieh states that McMahon requested that this item be put on the agenda for the first CEC meeting of the spring 2018 semester. Hsieh states that this is an opportunity, if there is any feedback, for any constituency to share. Hsieh assumes that this is just an input process. Any feedback would be brought back to Academic Senate, the AS could entertain that feedback and then the AS can bring back to CEC. If there is no consensus then there will be a collegial consultation process which is the next step, according to the governance handbook. There will be only two votes needed which will be from the college president and AS president. Hsieh</p>	1, 2, & 3	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2020 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 2013-2020 Strategic Plan**

<p>asks if there is any feedback from the constituency groups. Allen addresses CEC with the concerns of the Classified Senate. Allen states that the CS just met to discuss this proposal recently during the spring semester and they have concerns about the proposal. CS is ready to help in any way since Guided Pathways will impact the entire college. The CS was very informed, but disappointed in the lack of collegiately they witnessed at the Jan. 25 Guided Pathways Dialogue session as it related to CS involvement and input. The CS is concerned that any decisions made on Guided Pathways would be made by only two main groups required to sign off on the document. The CS recommends that the College review existing plans and frameworks, building on existing structures and processes, and that this data can be used as platform toward Guided Pathways to create a collaboration proposal that will lead to student success and benefit all departments. The CS also recommended that the key elements with GP assessment be used as a guide to write a collaborative college wide proposal. The CS will send its recommended changes to the membership of the Academic Senate's GP proposed Steering Committee that was presented last semester. The CS was also concerned about the timeline. Allen will submit the draft of her statement to be included in the minutes once the document becomes final (see attachment).</p> <p>McMahon appreciates the concerns of the CS. McMahon points out that the Academic Senate's GP Proposal was never shared at the Jan. 25 Dialogue session, but rather the discussion was about the unresolved self-assessment tool. The primary goal of putting this proposal on the first CEC agenda of the spring semester is indicate where we are as a college with regard to these two items (the GP Self-Assessment, and the Academic Senate's GP proposal for a plan. All input is welcome. McMahon stresses that this is the only proposal currently on the table and it has been vetted by the AS and there is a limited timeline. Murphy points out that the AS did reach out and meet with the CS during the Fall 2017 semester to initiate dialogue on this proposal and vocalized the intent of the AS to work collaboratively with the CS. Murphy reminds that this proposal is not stating what GP is going to look like moving forward, but rather it is saying let's get a group together to evaluate where we are and where we want to go. Murphy wants to be very clear that while there was a discussion about the fact that two signatures are legally required for the document submission, there is still a desire and intent to have all constituencies provide input. The AS has never said that they did not want to have complete involvement by every constituency group. Padilla would like to see more CS representation on the Steering Committee, but not just any representation, rather representation of classified reps who will be more relevant in GP. McMahon asks for clarification and encourages the CS to forward names or designated titles of those they would like to see as members of the Steering Committee. Sacro adds that he'd like to see more classified involved in the process, but not just in support rolls. Sacro wants to know why the analyst was excluded from the proposal. McMahon responds that this proposal was created in the Academic Senate is perhaps</p>			
--	--	--	--

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2020 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 2013-2020 Strategic Plan

<p>seen currently as faculty heavy because it was created by the AS, but she stresses that this is by no means a dictate and is open to modification. It is not the intention of this proposal to exclude anyone. Murphy reminds that the CS has voiced concern to the AS about being able to find enough classified that are able and allowed to fill spots on all governance committees as it is. Bermodes states that the Associated Students were not involved. Bermodes went on to read a statement on behalf of the students, it read:</p> <p>Thank you for inviting ASG members to the Guided Pathway Dialogue. We understand there are differing opinions regarding the Assessment Tool, but we support moving forward with the planning and implementation of Guided Pathways. The Assessment tool was only an instrument to measure Miramar’s foundation. It is important to use that tool only for means of moving forward. Please know that ASG is committed to working with the entire campus in developing this program. We will continue to participate in these conversations as they occur in the current shared governance structure. Over the past semester we have learned that this structure works and it allows us to stay informed. This shared governance structure has provided us with a way to contribute to the planning and implementation of many Campus Initiatives such as Guided Pathways. Adding another committee or workforce only contributes to the daily workload we already have. As students, we balance life, work, family and etc, all the while trying to better ourselves and attend school. We believe that the shared governance structure is beneficial allowing us to effectively manage our time and efficiently use resources we currently have. At this time, ASG would also like it to be noted, that Guided Pathways is structured to be a “Student” focused program which enhances the “Student” experience and such, the participation of “Students” in the development of this plan is critical to its’ success. The continued opposing dialogues only prolongs the process and implementation of Guided Pathways. In the meantime, students’ success and experience is hindered. We as students appreciate that our voice is considered in the framework of Guided Pathways. The Associated Student Government of Miramar College encourages more student focus groups and involvement in the current committees. This allows us to give continued and current feedback. Also allowing us to take responsibility in our education and a sense of ownership therefore, enhancing our student experience at Miramar. This campus is growing and constantly evolving with every semester of new students. It’s is essential that our vision is kept in mind as we move forward. The implementation of Guided Pathways requires all sides and perspectives to work collaboratively toward this common goal. McMahon thanked ASG president Bermodes for expressing this, and for pointing out that shared governance committees are indeed very effective. McMahon indicated, however, that we need to be aware of the distinction between shared governance committees and constituency bodies – as they are different. Shared governance committees are often very specific in their goals and composition, with distinct charges and roles. These</p>			
---	--	--	--

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2020 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 2013-2020 Strategic Plan

<p>committees then send their recommendations up to the to the constituency groups for vetting. This is important and works as a system of checks and balances. The important aspect all of this is that it is binding by law that the AS and administrative bodies come to an agreement on 10+1 issues. Murphy states that it would have been better to have this vetting process with the all shared governance groups happen in the fall prior to it being rolled out to the college. Both McMahon and Murphy relate that they appreciate and applaud the voice of the students and want them to be involved in this process. McMahon states that AS wanted the College to come to a single vision in regards to the self-assessment tool prior to the College convening a “Dialogue” about Guided Pathways on Jan. 25. Hsieh comments that normally with the college’s process that should have happened, but the finalized AS assessment tool wasn’t sent to the college president until Dec. 15 in the afternoon-the last day of the fall semester. There was no more meetings left for the semester for the ASG, CS or managers to discuss, therefore, Hsieh went to the AS senate meeting, to propose that in the spring, the college have an open discussion with the entire college. McMahon states that AS officially presented it feedback on the GP Self-Assessment Document to CEC on Dec. 12th, 2017. Hsieh attended the AS exec meeting later that afternoon. McMahon pointed out that Hsieh was reminded at that meeting that there was still time for the Administrative constituency to hold an emergency meeting in order to come to an agreement about the GP Self-Assessment document. That was not agreed to by Hsieh. Hsieh states the reason she did not agree was because the CS and ASG never had the chance to have input. Bell speaks on behalf of the managers and states that the managers got together and took the AS proposal and looked at how the college could use its existing college governance structure to accomplish the majority of the tasks that have been identified in the proposal for the Steering committee (see attachment). The managers propose that the guidance of the GP planning be accomplished by PIEC. Anything that comes out of PIEC then goes to the constituency groups and then goes to CEC. There was a comment in the proposal from AS to allow for a review of national and state guided GP. The management agrees that there should be a venue for that and the management suggests that the research sub-committee be that venue. Anything coming out of the research sub-committee should go to PIEC. PIEC should provide input about national and state GP to the constituent groups and that review then returns to CEC for final vetting. The management agrees that the use of external consultants to explore collaboration will be needed in the future and management believes that the identification of external consultants should be made at the design group level or at functional group or campus governance group level and what the goals and the outcomes of an external consultant would be. The request would come from either a governance or functional group to PIEC, and then to constituency groups for review and to president’s cabinet for final approval. Management agrees that there should be a draft plan. McMahon asks that this be wrapped up soon since there</p>			
---	--	--	--

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2020 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 2013-2020 Strategic Plan**

	are 22 slides. Bell continues, but McMahon suggests this be sent AS. Bell states the management took the key elements of the GP proposal and aligned those key elements with existing governance groups or what we call functional groups that would have subject matter expertise, but the key was that the majority of those groups went through PIEC and back up to the constituent groups. Murphy asks how management is proposing to put this important and substantial amount of work onto the shared governance committees that are already overloaded? Ramsey states that the work would not actually be done by the committee members, but farmed out to others or to constituency groups. Murphy questions how this is in-line with the managers plan to have committees be responsible for the work? McMahon reiterated again that this is not the form to continue this debate – all of this in depth discussion and feedback belongs in constituency bodies or should be referred a specific constituency body – as in to the Academic Senate, not occurring at a CEC meeting. Hsieh clarifies that on any campus there is no way for us to create a special group to do any project that is required by the state. Hsieh wants to see input from every group as requested by the other constituency groups. Murphy agrees and asks what is the next step? Hsieh states that the next step is that all the constituency groups provide the feedback and as they said they will follow up with the communication to the entire campus, including the AS. The AS will then discuss and review that input and the AS can come back to the CEC meeting when the AS is ready. Then the College will move to collegial consultation.			
2	2018 ACCJC Annual Report (Internal Due Date 3/23/18) Miramontez reports that there is a due date of 3/23/18. His office is working on the components, which is getting student achievement data together, outcome assessment, career education data together, and then distance education together. The college should be getting the template from ACCJC this week.	1	I, II, III, IV	Miramontez
3	AB 705 (Pre-Req Change) Ramsey reports that assessment work groups have been created throughout the district and that Hopkins is in charge of ELAC at the College.	1	II	Ramsey
4	Panera Fundraiser 2/7/18 (attachment) Quis reminds everyone that there will be a Foundation fundraiser at the Panera in Mira Mesa on Wednesday, Feb. 7 from 4pm-8pm. Quis will email a flyer to the DL and asks that those who attend print the flyer and hand it to the cashier so the foundation can receive 20% of the proceeds.	1 & 4	I	Quis

F. Old Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	California Community Colleges Board of Governors 2018 Classified Employee of the Year: Allen reports that Lonnie Pham has been nominated and her name has been submitted to the president for board approval in January. Hsieh says she presented Pham's name to the Chancellor's Cabinet today and an invitation has been extend to Pham for her to attend the Feb. 20 meeting at district office to be recognized.	1	I	Allen
2	Guided Pathways Self-Assessment (attachment) McMahon	1, 2, & 3	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2020 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 2013-2020 Strategic Plan**

<p>shows that there are two documents in the attachment. One was a multi-colored, unresolved document that the parties (the Administration and the Academic Senate) agreed would be submitted to the state. This unresolved document is the document that McMahon signed off on Dec.15. This unresolved document, signed by McMahon, was not the same document that was submitted to the State through the official portal. The original document that the AS president signed off on contain two opposing scales selected, and contradictory narratives that used formatting, which included bold and colored font, strikethroughs and highlights. That document was sent via email to the State without the AS President being copied on that email. McMahon showed that the GP Self-Assessment document submitted through the official State online portal on Dec 19, 2017 was different from the one that McMahon had signed as AS President. The document that was sent through the portal 1) allowed only 1 scale to be submitted (out of the two contradictory scales in the unresolved document) and the scale that was selected was the one determined prior to AS input. 2) Since all of the formatting was put in place by the AS was removed in the process of submitting it via the official portal, the narrative became nonsensical (and it was indicated by Hsieh that the AS input for the scale rankings could be derived from the narrative, which was made no sense). In addition, the AS Disclaimer provided a key for the formatting, and this too was rendered meaningless due to the removal of that formatting in the original document, McMahon states that she was never notified of this change and that Hsieh knew of the scaling selection and format change and still decided to submit this document without consulting McMahon. McMahon indicated that had she been informed of the radical changes in the document that was submitted via the official State, she would not have signed off on that – but she was not given that opportunity. McMahon reiterated that the two documents were different,. McMahon states that the original GP Self-Assessment continues to remain in an unresolved state to this day, Hsieh responds by going back to the earlier comments expressed by students, managers and CS, this document is different than the one sent to the College on Dec. 11 sent by AS to the college president that was in turn sent out to the entire campus and was put on the 12/12/18 CEC agenda. On Dec. 12, the college constituency leaders clearly articulated that there was no more time for college wide input, let alone this was received on Dec. 15 with the disclaimer that was honored by Hsieh. The College was initially told that the district would submit this document on behalf of all the colleges. When the document, with the disclaimer, was sent forward on Dec. 15, Hsieh's staff member informed Hsieh that the document was “corrupt.” McMahon states that she was never told that the file was “corrupt.” Warren states that she and McMahon were in the office on Dec. 15 and that Warren told McMahon that there was an issue with the format. McMahon again states that she never heard the term “corrupt.” Hsieh adds that when she met with McMahon in the president’s conference room that she stated the file was “corrupt.” McMahon again disagrees. Hsieh then asked McMahon to resolve the issue with the document by working with Ms. Warren to restore the file. McMahon disagrees that this happened. After the file was restored by Ms. Warren and signed by McMahon, Hsieh sent the document to district and immediately forwarded the</p>			
--	--	--	--

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2020 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 2013-2020 Strategic Plan

	<p>communication to McMahon and AS exec that the document, with the signature page, was emailed and hand carried to the district. McMahon states that we were out of time in the meeting and we needed to finish within the next few minutes Hsieh states that she can finish her comments in three minutes which was accepted by McMahon. Ramsey moves to extend meeting by 5 minutes. McMahon indicated that it was not possible for her, as co-chair of this meeting, to stay another 10 minutes and Ramsey did not pursue his motion. Hsieh continues and states that the document was sent to the district and Hsieh was told on Dec. 19 by Lynne Neault that each college had to submit its own document to the state. Hsieh's staff member accessed the state portal and had an issue with the submission. The staff member could only submit what the portal accepted. Hsieh told the Chancellor of the issue with submitting the document and said she would follow up with an email to the state chancellor's office explaining the situation. The original document, present by the AS, was attached to the email and Hsieh explained that to the College on Jan. 25 during the GP Dialogue session. Hsieh also states that she had a phone conversation with Laura Hope of the state chancellor's office to make sure that the state chancellor's office understood why the document was submitted the way it was. McMahon says she was never contacted with regard to the problems with submission or that any of the follow up. Kjartanson asks if the AS president was advised of the mishap. Hsieh responds "no" because Hsieh was advised not to contact faculty when the college is not in session, because they were not being paid.</p>			
3	<p>Preparation for Accreditation Midterm Report (Due to SDCCD Board November 2020)</p> <p>a) Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement b) Data Trend Analysis c) Report on Outcomes on Quality Focused Project d) Action Planned in SER e) Dates and Progress for Milestones Agreed by CEC 1.) Tuesday, April 3, 2018 2.) Tuesday, April 2, 2019 3.) Tuesday, April 7, 2020 f) Monthly Progress Report & Distribution Along with a Newsletter (attachments): Tabled (time)</p>	1	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
4	Website Upgrade Project: Tabled	1	III	Miramontez
5	Progress Report on Implementation of 2017-19 Integrated Plan: Tabled	1 & 2	I, II, & III	Ramsey, Teresh, & Hopkins

G. Place Holders

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	Progress Report on Implementation of Cultural & Ethnic Diversity Plan (Report in April 2018) No report (time)	3	I, III, & IV	Hubbard & Arancibia

H. Reports

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

- Academic Senate: No report (time)
- Classified Senate: No report (time)
- Associated Student Government: No report (time)

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2020 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 2013-2020 Strategic Plan**

- District Governance Council: No report (time)
- District Strategic Planning Committee: No report (time)
- Budget Planning and Development Council: No report (time)
- College Governance Committee: No report (time)

I. Announcements: None

J. Adjourn: 2:34pm

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

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2020 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 2013-2020 Strategic Plan