

COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, February 20, 2018 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

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

Attendees: Beitey, Barnard (absent), Ascione, & Miramontez

Meeting called to order at 1:33pm

- A. **Approval of the Agenda:** **McMahon** remarks on the agenda format change and points out that this might be the first time that this agenda follows the format that is prescribed in the college governance handbook. The new format was a result of the CGC meeting held 2/13/18. The biggest change noted is that the meeting should be organized in section 1 being AB-1725 (Academic Senate matters) and section 2 (non-academic section matters). **Murphy** approves agenda, **Bell** seconds. **Hsieh** appreciates that CGC reviewed the College’s governance handbook to make sure the handbook is being followed. **Hsieh** quotes page 9 of college governance handbook as it relates to meeting agendas: The CEC will divide the agenda in the following manner: The first section will include those items which are “all-campus” in nature. Any items that are specific to those areas defined by CEC committee goals are to go in section 2 and these are AB-1725 items will be moved to section. **Hsieh** says the CEC probably needs to reverse the order. **McMahon** notes that this is a good point and asks if we begin following that agenda order next week and leave this agenda “as is” for today. Motion passes.
- B. **Approval of Previous Minutes:** This item has been tabled to the next meeting so that everyone can review the minutes one last time.
- C. **Guests/Introductions:** **Arancibia, Gonzalez, Teresh, and Harrison**
- D. **Section One: AB-1725 (Academic Senate) Matters**
 - ii. **Old Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p>A) Guided Pathways Self-Assessment (attachment) McMahon presents the AS response and clarification for the GP Self-Assessment: Vetting of an official institutional document relating to Academic and Professional Matters (10+1) is the purview of the Academic Senate as per Law (AB-1725). Vetting delayed by college president who did not initially believe it needed approval by Academic Senate (AS) or other constituency (as the product of Shared Governance Committees). McMahon states how there was some potential confusion with regard as to what should occur and that did create a delay. After going through the Academic Senate many very sound and well-founded comments were included and presented at CEC Dec. 12, 2017, and this gave sufficient time for Administration to negotiate and incorporate AS input for a resolved document prior to submission. When this document was presented at CEC it was in an unreconciled state. Later that day, reconciling the differences was refused by college president at AS Exec meeting (12/12/17) and AS would have final edit, (which was minimal, and add an AS disclaimer in order for a sign off on this document to occur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Different Self-Assessment Document was submitted on Dec 19, 2017. The college president announces, in an email on Jan 10, 2018, that a FLEX activity called GP Dialogue would be held on Jan. 25. This was created & planned without any input from AS. The AS tried to negotiate privately this failed and with official AS protest of a breach in Collegial Consultation this FLEX went 	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**

ahead. **McMahon** states “what was accomplished by that FLEX?” The opinion of AS is- apparent purpose to persuade ‘the college’ to agree with officially submitted GP Self-Assessment ranking – college president’s assistant was used to explain “Technical Difficulty” of official submission - including the selection of a Higher Scale of Adoption that the AS did not agree with.

McMahon shows slide of what college president sent via email.

From CP: “At the 1/25/2018 Guided Pathways Dialogue, the Academic Senate and the entire college also received the ASG’s, Classified Professionals’ and manager’s input on the Guided Pathways Self- Assessment provided by the Academic Senate...” **McMahon** notes that input from a FLEX Presentation is not input from a constituency body or a shared governance committee. There was no quorum, no minutes, no motions or recommendations can be made, no actions can be taken. **McMahon** shows the AS approved document from 12/12/18 with the AS changes ([see attachment](#)) and the officially submitted document from 12/19/18 on the right. **McMahon** reminds the CEC that only one scale could be selected for submittal and that vetting by all constituency groups is fundamental to the success of the College.

McMahon points out that some of the issues that are lacking and are contradictory in the submitted document. **McMahon** asks when GP was rolled out on the campus? **Hsieh** says 2014. **McMahon** responds by saying that there has been no official roll out of a State-wide GP Award Program or Inactivate at this College. An example of the written portion from Key Element 1 in the Officially Submitted Self-Assessment Document (12/19/18) showed completely contradictory statements within the narrative purporting to support the scale of adoption selected. Subsequently, with regard to the single scale of adoption selected (e.g., Full Scale in above example), the college president indicated that the AS input regarding their scale of adoption rankings could be derived from the narrative of the officially submitted version – this is an absurd position to hold given that the narrative was made nonsensical in the officially submitted version.

B) Official Submission of a Different GP Self-Assessment Document by the College President:

The term “*Technical Difficulties*” used by the college president to describe what occurred in the submission of the GP Self-Assessment document on Dec 19th, 2017 is untrue. The State’s official online portal for submission of this GP Self-Assessment document only allowed one “Scale of Adoption” to be submitted (not two different scales). The “Scale of Adoption” entered into the online portal under the custodianship of the college president was not approved by the Academic Senate, but matched what existed prior to AS input, that is, the scale the college president supported (and was lobbied for post-hoc at the “FLEX Dialogue” on Jan 25, 2018). This was not due to a ‘technical difficulty’ this was due to a unilateral decision made the college president. As shown, formatting put in place by the AS to indicate disagreements in the narrative (bold, red, strikethroughs and highlights) were all removed, rendering the written narrative nonsensical. The AS disclaimer providing a key for the

*** 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

formatting was also rendered meaningless. The college president was fully aware of all of these changes and submitted that document on Dec 19th - without consulting or even notifying the AS President. A reasonable expectation from the CEO of a college is that this leader be capable of exercising sound professional judgment – and should have included contact with the AS President immediately.

McMahon said that the excuse provided by the college president for not contacting the AS President was that this occurred during the break and outside of usual work time, though there are other examples of the college president contacting the AS president outside of work time via cell phone to discuss other issues. **McMahon** showed documentation of how GP materials, including self-assessment, are listed on the websites of Mesa and City College and she states that all that can be found on the Miramar College website is a news release authored in August of 2017 – no information about the GP Initiative or the GP Self-Assessment document is posted on the Miramar College website - as is the case for the other colleges.

McMahon showed a chart comparing the GP self-assessments officially submitted by the 3 SDCDD credit colleges and the status of each of the self-assessments. Miramar College is the only college scaled at Full Scale for all of the Inquiry phases, while Mesa and City are at pre- and early adoption. **McMahon** stated that this GP Self-Assessment Document is still unresolved:

- Unlikely that AS will agree with the officially submitted version.
- What exactly are the next likely steps if these two constituencies cannot come to an agreement on this doc?

Ramsey asks how much more time are we going to spend on these two GP items? **Hsieh** recommends that all constituency leaders put the accreditation item on their next meeting agenda and she asks that we stay past 2:30 to hear the accreditation item. **Hsieh** then addresses the question about what the next step should be if the two constituency groups can't agree. **Hsieh** states that she sent several emails to the College saying that she is waiting for the AS to bring back their official position. **Murphy** indicated that despite all the dialogue, as yet, there has been no official input from any constituency into the Academic Senates GP Self-Assessment that was shared on 12/12/18. **Murphy** then clarified the issue and by asking if there is any official input from any group on this self-assessment tool? **Allen** says the CS did not know they were supposed to review the unresolved assessment document and supports the original assessment document dated 10/26/17 that was sent out. **Bermodes** states that ASG voted on the original assessment document presented in October. **Hsieh** responds to bullet #2 talking about using the shared governance committees to complete this instrument. On Feb. 15, **Hsieh** sent an email to the entire campus and she attached a communication that was sent to the College on Oct. 10, right after CEC agreed on the method and steps the College was going to use to complete the assessment instrument. It was to use the College's existing participatory governance committees. **Hsieh** states that the manager's position is the same: managers support the original

*** 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>assessment document with additional changes made made on Dec. 14 and Dec. 15 with the disclaimer. Hsieh sent out an email to entire campus on Jan. 10 talking about the GP Dialogue session to be held Jan. 25. The original version and the one with all the changes made by the AS and that the constituency groups were asked for additional input. Only Dean Ascione responded asking for clarification on a SPAA issue. There was no other additional feedback. Hsieh clarifies that GP self-assessment sent out for comment in Jan. 2018 was the version sent out on Oct. 31, 2017. The AS can either say “we want to go forward” with the version presented on Dec. 15 or we want to go with original version from October. Hsieh asks that the AS completes that discussion at today’s AS meeting. For the proposal, Hsieh states the same that AS can bring back their position at any time-either privately or at CEC. Hsieh states that until she gets the official position from AS she could not answer the question posed by the AS president-“What exactly are the next likely steps if these two constituencies cannot come to an agreement on this doc?” McMahon reminded everyone that CEC agreed to have various committees start the process of filling in the GP Self-Assessment tool in Oct 2017, and that subsequent to that, this document needed to then go through the constituency vetting process in order to adhere to the processes of participatory governance.</p>			
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Senate Guided Pathways Plan Proposal (attachment) McMahon presents AS power point on GP Plan Proposal. In regards to the first CEC meeting of the spring semester held 2/6/18 the AS had this to say: meeting was moved to K1-107 – a large meeting room, without AS President Co-Chair being consulted/informed. Panel seating for members with-30 chairs arranged for the ‘audience’. The 2 items placed on the Agenda by Academic Senate were: The GP Self-Assessment and the Academic Senate GP Proposal for a Plan. In order to determine next steps since a) no agreement has been reached with self-Assessment, and b) there had been no schedule for official input into the AS Plan by the other constituencies as yet, the college president orchestrated and presided over a planned out and very lengthy presentation by: Classified Senate - specific concerns about classified involvement the AS GP Proposal – great input. The Associated Student Government (ASG) expressed their belief that the Guided Pathways work should be done using existing Shared Governance Committees, and felt that their voices were not heard. Very compelling input though appears not to have been vetted officially by ASG. Administration presented a portion of a lengthy (22 slide) PPT presentation of an entirely different Plan (not input into AS Plan per se) about using Existing Shared Governance Committees to do all the work of Guided Pathways. McMahon showed evidence from meeting minutes posted on the Miramar College website (for shared governance committees that the Academic Senate’s Guided Pathways Proposal Plan was not itemized on any agenda’s that could be located online for 	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**

meetings that were held by Classified Senate (CS) or the ASG. The classified senate indicated in materials sent to the AS that they met on Jan 22nd, 2018, but the only meeting dates shown on the online schedule were for Feb 1st and Feb 15th (and a cancelled Jan 18th meeting). The Feb 1st agenda for CS did not have a GP AS Proposal Plan itemized - only the GP Self-Assessment document was on the agenda and yet the AS received no feedback from the CS regarding this issue. Also after looking online, it appears that the ASG had their first meeting for the Spring semester on Feb 9th, (this was held after the Feb 6th CEC meeting) and had last met Dec 8th, that was prior to AS sending out the GP Self-Assessment. It could be that the information cannot be located online, but this would appear to indicate that the input from ASG on Feb 6th did not satisfy the Brown Act for open meetings

McMahon asked “Where does this currently leave us as a College?” It may be that the Classified and ASG input into the AS Proposal (2/6/18) not from official constituency venues satisfying the Brown Act. If that practice was not acceptable last semester, should not be so now. The Academic Senate plans to investigate all of these issues thoroughly with regard to apparent egregious breaches in Collegial Consultation. There is currently still no agreement on Guided Pathways Self-Assessment. In the meantime, if we as a college cannot agree where we are, it is not prudent to move the next phase of developing a Plan guided by the phases of: Inquiry, design, and implementation. **McMahon** reiterated that there is still no agreement on the GP Self-Assessment plan and if we can’t agree on this, how are we going to go to the next stage which requires planning? **Allen** states that the CS will respond in writing to above questions. **Ramsey** comments that everyone should be courteous enough to reach out to the constituency bodies if they have a question about how an opinion was reached. **Hsieh** responds to what the next step is in terms of the proposal? The AS needs to make a decision at its meeting today on whether or not to accept the feedback from ASG, CS and management and to bring their decision back to CEC or privately to the president as soon as they can. For GP self –assessment and GP Plan Proposal, **Hsieh** understands that the AS will take an official position at their meeting today and **Hsieh** asks that they bring that official position back to her or the CEC as soon as they can and the College will move to the next step according to the college governance handbook. **McMahon** responds that the academic senate had reached out several times to engage classified and student voices and the AS always welcomed and would never not want to hear input from students or classified. What is in question here is the responsibility of the college president with regard to her supporting and proposing that the information from those two bodies presenting at CEC on Feb 6th had been officially vetted when it wasn’t, and how can we have faith in the integrity of the college president with regard to this. **Hsieh** does not agree with McMahon’s statement.

*** 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**

--	--	--	--	--

iii. New Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
---	------	------------------	------------------------	-----------

E. Section Two: Non-AB-1725 (Non-Academic Senate) Matters

ii. Old Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p>Preparation for Accreditation Midterm Report (Due to SDCCD Board November 2020)</p> <p>a) Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement</p> <p>b) Data Trend Analysis</p> <p>c) Report on Outcomes on Quality Focused Project</p> <p>d) Action Planned in SER</p> <p>e) Dates and Progress for Milestones Agreed by CEC</p> <p>1.) Tuesday, April 3, 2018</p> <p>2.) Tuesday, April 2, 2019</p> <p>3.) Tuesday, April 7, 2020</p> <p>f) Monthly Progress Report & Distribution Along with a Newsletter</p> <p>(attachments) Miramontez reports that a ton of information has been sent out via email as part of the CEC agenda. These are status reports across the 3 divisions. Miramontez will gather all the information and send out a monthly newsletter as to how the college is doing in preparation for its accreditation midterm report.</p>	1	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
2	<p>2018 ACCJC Annual Report (Internal Due Date 3/23/18)</p> <p>(attachment) Miramontez reports that he received a template from the ACCJC. No new information from last year. They are only asking for our numbers across outcome assessment, distance education, student achievement and career education. Miramontez has collected the college information and populate a draft report and he will send that out on 2/21/18. Miramontez is awaiting data from the district in regards to distance education and secondly there is an internal college deadline of March 23, 2018. The College is on schedule to meet this deadline.</p>	1	I, II, III, IV	Miramontez
3	<p>Progress Report on Implementation of 2017-19 Integrated Plan: Tabled until next meeting</p>	1 & 2	I, II, & III	Ramsey, Teresh, & Hopkins

iii. New Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p>Diversity Center & Update on Implementation of Cultural & Ethnic Diversity Plan (Report in April 2018) (attachments)</p> <p>Tabled until next meeting</p>	3	I, III, & IV	Hubbard, Arancibia, & Gonzalez
2	<p>2017-18 Classroom AV Prioritization (attachment) Bell reports that BRDS went through the same process as last year. AV identified all the classrooms that need upgrades. Dean's council prioritized those upgrades and BRDS has set aside \$75,000 to attack this list beginning with priority number one and going through 16. There is enough money to do 9 classrooms. CEC gives its consensus.</p>	1	III	Bell

* 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

3	Revised CEC Agenda Format (attachments) Tabled until next meeting	1	I & IV	Hsieh & McMahon
---	---	---	--------	-----------------

A. **Updates from the Chancellor’s Cabinet: Hsieh** reports quickly on the president’s cabinet meeting. There is no enrollment management report due to the holiday. When Hsieh receives the report she will send to the College. The new state funding model was discussed. **McMahon** states the new funding model will likely transition into 50% as the base, 25% on students at risk (BOG waiver recipients), 25% on awards conferred. The college needs to meet 3 requirements to receive available promise funding. The college has already met 2 of the 3. In addition, each district we have to determine which physical year the college will use your summer FTES. Switching back and forth will no longer be allowed.

B. **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
- 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

C. **Announcements:**

D. **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