

# COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, March 13, 2018 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

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

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

Meeting called to order: 1:30pm

- A. **Approval of the Agenda:** Bell moves to approve, Hopkins seconds. Motion passes.
- B. **Approval of Previous Minutes:** McMahon asked Hsieh to clarify a comment from last week’s meeting, and Hsieh confirmed that the statement “McMahon can listen to the recording” was in reference to discussions at the collegial consultation meeting regarding Guided Pathways that occurred on Feb. 26, 2018. Bell moves to approve minutes with suggested edits sent over by Hubbard and McMahon for correction of minor content and typos. Hubbard seconds. Motion passes.
- C. **Guests/Introductions:** Benjamin Gamboa, Cassie Morton, Tonia Teresh, Naomi Grisham, Brielle Warren.
- D. **Section One: College-Wide Matters (Non-AB-1725)**
  - i. **New Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator

**ii. Old Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p><b>Preparation for Accreditation Midterm Report (Due to SDCCD Board November 2020)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement</b></li> <li>b) <b>Data Trend Analysis</b></li> <li>c) <b>Report on Outcomes on Quality Focused Project</b></li> <li>d) <b>Action Planned in SER</b></li> <li>e) <b>Dates and Progress for Milestones Agreed by CEC</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.) Tuesday, April 3, 2018</li> <li>2.) Tuesday, April 2, 2019</li> <li>3.) Tuesday, April 7, 2020</li> </ul> </li> <li>f) <b>Monthly Progress Report &amp; Distribution Along with a Newsletter</b></li> </ul> <p>(attachments) Miramontez states that progress reports from the VP’s and Miramontez are due Thursday, March 15. Miramontez will take that information and create an updated newsletter and that newsletter will go out next week.</p>	1	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
2	<p><b>2018 ACCJC Annual Report (Internal Due Date 3/23/18)</b></p> <p>(attachment) Miramontez reports he attended two of the constituency group meetings. At the ASG meeting a question arose about why the EMT data read zero. Miramontez went back and looked at the data and noticed that there was no entry. He has no idea why there was no entry for that year. There was a question about student services and learning support and why the college went from 21 to 20. The reason is because the Equity Office is now under the dean of student development &amp; matriculation. As for the programs, Miramontez attended the AS meeting last Tuesday and Murphy raised the question as to why the number of programs was so much lower in 2017 than 2016. Grisham says there was an error and instead of 86, number should read 116.</p>	1	I, II, III, IV	Miramontez

**\* 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

	Hopkins confirmed that no one had caught the error. <b>Miramontez</b> asks if the CEC wants to reference the reasons for the change in the number regarding questions 21 & 23. <b>Hsieh</b> suggests we state it just for the institution's reference. <b>Miramontez</b> will make the changes to #21 and #23 and send it back out to everyone. <b>Miramontez</b> asks the CEC if they consider this report complete after the changes are made. The consensus is yes.			
3	<b>Progress Report on Implementation of 2017-19 Integrated Plan:</b> No report due to <b>Ramsey</b> absence.	1 & 2	I, II, & III	Ramsey, Teresh, & Hopkins
4	<b>Diversity Center &amp; Update on Implementation of Cultural &amp; Ethnic Diversity Plan (Report in April 2018)</b> ( <a href="#">attachments</a> ) It was agreed upon a few weeks ago that this item was to be struck from the agenda moving forward. No report as a result.	3	I, III, & IV	Hubbard, Arancibia, & Gonzalez

**E. Section Two: Academic and Professional Matters (AB-1725)**

**i. New Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<b>Viability Review of Instructional Programs</b> ( <a href="#">attachment</a> ) <b>Murphy</b> states that this was approved in the Academic Senate, but she is not sure where it is in the other constituency bodies. <b>Murphy</b> continues that this was initiated due to a requirement by ACCJC and by district policy that there is a plan for discontinuing programs. Instead of developing a discontinuance plan, a viability review plan of instructional programs was developed to encompass new programs coming online, program revitalization as well as program discontinuance. This was passed through Academic Affairs as well as Academic Senate. <b>Hubbard</b> asks if this needs to go through all constituencies. <b>Murphy</b> says she does not know as she is not the rep for Academic Affairs. <b>Miramontez</b> states that since this is an accreditation item and is in the College's QFE, he asks if it needs to be vetted in that way. <b>Murphy</b> says that it should have been given to all the constituency groups as an FYI at a minimum. <b>McMahon</b> asks if we can do that now if it has not been done. <b>Murphy</b> explains that this should have come from Academic Affairs. <b>Hopkins</b> says that Academic Affairs will be happy to send it out for vetting to all the constituencies. <b>Murphy</b> asked if the students say saw it and the answer was no, and <b>Hopkins</b> stated she would send it to everyone. <b>McMahon</b> says that this document can be brought back to CEC once everyone has had a chance to look at it.	1	I & II	McMahon
2	<b>SLO Disaggregation Recommendations</b> ( <a href="#">attachment</a> ) <b>Grisham</b> states that she is taking these recommendations over from the prior Outcomes and Assessment Facilitator. There was a study done on this topic and 4 recommendations came out of it. 1-do not recommend continued disaggregation of SLO's on a student by student basis. 2-recommend that the office of PRIELT determine how to collect and begin collecting reliable education plan data to be used for disaggregation of course success. 3-recommend that SLO success and course success be disaggregated by course modality to better inform our strategic enrollment management plans in the increased offering of online course and 4-recommend that the faculty be provided with SLO success and course data for comparison to improve outcomes and assessment and align outcomes with successful course completion. This item was approved at Academic Senate and Academic Affairs. <b>Hopkins</b>	1	II	McMenamin & Grisham

**\* 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**

	says this will be sent to ASG and CS to review and as an information point for the other constituency groups. There is no pressing timeline on this item.			
3	<p><b>CGC Change Proposal for CEC</b> (<a href="#">attachment</a>) <b>McMahon</b> takes the opportunity to let everyone know that there is a change proposal from CGC about suggesting changes to CEC and it is going through the AS currently. <b>Hubbard</b> asks if this is coming from CGC. <b>Murphy</b> says “yes” and that this was approved as a recommendation from CGC. <b>Hubbard</b> asks that if the addition of the 3 recommend faculty members to the CEC would be as voting or non-voting members? <b>Murphy</b> says non-voting. Voting constituencies do not change based on the composition if the committee: There are four votes, one for each constituency for all campus matters, and two votes of Academic and Professional matters. <b>McMahon</b> stresses that the addition of members would not affect the voting capacity of the CEC. <b>Hopkins</b> asked if the document placed at each seat was there for a reason, and <b>Hsieh</b> said yes. <b>McMahon</b> stresses that the addition of members would not affect the voting capacity of the CEC. <b>Hsieh</b> says that management supports the additional faculty members, but management also has additional comments and <b>Hsieh</b> wants to know that if the management wanted to put forward a different change request, how should they proceed as a group? <b>McMahon</b> suggests that management’s input just be added to the existing change proposal. <b>Hsieh</b> clarifies that, in an email she received yesterday, what the management put forward is not being responded to what CGC asked for which is the original change proposal for changing the faculty representation for non-voting members. <b>Hsieh</b> wants to clarify what is the proper way to proceed? <b>Hsieh</b> prefers that the management send out their own separate change proposal. <b>Hubbard</b> asks if the CS should wait to look at the change proposal until they receive management’s proposal. <b>Hsieh</b> says “no”. <b>McMahon</b> asked what attachment was being referred to on the agenda next to the E3 and it was determined it was the piece of paper that was placed in front of every seat.</p>	1	I & IV	McMahon

**ii. Old Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p><b>Guided Pathways Self-Assessment</b> (<a href="#">attachment</a>) <b>McMahon</b> states there is only one issue and that is we had an agreement on the Miramar College Guided Pathways Self-Assessment and <b>McMahon</b> requested that the College President inform the State chancellor’s office that there was a new agreed upon self-assessment. <b>McMahon</b> said this is because the one that was submitted through the official portal, and the approved one that was emailed to the State, neither one of these were accurate now, both are different from the one we have just agreed upon, so <b>McMahon</b> asked President <b>Hsieh</b> to inform the state of this but this did not occur, so <b>McMahon</b> sent it herself to the Executive Vice Chancellor Hope so that this newly affirmed assessment would be known by the State. <b>McMahon</b> has not heard anything back. <b>McMahon</b> wants to make sure that the GP self-assessment that was agreed upon is what the state has. This is very important because the assessment will dictate how we move forward with the GP proposal.</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**

2	<p><b>Miramar College Guided Pathways Plan Proposal</b> (<a href="#">attachment</a>)  <b>McMahon</b> reports that the Steering Committee had a very productive meeting yesterday and there is a cross constituency writing team working on a draft for the work plan, elements 1 through 3. The feedback will come back tomorrow morning and they meet as a writing group in the afternoon at which time the finalized draft will be sent to constituency group leaders. <b>Murphy</b> is hoping that when the Steering Committee meets next Monday a fairly solid draft will be ready to be vetted and put forward on March 23. <b>Murphy</b> confirmed that it will sent to all constituency leaders on March 15. <b>McMahon</b> asks the CS and ASG if there is any feedback on the timeframe. There was none. <b>Miramontez</b> wants a point of clarification if it still makes sense to include these items under Section 2-Academic and Professional Matters. <b>McMahon</b> says that her understanding is that anything that involves a 10+ 1 would be in the second category, but there is a lot of cross over and we can talk about that, again, it would depend on the specifics of any item. <b>McMahon</b> indicated that the intent of the arrangement of the CEC agenda into Section One and Section Two is to distinguish between which parties are voting on the item. Placement of an item in Section one or two would be dependent upon what is being discussed.</p>	1, 2, & 3	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon
---	--	-----------	------------------	---------

**F. Updates from the Chancellor’s Cabinet:** **Hsieh** reports on enrollment. There was a discussion on enrollment and that information has been sent in an email to the entire college. All the college’s spring projections have been lowered. Miramar College’s FTES spring projection was lowered by 125 FTES. Lynne Neault’s office claims to have over projected the College’s public safety numbers. There are a few proposals for summer FTES. One is to keep Miramar where it was-Mesa, City, Miramar. The second is to give Miramar additional FTES. The College was asked if they can take on additional FTES or if the College wants to go back to the original funding formula and **Hsieh** has asked **VPI Hopkins** to discuss with the deans and department chairs and provide a recommendation by this Friday, March 16 so that she can bring this back to the cabinet.

**G. Reports**

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

- Academic Senate: **McMahon** reports that their next meeting is March 20. The Senate Exec will act as an entire body to vet the Guided Pathways work plan.
- Classified Senate: **Hubbard** reports that they meet on Thursday. They will be starting to make plans for Classified Week which begins May 21. The Classified Awards Ceremony is May 8 at 1pm.
- Associated Student Government: **Bermodes** reports that Spring Fest begins this week. ASG will be attending the College Wide Planning Summit on Friday rather than holding their regularly scheduled meeting.
- District Governance Council: **McMahon** reports that the next meeting is April 18.
- District Strategic Planning Committee: **Miramontez** reports that they had a very productive meeting and the information from that meeting was shared at the last PIEC meeting. The next meeting is at the end of April.
- Budget Planning and Development Council: **Bell** reports that at the last meeting they discussed many items including apportionment for '15-'16 was recalculated and SDCDD received an additional \$481,000. The '16-'17 apportionment was recalculated and SDCC was apportioned at 100% of the projections. The redesign of the apportionment calculations was reviewed. And there was a sneak peek at the '17-'18 apportionment and there is a projected .004 deficit factor included in '17-'18. The new state funding model was discussed and the next meeting is April 18.
- College Governance Committee: **Murphy** reports that they are meeting later today and they will discuss trying to get a workshop together for spring to work on shared governance issues and to provide results of the evaluation tool.

**H. Announcements:** **Hubbard** announces that the Civil Rights Film Festival will be held Saturday, April 14.

**\* 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**

**I. Adjourn: 2:18pm**

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**