

# COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, September 18, 2018 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

**Members:** Hsieh, Bell, Hopkins, Gonzales, McMahon, Murphy, Hubbard, Young, Bermodes, & Stuart (absent)

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

**Guests:** Teresh, Kunst

Meeting called to order at 1:30pm

- A. **Approval of the Agenda:** Bell moves to approve agenda. Hubbard seconds. Hsieh proposes that item F (updates from Chancellors Cabinet) be moved up under item C. Hubbard requests that E. (Section Two: Academic and Professional Matters (AB-1725) be moved ahead of D. (College-Wide Matters (non-AB-1725) since it was skipped last meeting. After 5 minutes of debate these changes were agreed to and the motion passed.
- B. **Approval of Previous Minutes:** Bell moves to approve minutes from the 5/15/18 CEC meeting. Hopkins seconds. 4 people abstained. Motion does not pass. Quis states that the committee has had 4 months to review these minutes. McMahon says that minutes can be changed any time. Hsieh comments that McMahon’s statement that “the minutes can be changed all the time.” She suggests that before any changes are made that members listen to the recording of the minutes. This sets of CEC minutes are very important as they represent major evidence in terms of accreditation. McMahon clarifies that if anyone wants to add any edits to the minutes at a later date then they can, per the Brown Act- if you have additions to the minutes and bring it back to the body, than the body can vote on that. Hsieh disagrees with McMahon’s statement saying that it would have to be added as a footnote. Hsieh continued on about listening to the recording of the meeting. McMahon reminded Hsieh that as long as the edits are accurate, listening to the recording was not required. There was much confusion about whether the motion to pass the 5/15/18 CEC meeting did in fact pass with only 4 votes to approve, as that was not majority of the 10 committee members. Bell moves to approve 9/4/18 CEC minutes, Gonzalez seconds. Hsieh suggests that we move to the next item while the minutes are being located. This item was never revisited.
- C. **Guests/Introductions:** Teresh and Kunst
- F. **Updates from the Chancellor’s Cabinet:** Hsieh reports on enrollment. She will send the enrollment report out when she receives it from the district. The College’s target has been reduced to 9,504 FTES for ’18-’19. The College is a little behind the fall target. Collection of military base instruction FTES was discussed. There is a law that prohibits collection of military base instruction FTES because it is not completely open to the public. The District is looking into different options. The Sept. 27 board meeting will be at City College and there is one item that pertains to Miramar College which is a POST agreement with Public Safety Training Institute. This past Friday there was a districtwide student centered funding formula workshop that relates to enrollment management and it was very informative workshop. Faculty members who attended were very engaged in the discussion. Under this new funding formula, the top priority is student success and we need to be aware of this as a small college. We will be significantly impacted by this new funding formula.
- E. **Section Two: Academic and Professional Matters (AB-1725)**
  - i. **New Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<b>Collegial Consultation –</b> a. <b>Recording of Individuals without Consent:</b> McMahon states that this is a big concern for Academic Senate regarding collegial consultation. During collegial consultation the college president recorded the AS president and faculty without their knowledge. This issue goes to DGC tomorrow. McMahon talks about the legality of the recording, regarding the difference between the recording of a Brown Act meeting and the recording of a non-Brown Act meeting. McMahon states that in the state of California there is a two party consent	1, 2, 3 & 4	I	Mc Mahon

**\* 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**

law that states that anytime you record a conversation you must have everyone's consent in the room. **McMahon** states that she included that language in emails that were sent to the college president prior to the July 31 consultation meeting, indicating that it was a legal requirement and the college president failed to do that. **McMahon** says that regardless of the legality that this is a really poor practice to engage in. Particularly since we just had a Collegiality in Action Visit and one of the main issues was that our practices are failing our processes, and this is one example of that. It is important that we put this information out there because we do not want to conduct business in a way that is not professional or ethical, or that is not of the standard to create a culture of trust – which we currently lack. **Hsieh** comments that she is happy that they'll be more understanding on this complicated issue and that any statement has to be based on evidence and has to be factual.

- b. **In-person meeting requirements for essentially all AS questions and requests:** **McMahon** states for the past 5 years there was one in-person meeting a month but that all sorts of other communications are available, email, phone. However, what is currently occurring is that any requests or questions from the AS to the college president require in person meetings. This has been very ineffective and is causing a big delay in processing information and preparing for various issues. The AS is also very concerned that we can't seem to make headway with the college president on establishing ground rules to create effective and efficient communication – which is currently lacking. This is another example of a failure in our collegial consultation. For example, **McMahon** cited as AS president she has tried at multiple venues, including CEC, to get conferral of appointments of faculty – it should not take 2 months to get a conferral. It is not functionally rational to have simple matters take months, and the in person meetings aren't any more clear because it requires that we sit and listen without “interrupting”. And if these meetings are now going to be recorded, and a summary of it is written up and shared with everyone, then why not just write it and send that information in an email? **McMahon** states that what is happening is a waste of everyone's time by having meetings that are just the pretense of communication. These are all very serious problems that we are experiencing. **McMahon** states that what is currently occurring is that any requests or questions from the AS require in person meetings. This has been very ineffective and it causing a big delay in processing information and the preparing of information. The AS can't seem to make headway on establishing ground rules to create effective and efficient communication. The in-person meetings are not very effective either. **McMahon** states that what is happening now is wasting everyone's time. **Hsieh** comments that all the recordings currently in place for collegial consultation are per the AS president's request to have a summary of the meetings. **Hsieh** states that she would encourage anyone, that has the AS

**\* 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>president's permission to review all the email communication that has gone on back and forth. <b>Hsieh</b> states that all statements need to be factual. <b>McMahon</b> states that all statements presented are factual and anyone is welcome to view any string of emails.</p>			
2	<p><b>Faculty Evaluation Issues:</b> <b>McMahon</b> states that there appears to be some practices that are contrary to AP-5105 for distance education and it will be discussed at AS later today. <b>McMahon</b> shared that AP-5105 is for distance education and she wanted to bring everyone's attention to three very important components of AP-5105 that are going to link back to the faculty evaluation issues. Course Quality Standards and Determinations: so this is about the quality of distance education, because as we know, we are articulated with different institutions regardless of modality of the course. These should all be equivalent Instructor Contact: Any portion of a course section conducted through distance education in lieu of face-to face interaction includes regular, effective and substantive contact between instructor and students; <b>McMahon</b> reports that this is currently being revised and re-written to include student to student contact as well, as this is deemed as incredibly important. The same standards of course quality shall be applied to any portion of the course conducted through distance education as are applied to traditional classroom courses, that is regardless of modality of these courses. So it gives a very clear delineation about instructor contact and what it means with regard to distance education. There's also the course of outline, and how on campus and online course should be identical and the content should be identical. This is what I am going to share and we are going to talk about it at senate. <b>McMahon</b> says she has been told that there has been an evaluation of a course with online content that is essentially empty and it fails to meet the requirements, and yet the same faculty member who was evaluated over a year ago, with a poor and unsatisfactory evaluation, is continuing to teach this course contrary to the department chair and the peer evaluators assessment of the qualities and these are directly related to the accreditation standards and this is something that the AS will have to let accreditation know if the College can't actually practice evaluations to enforce our administrative procedures and board policies. This is something that is very important and everyone should be aware of this situation. <b>Hopkins</b> says this looks like a personnel issue, if this is about an evaluation that is unsatisfactory or conducted in a manner which needs review then it is not something that should be spoken of at this body. <b>Hopkins</b> says that this is a curriculum issue and the curriculum committee reviews this and this is not an issue that needs to come to CEC, and it we are talking about an evaluation then it is not something talk about in public. <b>McMahon</b> disagrees again and <b>Hopkins</b> states that we do not talk about personnel issues in public. <b>Murphy</b> states that the point that is trying to be made here is that the AS has a concern with the validity of the faculty evaluation process and that evaluation of faculty in online courses vs. face to face courses is not held to the same rigor. There was an example that McMahon eluded to but the point and the reason why it's here and the reason why the senate is concerned, because it is under the purview of the senate, is that we need to make sure that when online faculty is evaluated they are held to the same rigor and that is why it is here for discussion. <b>Hopkins</b> says she understands that statement, however, the</p>	1, 2, 3 & 4	I	Mc Mahon

**\* 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>AFT/CBA for faculty is currently in negotiations. This would be something that the AS would negotiate into their contract because the College honors the contract. <b>Murphy</b> states that this is not a contract issue, but rather about an AP that is based on a board policy and the AS is beholden to do this, and if they are not doing this, regardless of what our contract says, then the College is not meeting accreditation standards when it comes to distance education. <b>Hopkins</b> believes that the College is following the contract and the College is evaluating to the standards. <b>Hopkins</b> feels this should not be brought up at this meeting. <b>McMahon</b> states that this is not accurate, and here's why. Through the state-wide senate we've had long discussions about the quality and content of online courses vs campus/in person courses. And also, in our last senate meeting we discussed lots of suggestions for how to improve the current language in the CBA, that is one avenue, absolutely. We are also gathering information from faculty about the nature of evaluations of online courses. What we have to follow as it stands right now is the administration procedures from the board policy as it pertains to distance education. That is the issue we are tying together here.</p> <p><b>Hopkins</b> says that she and Kevin Petti said the same things, if we want something changed or improved you need to speak to the union to get it into the CBA. <b>McMahon</b> said just to reiterate, we already have contacted Jim Mahler, but what we have to do first is evaluate what we are actually doing, so that we can make it better and take on good suggestions that are in alignment with our administrative procedures, that's the higher end of the law. <b>Bell</b> states that this is a good format to announce the concerns of AS, but the administrative procedures and board policies appropriate venue would be DGC which is charged with evaluating these items. <b>McMahon</b> indicated that at the AS meeting the issues were multi-pronged and one issue was how do we best evaluate online courses, with a clear mind of whether we are we in alignment with our board policies. Sometime we are accustomed to doing practices over and over again but we don't go back to where the rules and regulation are, and very few people probably know this information. And this information is changing. <b>McMahon</b> attended the Board of Governors meeting all day yesterday, with discussion of distance education relating to the Fully Online College and the expansion of online courses. The subject of evaluations of online courses has become extremely relevant and this is an incredible time for re-evaluating how we do evaluations for online courses. The senate's approach to online evaluations is both general and also has specific examples. <b>Murphy</b> says that in our discussion here we are tending to conflate two separate issues. One is how to appropriately evaluate online courses, and the other is are we following the practice in a way that is appropriate. We have to make this body aware of it. It is our responsibility as faculty because the senate is concerned. <b>Hopkins</b> says the AS should be very concerned. The faculty designed the tools for evaluation, so if the faculty are not conducting these evaluations in the matter that they should be, the AS needs to take the case on. <b>McMahon</b> says that that is one component, agreed, but it is also how those evaluations are enforced, how we use them after the evaluation is submitted, etc., and the AS is here today to make everyone aware of the complexities of these issues.</p>			
3	<p><b>Concerns about class caps in accordance with AFT contract:</b> <b>McMahon</b> shows (attachment) the current language in the CBA</p>	1, 2, 3 & 4	I	Mc Mahon

**\* 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>regarding caps. She asks what is the College's procedure for classes when they are cancelled, what is the number, is it consistently practiced and if classes are cancelled how does the College go about changing the caps in other classes to recoup the loss? Caps within the district are different for the same class at the different colleges. This cap language in the current CBA will change significantly if it goes through. <b>McMahon</b> just wants to make everyone aware of these discussions that are ongoing. <b>Hsieh</b> is requesting that all attachments used in the meeting be sent in advance so that everyone has a chance to review. CEC is a governance meeting and yes it is important when a faculty negotiation item is discussed, however, we need to be respectful of other constituencies on campus as well. <b>Hopkins</b> says it is not productive or efficient to have these types of discussions here when they are but a small fraction of all the items being negotiated in the AFT/CBA.</p>			
---	--	--	--

**D. Section One: College-Wide Matters (Non-AB-1725)**

**i. New Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p><b>Update on Guided Pathways and State Guided Pathways Workshop: McMahon</b> reports that the college is the midst of developing its tri-chair arrangement, but it hasn't been finalized by the steering committee. <b>Gonzales</b> reports that he and a small group of 5 from the College recently attended a GP workshop. It was a really good faculty driven workshop. Meta-majors and way-finding and use of data were discussed. He wished Miramar could have sent a bigger team. <b>Gonzales</b> says that on the workshop website all the power points and resources are listed (<a href="#">see link</a>). He encourages everyone to go to the senate website and look for the information. The one big takeaway was Miramar College is not too far behind, but also not the leader of the pack. As for the GP steering committee, there is a group of 8 meeting outside of the steering committee to try and provide some more guidance. From that, <b>Murphy, Young</b> and <b>Gonzales</b> recently met and they have discussed an inquiry group and they will make a recommendation to the steering committee next week to see if they can move some things along and give them some idea as to the resources available based on this workshop that the College just attended. <b>Hsieh</b> asks that the link be sent to <b>Quis</b> so they can be attached to the minutes. <b>Hsieh</b> recommends that the tri-chair arrangement have a student involved. <b>Murphy</b> says that Miramar is at the very beginning of this process and that her take away from the workshop was not to jump into meta-majors until all the research/mapping has been completed. Also, this is all going to change over time so let's not wait any longer. <b>Hsieh</b> hopes the entire College will be involved in this GP process and that all GP information is always disseminated to the campus.</p>	1, 2, 3 & 4	I	Gonzales, Hubbard, Mc Mahon, & Bermodes/Barnard
2	<p><b>Solicitation of Interest from CCCCO of Program Pathways Mapper Pilot: Gonzales</b> says he sent out the letter that came from the Chancellor's office (see attachment) which stated that the Chancellor's office is offering an opportunity to partner with Bakersfield College who has a mapper software program. There is a webinar on Wednesday and it is open to anyone. They are willing to partner with up to 10 colleges, district and regional</p>	1, 2, 3 & 4	I	Gonzales, Hubbard, Mc Mahon, & Bermodes/Barnard

**\* 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**

	efforts. If we are interested we need to send a letter of interest. Regionally, Strong workforce is thinking of doing a regional effort around mapping. Our sister colleges are talking about this. <b>Murphy</b> states that that software will be available to the College whether or not we take advantage of this pilot partnership or not. For Miramar College to take part in this pilot program, then the College would have had to do some serious mapping and we are not in a position to take advantage of this. Strong workforce is bringing Bakersfield College to our campus next week and Bakersfield will do a presentation on the software. <b>Hopkins</b> says we do have a start to the process with our current course sequencing. <b>Hsieh</b> states that we can piggy back on the good work we have already been doing and that is an option for us. No need to reinvent the wheel when we don't have many campus resources.			
3	<b>Academic Senate Approved Recommendation to Provide IR/PR SLOAC Faculty Co-chair with Reassigned Time to Compensate for Workload:</b> <b>McMahon</b> says this was brought back to the first academic senate meeting with regards to implementing this and what the status is? There was an issue of finding out whether there was work done over the summer that may not have been compensated. IRP-SLOAC was charged with determining the reassign time. <b>McMahon</b> asks <b>Hopkins</b> if a recommendation was made. <b>Hopkins</b> replies that the issues of the workload have been resolved and she is happy to meet with anyone to discuss the matter further. <b>Hsieh</b> comments that compensation issues are not a part of AB-1725.	1, 2, 3 & 4	I	Mc Mahon

**ii. Old Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<b>Accreditation:</b> <b>Miramontez</b> says he is getting the updates from the various VP's and he will put out another accreditation newsletter soon to inform the campus of where we are.	1, 2, 3 & 4	I	Miramontez
2	<b>CGC Change Form proposal for CEC:</b> <b>Hubbard</b> says they will take this to the CS meeting on Sept. 20. <b>Bermodes</b> says they have sent it at. <b>McMahon</b> states that CEC meets again in two weeks and is hoping this will be settled in time for that meeting.	1, 2, 3 & 4	I	Mc Mahon
3	<b>Guided Pathways: Compensation of Faculty and Classified Involvement in GP:</b> <b>McMahon</b> says this has been covered already above.	1, 2, 3 & 4	I	Mc Mahon
4	<b>Timeline for Hiring of Associate Dean of Student Equity &amp; Success:</b> <b>Gonzalez</b> says he doesn't have a status for funding but can give an additional update. <b>Gonzales</b> has drafted up recommendations for the group and once the taskforce meets he would love to share them with the taskforce. He plans to be at the taskforce meeting scheduled for Sept. 23 and he will share his recommendations. <b>McMahon</b> asks about the status of funding again. <b>Gonzales</b> states that his recommendation is going to be that the College ties it the Strong Workforce piece, so he will need to talk to Gamboa about that piece. The College is going to use restricted dollars. <b>McMahon</b> asks if the position is funded. <b>Gonzalez</b> replies "assuming they have money in their budgets, then yes, absolutely."	1, 2, 3, & 4	I & II	Mc Mahon

**a. Old Business**

#	Item	*Strategic	Accreditation	Initiator
---	------	------------	---------------	-----------

**\* 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**

		<b>Goals</b>	<b>Standard</b>	
1	None			

**G. Reports**

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

- Academic Senate: **McMahon** reports that the second AS meeting of the semester is later today.
- Classified Senate: **Hubbard** reports that they meet on Sept. 20
- Associated Student Government: **Bermodes** reports that they meet this Friday and last Friday they elected new leadership (secretary, treasurer and senators).
- District Governance Council: **McMahon** states next meeting is tomorrow at 3pm.
- District Strategic Planning Committee: **Miramontez** says they meet Thursday at 2:30pm.
- Budget Planning and Development Council: **Bell** says they met on Sept. 5 and discussed new student centered funding formula. Next meeting is Oct. 3.
- College Governance Committee: **Murphy** says they met last week and will meet next week. Their primary charge is to look at the handbook.

H. **Announcements:** **Miramontez** says PIEC has been charged with looking at the College mission statement, per a 3-year cycle of needing to do so. **Hubbard** asks if there are lactating stations on campus. **Bell** states that there is one in health offices.

**I. Adjourn: 2:30pm**

**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**