

# COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, May 14, 2019 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

**Members:** Hsieh (absent/proxy Gonzalez), Bell, Hopkins, Gonzales, McMahon, Murphy (absent), Hubbard, Young, Bermodes & Van

**Guests:** Ascione, Teresh and Woods.

Meeting called to order at 1:32pm

- A. **Approval of the Agenda (1 min)** Bell approves the agenda, **Hubbard** seconds. Motion passes.
- B. **Approval of Previous Minutes (1 min)**
  - ii. 4/9 Minutes: **McMahon** states these tabled minutes returned unchanged and **Hopkins** moves to approve, stating that **McMahon** was “right”. **Bell** seconds. Motion passes.
  - iii. 4/23 Minutes: **Bell** moves to approve. There was a discussion about the minutes structure. **Hopkins** states there is an inaccurate part of the minutes in the approval section as it relates to the 4/9/19. The comment in question was about **Hopkins** receiving the draft minutes prior to the co-chairs receiving it. **Hopkins** stated she did not say that, it is inaccurate. **McMahon** reminded **Hopkins** she had 2 weeks to make these edits and was provided the recording to make it more accurate. **Hopkins** said these were not sent out, **McMahon** states they were sent on May 1<sup>st</sup>. **Hopkins** insisted they were inaccurate and wrong, and wrong is wrong. **McMahon** stated that if we cannot approve these here today, we’ll have to call a special meeting. **Hopkins** says let’s ask committee if they want these edits, **McMahon** asks if others listened to the recording? **Quis** said he listened and that’s inaccurate. **McMahon** asks why edits were not provided over the last 2 weeks? There was a discussion on this issue. **Gonzalez** offers up a few suggestions for getting this correct. **Bell** asks what’s the down side of not approving these minutes today? **McMahon** responds that established process and accreditation standards are for CEC meeting minutes to be approved at the subsequent meeting and posted, that’s our duty. **Bell** counters that we table minutes all the time. **McMahon** asks why do this if we do not need to? It sets a very bad precedent. There are no extenuating circumstances demonstrating these should be tabled. However, **McMahon** suggests if we cannot approve these minutes, that we call a special CEC meeting to allow for everyone to listen to the recording and submit their edits. **Hopkins** and **Quis** state that these minutes, as written, are not accurate based on the recording. **McMahon** responds we are now 13 minutes into the meeting and if you felt strongly about something, you had an opportunity as a committee to conduct business in a reasonable way. **Hopkins** says it should say what actually happened and **McMahon** asked **Hopkins** what would that be? **Hopkins** says ‘what **Quis** said’, but **McMahon** states she did not change anything that **Quis** said. **Hopkins** would like these minutes changed now. **McMahon** states that this is not the best use of our time. **Bermodes** moves to table the minutes. **Bell** seconds that motion. **Gonzalez** then suggests that we have three options. 1-We approve what is up there. 2) We bring it back to a future meeting and say this is incorrect and make changes. 3) We make edits now and hope they are correct and if they are not we can correct them later, because there is a process for that. Or we can table these minutes and assign a group to go listen to the tape and agree to what it going to be. **Gonzales** suggests that we identify 2-3 people to listen to the tape and make a recommended edit that is brought back to a special CEC meeting. Gonzalez asks for 3 volunteers to listen to the tape. **Bermodes** and **Young** will listen to the tape and make recommended language changes. McMahon suggests May 21 at 1:30pm and the CEC agrees to meet again to address this. **McMahon** asks that the suggested edit be sent out to the CEC prior to May 21 meeting. Motion passes to table the minutes and hold a meeting on May 21 at 1:30pm.
- C. **Update from Chancellor’s Cabinet (three minute maximum)** **Hopkins** reports that budget issues are being worked by the big news is that the College will be getting more funds from the Student Equity Achievement Plan this year and next year.
- D. **Section One: College-Wide Matters (Non-AB-1725)**
  - i. **New Business**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<b>Miramar Student Equity Plan (SEP) Approval (attachments)</b> <b>Teresh</b> thanks everyone for reviewing this plan and it appears all constituency groups have veto to approve this plan. <b>Teresh</b> asks if the SEP can be moved	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Teresh

**\* 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**

	forward to the Board of Trustees. CEC approves.				
2	<p><b>Result of Grievance to replace AV equipment in School of Humanities at Miramar College: McMahon</b> reports on the results of the aforementioned grievance. As a result of the <b>Grievance</b> filed by the AFT on behalf of the faculty in the School of Humanities - the resolution was for the District/Miramar College to replace and fix dilapidated AV equipment in order to address and remedy the AV complaints. This is to be completed by the end of this academic year (end of May, 2019). Bell says that this on target.</p>	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon
3	<p><b>Update on Proposed Changes to EOPS Guidelines by State Chancellor's Office: McMahon</b> reports the EOPS had a regional meeting mid-April and they received new proposed guidelines from the state chancellor's office. What was proposing was changes to the law and they can't do that. <b>McMahon</b> presented the following slide that read.</p> <p>EOPS Regional Reps Meeting April 12, 2019, Chancellor's Office proposed guideline changes in the following way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>§ 56262. Director Qualifications</b> The elimination of the Minimum Qualifications for the EOPS Director (revision retracted)</li> <li>• <b>§ 56230. Full-Time EOPS Director</b> The elimination of the requirement for programs with over 500 students to have a full time Director (revision retracted)</li> <li>• <b>§ 56264. Counselor Qualifications</b> The elimination of the minimum qualifications for the EOPS Counselors (revision retracted)</li> <li>• <b>§ 56236. Counseling and Advisement</b> Allowing tutoring and workshops to count as EOPS counseling contacts</li> <li>• Allowing EOPS counselors to see any student.</li> </ul> <p>There was strong opposition to this and as a result Chancellor Eloy retracted the above. The changes were received with <b>strong opposition from the EOPS Association</b>, EOPS leadership and the EOPS community. EOPS began mobilizing and sent a strong message that the field did not support any of the proposed changes. Prior to the convening of the annual EOPS/CARE spring training, Jillian Luis, EOPS CCCO Program Specialist sent an email to CCEOPSA regional reps indicating that the CCCO would <b>not</b> be releasing an updated EOPS Handbook (Implementation Guidelines) at our training, the proposed changes to min. quals and full-time Director waiver requirement had been <b>retracted</b> and that the initial training agenda had been modified to allow for more continued discussion about proposed changes to EOP. The Chancellor's Office heard the united message loud and clear and the next round of revisions should be less intrusive and aimed at</p>	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	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**

	streamlining process while maintaining the integrity of our program. Draft will be provided in 2 weeks to regional reps and we will need to see how the day's discussions impact this round of edits.				
4	<b>Miramar Annual Planning Calendar Cycle – 2019-2020 (attachment)</b> Miramontez asks for an update on where this item is with regards to the constituency groups? Miramontez does say the manager's have looked at this and recommend that it move forward. Hubbard said it went to Classified Senate as an FYI and there were no issues. Bermodes (not audible). McMahon said there is a Senate Exec meeting next Tuesday. Miramontez says the updates are minimal and are about the dates. Some items were moved and some items may have been removed. This went out in March. Miramontez says that this is good to go pending AS approval. McMahon responds yes.	3 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
5	<b>Posting of College's Mission Statement in Offices and Classrooms (attachment)</b> Gonzales asks if the constituency groups are okay with the new mission statement being replaced in offices and classrooms over the summer. Hubbard asks if the new statements will include the diversity statement. Gonzalez says this is something CEC must decide. There was a discussion as to whether or not the diversity statement has been approved.	3 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Gonzales
6	<b>Scented Items in Workplace/Offices:</b> Hubbard reported that she had a brief conversation with Bell over this issue. Hubbard said this item is going to DGC tomorrow. Bell says this is likely an HR issue and we should wait for DGC. Hubbard wants to make people on the campus aware of how this might affect others.	3 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Hubbard

## ii. Old Business

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<b>Convocation Planning Fall 2019:</b> McMahon reports that Chancellor said "no" to convocation moving to Friday. Other arrangements for a Tim Wise visit are being explored. This frees up time for Ben Gamboa's presentation and a "Guided Pathways" kick-off. McMahon suggests that the convocation planning group gets together soon and discusses the program.	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon, Hubbard, Gamboa & Murphy
2	<b>Miramar EEO Site Compliance Officer – Status Report:</b> McMahon reports the following: SCO position a 3 year assignment. Scheduled end was 6/30/17. This position opportunity was never opened to the campus. This role appointed to Dean Beitey until his retirement April 2019.  <b>Important components to this role:</b> 1) Providing EEO training to the college; 2) Handling the case-work of complaints that are brought forward; 3) Maintaining an appropriate level of confidentiality in relation to complaints. 4) Reviewing and signing-off on screening committee	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon and Hubbard

### \* 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>questions; 5) Providing other pertinent diversity/inclusion/bias related trainings; 6) Delivering status reports to the college president/District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Announcement from Patricia (4/22/19) implied SCO position would be handed to the new dean of Public Safety.</li> <li>Faculty and classified recognize this position needs more attention should go to a qualified individual.</li> </ul> <p><b>McMahon</b> reported the recent history:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty in role prior to 2014 - Most recent faculty resigned 2013 - citing lack of administrative support in <b>reassigned time, ESU's and back-fill</b>; inequitable compared SDCCD.</li> <li>District created equitable practices across SDCCD.</li> <li>Reassigned time to 0.40 FTEF.</li> <li>Then the position awarded to dean Beitey.</li> <li>Currently the SCO positions at Mesa* and City Colleges are held by faculty.</li> <li>Take to DGC <b>meeting tomorrow</b> for discussion - seeking fair/consistent arrangements/practices across the SDCCD.</li> <li>Equitable selection processes for this position.</li> </ul> <p><u>From Pam Luster, President Mesa College:</u> *We recently changed our process and have invested college resources to hire a full time EEO/504/discipline position at Mesa. We did this by eliminating other positions using our hiring priorities lists generated from Program Review.</p> <p>There was further discussion on how to fund this position should it go to faculty.</p>				
3	<p>CEC Agenda and Minutes Protocols (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading): <b>McMahon</b> showed the protocols (<b>see attachment for details</b>) and has yet to get any feedback. <b>McMahon</b> mentioned we had established a straightforward processes before. <b>Bell</b> starts a discussion on no-verbatim vs. verbatim minutes. <b>McMahon</b> agrees verbatim is not necessary, if we get the spirit of what is said. <b>McMahon</b> added there is a difference between being detailed and verbatim. CIA recommended we move away from verbatim, laborious details and selectively quoting some and not others. <b>McMahon</b> said currently CEC minutes are all over the place and the reason for the details is to hold people accountable for what they say in meetings. <b>McMahon</b> responds that it will take us trusting each other more so we don't have to monitor so carefully what others say.</p>	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	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>When we are in a better place we won't need the laborious details. In the last two minutes there were detailed from <b>McMahon</b> but not verbatim. <b>McMahon</b> says <b>Bell</b> has posed a great question and asks what his suggestions might be? <b>Bell</b> suggests our minutes are way too detailed and maybe we could set a goal as CEC to work on this. <b>McMahon</b> agrees that is a good goal and that they are too detailed, but the first draft is always very detailed for some (admin) and not for others, thus they are lopsided. That leaves <b>McMahon</b> with two choices; cut down the detail provided or add the detail that is missing – and that is where we have gone. <b>McMahon</b> does not want this but it is required in order to provide balance. <b>McMahon</b> agreed with what <b>Bell</b> said at last CEC, that these are our records, this is the highest deliberative body and it deserves detail, particularly when we debate important issues that we have differences of opinion on, and we want to hold each other accountable. <b>McMahon</b> states we want to convey the complete story, and if we are only getting half the story, then more details are relevant. Even if long, it makes the issues easier to understand, at least they are complete. They provide a sense of what actually occurs in our meeting. <b>Gonzales</b> asks if we have thought about posting the recordings of our minutes, allowing us to keep the minutes to a minimum. <b>McMahon</b> notes we should keep the recordings but enough detail needs to be in the posted minutes so the public can understand them. <b>McMahon</b> says perhaps as we continue our work with the shared governance review we can get to a place where we record action items and partition the agenda between action and deliberative. <b>McMahon</b> mentioned she shared the minutes from two years ago with CEC and they were perfect Why? Because we were going through accreditation and getting along with one another. <b>McMahon</b> said that when we have differences of opinion it is not a bad thing that they are recorded somewhere. These are guidelines that in <b>McMahon's</b> opinion we used to follow. <b>McMahon</b> stated the only reason she brought them back to CEC is because we are not following them now, they have been abandoned. <b>Bell</b> says we should adopt this as a guideline and as we recognize how this guideline does or does not work and can be a living document that can be changed through time. <b>Gonzales</b> says what he doesn't see on this document is how we get items on an agenda. <b>McMahon</b> states that's a great question, and basically just contact the two co-chairs. <b>McMahon</b> says language could be inserted to address this and she will add this. CEC agreed with this.</p>				
4	<p><b>Guided Pathways Update (standing item):</b> <b>McMahon</b> reports that the two leads have been selected Lisa Brewster and Lisa Clarke. The GP Core Team will be these 5 members: 2 faculty co-facilitators (LB and LC), 1 Classified Professional (stipend compensation), 1 student (stipend/compensation), 1 Administrator (VPSS or VPI). These 2 faculty co-facilitators will work over the summer in preparation for the GP kick-off in the Fall 2019. Up next the focus is on design teams. The composition will be faculty lead (0.2), Classified professional lead</p>	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon and Gonzales

**\* 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**

	(stipend/compensation), Student lead (stipend/compensation) and Administrator. <b>Bell</b> asks is the stipend/compensation question is still unresolved. <b>McMahon</b> says yes. <b>Gonzales</b> says some regional guidance is also coming. He also says the design team numbers may increase. <b>Gonzales</b> says the 30 person steering committee has been disbanded. <b>McMahon</b> asks is everyone is okay with. CEC was.				
5	<b>Governance Review Steering Committees: McMahon</b> reports there is only one meeting left and it is Thursday, May 23. <b>Participatory Governance/Operational Committee Working Meeting</b> is Thursday May 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2019. From 12:30pm to 2:30pm and the <b>Academic and Professional Matters Committee Working Meeting</b> Thursday May 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2019. From 2:30pm to 4:30pm.	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon and Murphy
6	<b>Local Goals Alignment (standing item): Miramontez</b> states that they were approved at the May 9 Board of Trustees meeting and this item can be removed from the agenda.	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
7	<b>Diversity Taskforce Update (standing item) (attachment) Teresh</b> reports on the Inclusion Center survey. The response was outstanding by employees and students. In the fall, there will be a flex activity were survey results will be discussed in detail. By fall, they are also hoping to have a website up and running for a virtual space even if there isn't a physical space. This is just an overview of where we are presently. There is still discussion on when these results might be sent to the College. <b>Hubbard</b> asks how close they are to identify a space? <b>Teresh</b> says that that is the next step. Hubbard would like that on the diversity meeting agenda starting the fall.	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Gonzales
8	<b>Accreditation (Standing Item)</b> <i>a. Mid-term Report: No report</i>	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
9	<b>Faculty Co-Chair Reassigned Time for IPR/SLO Com:</b> Tabled	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Murphy and McMahon

**E. Section Two: Academic and Professional Matters (AB-1725)** Pursuant to AB-1725 and Title 5, the items in this section are Academic and Professional Matters (10+1) and therefore the primacy of the Academic Senate wherein Collegial Consultation, by way of “rely primarily” or “mutually agree”, occurs. Unless extenuating circumstances arise, these should be presented as ‘For Your Information’ items.

**i. New Business**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<b>Faculty Appointments to Committees:</b> Tabled	2 min	1, 2, & 3	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon and Murphy
2	<b>Plan for College President to Respond to AS Document that has Shared Detailed Concerns?</b> Tabled	2 min	1, 2, & 3	I, IV	McMahon

**ii. Old Business**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<b>Reports on Investigations of Complaints to the SDCCD by Academic Senate regarding Miramar College:</b> Tabled	5 min	1, 2, & 3	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon and Murphy

**\* 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**

**F. Reports (Please limit each following report to two minutes maximum).**

- Academic Senate: Tabled
- Classified Senate: Tabled
- Associated Student Government: Tabled
- District Governance Council: Tabled
- District Strategic Planning Committee: Tabled
- Budget Planning and Development Council: Tabled
- College Governance Committee: Tabled

**G. Announcements: None**

**H. Adjourn: 2:30**

---

**\* 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**