

COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, February 27, 2018 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

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

Attendees: Beitey, Barnard, Ascione, & Miramontez

Meeting called to order at 1:30pm.

- A. **Approval of the Agenda:** Bell motions to approve agenda, **Murphy** seconds, motion passes.
- B. **Approval of Previous Minutes from 2/6/18 and 2/20/18:** Bell motions to approve both sets of minutes and **Murphy** seconds. Motion passes.
- C. **Guests/Introductions:** Gonzalez, Arancibia, Woods, Warren.
- D. **Section One: Non-AB-1725 (Non-Academic Senate) Matters**
 - i. **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) Gonzalez brings forth a concept for opening a diversity/safe space center. DIEC is looking at perhaps a spot in the ASC. Arancibia holds up the report requested by CEC. It is a 5-page document with the strategic goals listed out and hopes it will satisfy everyone. Gonzalez states that this proposal for a safe space/diversity center was submitted originally to Associate Dean Honda who is no longer with the college and Gonzalez is now planning to submit it again. Gonzalez points out that in pages 6-9 that there is a student satisfaction survey that indicates the growing need for a safe space/diversity center. Gonzalez is looking for the go ahead from CEC so the DIEC can move to the next step. Gonzalez shows the approved estimated DIEC budget for 2018 and the committee has put \$2,000 toward this project. McMahon asks if the ASG has looked at this proposal and “taken it on” in their meetings. McMahon suggests it be vetted by the constituency groups and then be brought back to CEC. Ramsey says the intent of bringing this to CEC is to get an acceptance of the possible concept and a direction to say “this looks like something we want to do, now go away and bring it back when it has been properly vetted.” Murphy asks if this proposal will require funding outside of the money the committee already committed. Gonzalez confirms that there will be a significant need for additional resources outside of the \$2,000, but that the committee has no idea what that will look like. Teresh says that it will require in-depth analysis to determine how much resources will be needed. Murphy asks for confirmation that this proposal is first moving to the constituencies for vetting prior to any further development. This is confirmed. Arancibia makes a request that the DIEC be taken off the standing items list of the CEC agenda and that the meetings being reduced once a year to present annual report. Hsieh comments on the annual report and states that it is wonderful to see all the activities that the committee has carried out over the year. Secondly, she asks the committee to go back and take a close look at the goals listed on the plan. She hopes the campus will help carry out the goals of the plan to move things</p>	3	I, III, & IV	Hubbard, Arancibia, & Gonzalez

*** 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. Hsieh asks the daily classroom instruction become an important campus wide component of the diversity plan. Hopkins hopes to see two reports a year. One in the fall and one in the spring. The CEC agrees that the DIEC will present when called upon by the CEC and not twice a year. The DIEC diversity center proposal will go back to the constituencies and their report is complete.			
2	Revised CEC Agenda Format (attachments) McMahon points out that section one entitled non-AB-1725 “non-academic senate” matters should be rewritten as “all-campus matters.” Section 2, AB-1725 should actually read “academic and professional matters.” She suggests it is reflected this way moving forward. There was no objection.	1	I & IV	Hsieh & McMahon

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 sent out the first mid-term accreditation newsletter to the college on Feb. 26. It is a status update. Miramontez asks all constituency leaders to place this bit of news on their agendas to share with their committees as an information item.</p>	1	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
2	<p>2018 ACCJC Annual Report (Internal Due Date 3/23/18)</p> <p>(attachment) Miramontez sent this annual report, populated in the ACCJC template, to the campus and all constituency leaders last week. All the information has been stated with the exception of the distance education information which comes from the district. He is waiting on the official numbers. When that happens he will repopulate and send it back to the campus. Miramontez asks all constituency leaders to place this bit of news on their agendas to share with their committees as an information item.</p>	1	I, II, III, IV	Miramontez
3	<p>Progress Report on Implementation of 2017-19 Integrated Plan: Ramsey says there is no report at this time. He adds that he and Teresh will have a conversation with the president about a more strategically positioning this on the agenda.</p>	1 & 2	I, II, & III	Ramsey, Teresh, & Hopkins

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

i. New Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator

ii. Old Business

*** 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**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p>Guided Pathways Self-Assessment (attachment) McMahon reports that there was a collegial consultation meeting between the AS president and the college president on Monday, Feb. 26 regarding both GP issues. An agreement was reached whereby the college president agreed that the AS rating or rankings would be accepted as the College’s rankings as it pertains to the GP self-assessment. The Academic Senate’s self-assessment rankings would be what the College would focus its future planning on. McMahon states that she asked the college president why it took over 10 weeks to reach an agreement? According to McMahon, the college president indicated that it was due to the lack of input from the classified senate and the ASG. McMahon states that she is disappointed, that as a leader, it took this to long come to an agreement and her impression from the meeting with the college president this past Monday, was that it was an abdication of the administration’s involvement in Guided Pathways, basically they are saying “ok, you do it” and that troubles McMahon. Hsieh comments that the college did provide an opportunity to other constituency groups to provide input, which would not have happened on Dec. 15. Yesterday, at the meeting the AS president insisted that no “official” input has been received. McMahon wants to be clear that they are discussing that no “official” input has been received in regards to the self-assessment, to this day, by CS or ASG. Hsieh says that McMahon can listen to the recording of the collegial consultation meeting on Monday, Feb. 26. Hopkins asks that more civility be displayed in these meetings. McMahon disagreed with Hopkins assessment of the civility at the meeting, and indicated that in fairness, nothing was uncivil, it was a simple interjection of an important fact. Hsieh emphasizes that the self-assessment used by the AS, moving forward, will be the one presented by the AS to the college president, with the disclaimer, on Dec. 15.</p>	1, 2, & 3	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon
2	<p>Academic Senate Guided Pathways Plan Proposal (attachment) The AS GP Plan proposal was also accepted. Hsieh comments that the proposal that will move forward by the AS is the version that the AS president sent out on Feb. 21. The Feb. 21 version is different than the one that all the constituency leaders received on Dec. 12 after the CEC meeting. Hsieh understands the changes are minimal but it is a different version. The deadline to submit the work plan is Friday, March 30, 2018. Hsieh reminds everyone that March 30 is a district holiday and the four days leading up to the 30th the college is on spring break. If Hsieh’s signature is required, she will not be available on 3/30/2018. Murphy clarifies that the current proposal dated Feb. 21 is different from the Dec. 12 proposal because the Feb. 21 proposal incorporated the only feedback received from CS and ASG. She also indicated that there was an addition of a line item to “investigate our current governance committee structure” which addresses concerns of the CS, ASG and managers. This is an open ended edit. Language has been added to discuss a thorough review of governance structure of current frameworks of the steering committee. Murphy adds that the AS proposal is not an AS plan, but a proposal as to how the college could move forward. Hubbard explains how the CS met at an executive meeting and discussed the GP self-assessment. With regards to the proposal, Hubbard states that this</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**

was also discussed at a regularly scheduled CS meeting, despite information not posted on the web. **Hubbard** states that everything was done in accordance with the Brown Act. Murphy says all that information was taken and put into the proposal. **McMahon** wants to clarify that there was no input to the self-assessment. **Hubbard** says they voted on that back in Oct. **McMahon** says that was not parlayed to the AS. **Hubbard** states that the response to the proposal was sent to the Miramar College DL and that the information can be resent to the AS. To make it clear, **Hsieh** asks for the proposal and its input be brought up on the big screen. There was a brief discussion on the feedback. **Barnard** wishes that the proposals of the CS, managers and ASG were better listened to at the 2/6/18 CEC meeting and that what was provided in writing is not reflective in the new proposal document. Going forward, **Barnard** urges that the student's time is precious and that creating another body that they need to find representatives for will be difficult. **Barnard** commends **McMahon** for coming to the ASG meeting last Friday, but because there wasn't a quorum, **McMahon** was not able to stay for the entire meeting which would have been beneficial. **Barnard** wants to go on record as the ASG advisor and point out that it is very important that the AS president actually listens when she asks for feedback. **McMahon** thanks **Barnard** for her comments, but respectfully disagrees with **Barnard's** observation. **McMahon** responds that AS representatives did listen to Alana and Mark's presentation as they presented the input from ASG at that CEC meeting Feb. 6, and the AS thanked them for expressing the voice of the students. McMahon says her key point expressed at that meeting was to convey the understanding of the difference between shared governance committees and constituency bodies. **McMahon** states that is the reason why the AS added into its proposal, as a direct consequence of what the students shared with AS, because one of the key elements recognized at CGC is that it is very difficult for students to participate in the College's shared governance committees. From attending the IEPI Guided Pathways Workshop on Feb 21st, 2018 - the only contingency from Miramar were three faculty members – one important topic that was covered was the variety of different ways to get student voices and student engagement in guided pathways, including student vets, mature age students, using focus groups, workshops and surveys. It was conveyed by **McMahon** that this information provided by ASG was in fact directly incorporated into the GP Proposal after that meeting – this was displayed on the screen, showing section e. within the GP Proposal: "e. Review existing governance committee structure, composition and functions to investigate potential use in Guided Pathways inquiry, design and implementation." **McMahon** indicated that the AS realized that it was first necessary to examine the feasibility of using any existing shared governance committee before being able to determine if any one committee might be robust enough to handle this arduous task. **Ramsey** suggests that we admit as a college that we had a rocky road getting to this point but that we put it behind us and move forward. **Bell** wonders why the feedback from the managers was not incorporated into the AS proposal. **McMahon** asked which part of the presentation he was referring to? **Bell** cited it was suggested in the presentation that the PIEC be the launching point for Guided Pathways on our campus. **McMahon** informed

*** 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>Bell that this input was parleyed directly to the AS meeting that same day, and Senator North (in AS meeting minutes) shared that before we, as a college, decide where this task should reside in terms of any one committee, we needed to first examine if any of the existing shared governance committees was even capable of being agile enough to handle such a vast and comprehensive task. This is also why section e. was added to the GP Proposal after the presentation from Admin.</p>			
--	--	--	--

F. Updates from the Chancellor’s Cabinet: Hsieh states that the college has reached the 10,000 FTES threshold per district.

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 an academic exec meeting will be held today. Chancellor Carrol will attend as a guest for 1 1/2.
- Classified Senate: **Hubbard** reports that they meet on March 1.
- Associated Student Government: **Bermodes** presents the signatures of the students who authored GP response. **Bernard** states that the students came to campus while they were on break to craft the response. **Bernard** wants to remind everyone that the students schedule is much different from the schedule of AS, managers and CS.
- District Governance Council: **McMahon** reports next meeting is March 7.
- District Strategic Planning Committee: **McMahon** reports that the next meeting is Feb. 28.
- Budget Planning and Development Council: **McMahon** reports that the next meeting is March 7.
- College Governance Committee: **McMahon** reports that the next meeting is later today.

H. Announcements: None

I. 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**