

COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, October 16, 2018 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

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

Attendees: Barnard, Beitey, Miramontez, Quis & Hill

Meeting called to order at 1:30pm

- A. **Approval of the Agenda:** Bell moves to approve agenda. Young seconds. Motion passes.
- B. **Approval of Previous Minutes**
 - ii. May 15th Meeting Minutes ([attachment](#)) Bell moves to approve. Hopkins seconds. Motion passes with Gonzales abstaining.
 - iii. September 4th Meeting Minutes ([attachment](#)) Bell moves to approve. Hopkins seconds. Hsieh asks that in the minutes under new business D., number 4 (Timeline for hiring associate dean of equity) the third reason should be changed to “we are going to have a new VPSS and therefore, Hsieh suggests that the job description or announcement needs to be reviewed. This is per the 7/31/2018 meeting minutes. McMahon says she does not understand. The minutes reflect the reasons that McMahon gave. Hsieh says she will compromise and add a footnote stating that the third reason that the president stated was that the job description or announcement needs to be reviewed after VPSS arrives. Motion tabled.
 - iv. September 18th Meeting Minutes ([attachment](#)) Bell moves to approve minutes. Young seconds. Motion passes.
- C. **Guests/Introductions: Demko.**
- D. **Update from Chancellor’s Cabinet (three minute maximum):** Hsieh reports on enrollment and states the Lynn Neault is working on an enrollment model that will not only improve the enrollment update, but will include how to track outcomes. Outcomes will now also drive the funding for the colleges moving forward. The district will host a giving Tuesday on Nov. 27 that will benefit the San Diego Promise. Each college is encouraged to take advantage of that and Miramar College will use that day to promote its May 4, 2019 Invest in Success fundraiser. According to VC Bulger and OER textbook report will go to the board, but that no date has been identified. 11th annual festival of lights will be at Balboa Park on Oct. 20 from 1pm-8:30pm and the district has received 20 complimentary tickets. If anyone is interested in going, including students, please let Lynn Neault know. The district drafted a baccalaureate report because state legislators continue to ask for outcomes, VC Neault is working on this. VC Bulger reported that the district’s letter of interest to join the Bakersfield College guided pathways program mapper was not accepted. VP Hopkins has already notified the campus about this. USIU articulation agreement partnership was discussed. This topic has come up twice. This would be an articulation agreement with an African university called USIU Africa. Hsieh reminds the committee that, last semester, she asked this body if they had any interest in joining as a college and there was none. City and Mesa are interested in participating. The College asked for an EMGM 050a course to be approved in curriculum. At this point, this is an outstanding issue, because there is a concern that People Soft will not be able to handle .1 unit. The College is in a holding pattern until further notice. An email with a link to renew parking permits will come next week to all contract employees.
- E. **Section One: College-Wide Matters (Non-AB-1725)**
 - i. **New Business**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p>Review of CEC Co-Chair Responsibilities/Duties: McMahon reports that the co-chairs, along with Murphy and Kunst held a meeting to discuss how to better effectively communicate so that there wouldn’t be a repeat of the Oct. 2 CEC meeting whereby an agenda was never approved and official meeting never took place. McMahon reviewed the co-chair duties as stated in the college governance handbook. It was pointed out to CEC that a time limit column has been added to the agenda moving forward. It was agreed that update form the Chancellor’s Cabinet would be moved up to D. with a time limit. McMahon points out that when we want to genuinely resolve issues we have to come to the table with</p>	3 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I & II	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

	a genuine desire. This was agreed upon by the parties.				
2	<p>Brown Act Regulations: McMahon states that Hsieh had brought up the 72-hour window for posting agenda's at the recently held co-chairs meeting. It is Hsieh's interpretation that 72 hours covers accessible hours to the public, whereby the college is open. McMahon believes, per the Brown Act, it covers clock hours. The issue on the table is why the agenda is posted on a Thursday before a Tuesday CEC meeting and not over the weekend covering 72 clock hours. McMahon states that SDCCD legal counsel Kostic verified that it is 72 clock hours and she states it is in the college governance handbook as such. Hsieh says that she will be happy to send an email to the CEC from the general legal counsel about the 72 hours. Hsieh states that the Brown Act in the past covered physical posting and not electronic posting. Last year, the College had discussion about how electronic posting will become law and acceptable in January 2019. The College did identify a 24-hour publically accessible place to post the agenda within 72 hours. The College did decide to continue its current practice of sending out the agenda on Thursday, counting Friday, Monday and part of Tuesday as the 72-hour period. Also the College puts the agenda on the downstairs posting board in the N building with the understanding it is not open 24/7. McMahon interrupts Hsieh and says this is not the issue. Murphy says to clarify it is not a decision that the college made to do the 72-hour ACCESSIBLE posting. Murphy says the college governance handbook clearly states 72 clock hours. She says this is not an issue for this committee to decide. McMahon is not asking that we change our practices she was simply stating that we could continue to send it out on Thursday and should there be changes, than agenda could be amended, posted still on Saturday and be in compliance with the Brown Act. Hopkins points out that we need to acknowledge that classified staff do not work on Saturday's and if they are brought in they need to be paid time and a half. She proposes that perhaps CEC be moved to later in the week. McMahon says there has never been a proposal to change our practices, she is simply stating that the College would not be outside of the law if the agenda were posted on Saturday. Hsieh again says she will forward the general counsel's interpretation of the law to everyone.</p>	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I & II	McMahon and Murphy
3	<p>Technology Committee Change Proposal: Miramontez reports that the change proposal for the Technology Committee has gone to the constituency groups. Miramontez states that academic senate has approved it along with the managers, who approved it with a change that we remove the term "operational" to make it Technology Plan and consistent with the other plans. It is pending with ASG and Classified Senate. The primary change is that we have a technology recommendation from ACCJC and that is for the district to form a district wide technology committee. However, it is the College's recommendation to add a district voting member.</p>	2 min	1, 2, 3	III	Miramontez, Hill, and Murphy
4	Program Mapper Project SOI - Current status and	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I & II	McMahon and

*** 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>lack of Collegial Consultation: Murphy states that the issue the AS and the faculty have is that there is great concern over the process for submitting the solicitation of interest letter. As was stated by VPSS and VPI in an email sent to the campus, the submission of this letter, if it were to be accepted would mean that the College would implement the program mapper project, however that particular decision was never vetted in any constituency group nor was a vote taken. Murphy adds that we completely again by passed collegial consultation on a 10+1 item. There also was discussion in the guided pathways steering committee. This is big concern for the AS. It is moot because the college was not accepted, but this can't keep happening. The faculty discussed, in AS, that they were not ready to submit this letter. Gonzales states, that in fairness, we were in the process of collegial consultation and that the College had not made a local decision, but rather the district decided to move this forward. Secondly, Gonzales did attend the AS meeting and the AS had a discussion but did not take a position. Gonzales says that as College we need to have clarity as to when we are asking for a formal position. In reality, the College needs to find a better process to communicate with the district what our final position is. Gonzales says this moved too quickly and that the College was trying to convey that we have interest but aren't ready to move forward at this time. McMahon states that she brought this issue to the board meeting and asked the Chancellor, that if we are going into this as a district, what are the implications, because we did not agree as a College to go forward with this and the Chancellor said that at her Chancellor's Cabinet, the college presidents indicated that they had consensus of their Colleges to move forward. Therefore, a decision was made without consultation of the decision making bodies. Gonzales states that he has heard in multiple venues that we are interested but we are not ready for this phase. Murphy states that the faculty did not state they are interested, rather they said that this is something that could be potentially good in the future. Murphy says we are talking about submitting a letter of interest for this pilot program and she states that the email Gonzales sent to the campus stated that if our letter is accepted then we will, along with City, Mesa and CE implement the program mapper pilot. Gonzales states that this is the district telling us we are going to do this. Murphy says they are telling us that because they are not getting any push back from our leader. Our leader needs to consultate with the constituency groups. Gonzales says we need to follow our process and McMahon and Murphy agree. Gonzales says we never had a formal statement from the AS as to what they wanted to do. Hsieh says that she believes the College will be able to go through the State process in the future and the College will be able to apply its processes at that time.</p>				Murphy
---	--	--	--	--------

ii. Old Business

#	Item	Time	*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**

		Limit	Goals	Standard	
1	Accreditation (Standing Item) Miramontez sent out the latest accreditation newsletter yesterday.	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
2	Guided Pathways Update (Standing Item) Gonzales says the inquiry group met last Tuesday. They are working on putting together as much information as possible for the next meeting. Hsieh asks if there is a timeline according to the state requirement to provide a progress report. Gonzales says no and that no template for reporting has been issue, however the college will have to report on the use of the funds. Murphy says the college has a work plan and perhaps the College should come up with a timeline to report out on that work plan, at least internally. Gonzales says they should put that on the next agenda. Murphy hopes we can adopt messaging for a smooth rollout. Hsieh asks if we have a communications plan. Murphy says no. Gonzales says there is no formal plan, but as outlined in the work plan, there should be campus forums, faculty training and workshops and that is identified in the work plan. There is no timeline at this point.	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I & II	Gonzales, Mc Mahon, Hubbard, & Bermodes

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

i. New Business

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1					

ii. Old Business

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	College Executive Committee Change Proposal: McMahan says they are waiting on ASG and CS feedback. Murphy says that Hubbard contacted her and this was approved by CS. Bermodes says it was voted on last semester and the ASG was in opposition. This item will be moved forward with 3 of the 4 constituency groups approving.	2 min	1, 2, & 3	I	McMahan and Murphy
2	Faculty Committee Appointments: Title 5 Section 53203 (f) and AP-2510: McMahan reads the AP-2510 language. McMahan says that at Miramar College, based on the by-laws, the AS President makes these appointments. McMahan has been made aware of a violation of a faculty search committee where an administrator attempted to replace a faculty member on the committee. McMahan wants to make everyone aware that this is not appropriate. She says this a concern. McMahan is hoping for a review of this procedure. Hsieh hopes McMahan will share with her, off-line, which committee had the issue, so she can address this. McMahan says she will provide Hsieh that information when she can verify it. McMahan points out that faculty hiring committees can have a faculty co-chair. Folks wishing to serve cannot be excluded by dates. The committee should set the dates so as to include everyone. McMahan hopes this document will be sent out to administrators. Hsieh says management	5 min	1, 2, & 3	I	McMahan

*** 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**

	is very sensitive to this issue and she thanks McMahon for her leadership in this area to educate every one of the rules. McMahon says that some people are fearful of speaking out. Bell says they shouldn't because each committee has an EEO rep to address concerns and make sure all the rules are followed properly.					
3	<p>Faculty Evaluation Issues: McMahon reports the AS has concerns over the online course integrity and content and instructor contact. McMahon states that at first when they brought it forward it was described as a personnel and administration issue. She thinks now that they have gotten to the state where it is it and that it is an academic and professional matter and we are attempting to work out a meeting where we can review the circumstances. We have made progress in attempting to rectify what are perceived to be very poor practices that are in violation of policy AP-5105 with regards to distance education. McMahon reports that they are getting closer to an appropriate addressing of this issue in the senate. AS has a work group working on various aspects. One of the issues is about the evaluation of online courses, not only specific criteria and modality, but how to ensure that the process is followed. McMahon continues that once an evaluation is signed off on by faculty then it falls in the hands of administration to follow through appropriately with that evaluation. In her opinion, this is the area that the College is failing at.</p> <p>Hsieh asks who is on the work group. McMahon says it is 8 people but can't recall just who. Hopkins responds that because we are now in contract negotiations with the AFT and evaluations are set by the CBA, the College follows process to a "T". If the AS wants to make some changes, Hopkins suggests that those changes are made with the AFT in collective bargaining. Hopkins says she is not aware of any violations and would need to see them before she can address them. Hopkins states that the other piece is that if one is looking at faculty evaluation process-that is a real personnel issue and those issues are confidential. McMahon states that she thinks Hopkins is confused on the issue. Hopkins says she is not confused. McMahon says this not about the actual faculty evaluation tool, which is an AFT issue, but it's about what occurs after that in terms of implementing our standards that are listed in the administrative procedures. It is about the process that we follow after an evaluation takes place. Hopkins explains what the process is and states that after an evaluation occurs, let's say it is an adjunct evaluation, which is done by a faculty member, the faculty member signs off on it, they turn it in to the dean's office, the dean asks the chair to review it, the chair reviews it and signs off on it, and then the dean will sign off on it. If there is an unsatisfactory evaluation, I can tell you that action is taken. But when there is a satisfactory evaluation it is signed off. McMahon says that when it is unsatisfactory that we want to pay attention to what happens. Hopkins says she is not aware of any unsatisfactory evaluations. McMahon says that is why she wants to have a private meeting to make her aware of them. Hopkins states that McMahon is going down some personnel places.</p>	5 min		1, 2, & 3	I	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**

	Hopkins says she will not speak individually about anybody. McMahon says that is not required or being asked of Hopkins .				
4	Options for increasing Academic Senate Travel Budget: Tabled	5 min	1, 2, & 3	I	McMahon and Murphy
5	Assoc. Dean for ASC Timeline: Tabled	2 min	1, 2, & 3	I	McMahon
6	Effective Communication between the College President and the Academic Senate: Tabled	3 min	1, 2, & 3	I	McMahon and Murphy

G. 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

H. Announcements: None

I. Adjourn: 2:57pm

*** 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