

# COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, February 12, 2019 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

**Members:** Hsieh, Bell, Hopkins, Gonzales, McMahon, Murphy, Hubbard, Young, & Bermodes

**Attendees:** Barnard, Beitey, Miramontez, Quis, & Kjartanson

Meeting called to order at 1:31pm

- A. **Approval of the Agenda (1 min):** Bell moves to approve agenda, Hubbard seconds. Miramontez asks to move two items. He requests that item 8 under new business entitled “Local Goals Alignment” and item 3 under old business “Revised College Mission Statement” be moved up to the top. McMahon notes that we (co-chairs) did prioritize for vital agenda items to be first, given that, we can still make amendments if we can get everything addressed. McMahon noted that with so few CEC meeting everything is urgent. It was also noted that standing items are not new business. Bell has a similar request, but states he is fine leaving his item “BRDS Request for Funding Prioritization” as item 6 under new business as long as the CEC holds to the time limits. Hopkins requests that item 1 “FCHC Electorate Change Proposal” under section F new business be moved somewhere up higher. After a brief discussion, it is agreed upon that FCHC Electorate Change Proposal will be moved to the top of Section E, Old Business item 1. The Revised College Mission Statement moves up to Section E. item 2 under old business. “Local Goals Alignment” item 8 under new business is flip flopped with Item 4 Technology Committee Recommendation. Motion carries.
- B. **Approval of Previous Minutes (1 min):** McMahon repeated the CIA suggestion that we want to move away from verbatim transcriptions of minutes, especially when there is such a lopsided first draft of the minutes, it requires an enormous amount of work from the two faculty and student members. The draft minutes sent out did not reflect many of the important statements made by the students and faculty present, and McMahon wanted to ensure they were included. The edits McMahon provided were not verbatim but contained the essence of what occurred, and there were also errors in the language which mischaracterized some things that were stated by McMahon and we needed to be careful of doing that. Due to edits coming back the night before the meeting, there was not enough time to review, Bell motions to table the minutes of Dec. 4. Hubbard seconds. Motion passes.
- C. **Guests/Introductions (1 min):** Julie Bruno, Helen Benjamin, Grisham, Kunst, Teresh, Woods, Ascione, and Jesse.
- D. **Update from Chancellor’s Cabinet (three minute maximum):** No report due to no chancellor’s cabinet meeting.
- E. **Section One: College-Wide Matters (Non-AB-1725)**

**i. New Business**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p><b>Recommendations for Improvements to Miramar ASG:</b> McMahon states that we ended off the semester with issues that were taken forward to the Chancellor with regard to what came up at the Dec. 4, 2018 CEC meeting and an investigation was conducted and recommendations were made for improvement.</p> <p>a) <b>Clarification on Student Stipends across SDCCD:</b> Bermodes states that there will be district wide dialogue with the other ASG presidents from the district colleges within the United Students Council and hopefully make recommendations to the board to approve student leadership stipends so they are consistent across the District.</p> <p>b) <b>Designated Space Specifically for Miramar ASG:</b> Bermodes states that there are work studies in student government working in space that was never approved or authorized through the student senate. This has been a difficult adjustment – especially since this involved moving a senator’s possessions off their desk into boxes without any notification, in order to make</p>	7 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Bermodes

**\* 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>space for work-study when this area should be an area for student government. The elected senators have rights to that specific desk. <b>Bermodes</b> is bringing this forward to CEC for any recommendations on how to establish guidelines or boundaries for that ASG space.</p> <p>c) <b>Hubbard</b> asked what area the work-study student's belonged to?</p> <p>d) <b>Gonzales</b> says that he has called a meeting to try and resolve this issue. He is waiting for people to respond to their availability. <b>Gonzales</b> hopes that they can find a resolution to this. <b>Bermodes</b> stated that all senators should be involved as it is about all of their space.</p> <p>e) <b>Student Appointments to Com; Farmers Market: Bermodes</b> states that she has no idea how that is going, as a taskforce was formed, and students have approached her with concerns that faculty/staff have been lined up to get food while students are attempting to leave their classes to get food before it runs out. <b>Bermodes</b> wants to brain storm to see how ASG can assist students in getting better access to this resources which was created for students. <b>Bermodes</b> says she wants to see ASG appointments being made to that committees that oversee the food pantry and the farmers market because to her knowledge there is no ASG rep. <b>Gonzales</b> says it is time to formalize a committee around the food pantry.</p> <p>f) <b>Honoring Confidentiality and Respect: Bermodes</b> states that there was a student complaint about a Brown Act violation and Bermodes thought this was a confidentiality situation, however in the past ASG meeting last Friday, the dean of students affairs printed out that student complaint and handed it out to the students at the meeting. <b>Bermodes</b> said she thought it needed to be handled internally. She wants clarity on understanding the confidentiality part of the complaint. <b>Bermodes</b> asked if every complaint would be handled this way? Wants clarification on the confidentiality part as her name was on that complaint that came in anonymously, which contained nonfactual information.</p> <p>g) <b>McMahon</b> indicated that Chancellor Carroll got an anonymous letter but it was not used for decision making, and <b>McMahon</b> asked that we reestablish those understandings with regards to complaints. It's great to seek improvement through complains but the method by which we do that is important, how we source and use complaints if they're anonymous.</p> <p>h) <b>Gonzales</b> explained the back story on the complaint and said Vice Chancellor as well legal was consulted and legal said that the issues they</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

**\* 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>are bringing up are valid and should be shared with the group, take it to ASG so they are aware there is a complaint and then the college should do a retraining so that people understand what their roles and responsibilities are. <b>McMahon</b> reiterated that regardless of intent, it could have been handled with consultation behind the scenes. <b>Gonzales</b> said that based on the advice from the District they took those steps.</p> <p><b>Bermodes</b> indicated that although her name was in the letter, she was never approached about the letter before it was distributed to all at the ASG.</p> <p>i) Faculty Academic Senate Advising with ASG: AS discussed at CIA, AS Faculty <b>Tabled due to time</b></p>				
2	<p><b>Brown Act Regulations and Changes</b></p> <p>a) <b>New Practices as of January 2019: McMahon</b> suggests that the details of the new practices be taken to DGC for a comprehensive discussion across campus and the constituencies.</p> <p>b) <b>Bulletin Board for Public Posting of Agendas: McMahon</b> indicated that last semester (and before) the bulletin board in the N building where the CEC agendas are posted was not visible from the outside - thus we were out of compliance with the Brown Act. <b>Bell</b> says there is a new bulletin board outside of the LLRC for posting that has been installed. Who will have access and keys is still being discussed, but it will be for posting all agendas.</p> <p>c) <b>72 (Clock) Hour Advanced Notice for Agendas: McMahon</b> understands the need to streamline the process for generating an agenda but it has to be done in consultation with the two co-chairs. The suggested protocol that was sent to CEC was not in consultation between the two co-chairs – we need to do that first before we decide on protocols. Another reminder from <b>McMahon</b> about advanced notice of agendas, it is not 3 business days, but 72 clock hours.</p>	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon, Bell
3	<p><b>New Full-time Faculty Allotments 2019 and Screening Committee Practices, including EEO Certification: McMahon</b> states that AS shared with board of trustees and the chancellor a resolution that the AS made in 2017 that shows a ratio of fulltime faculty to FTES. (see attachment). At Miramar the ratio is 1 Full time faculty to about 80 FTES, whereas at City and Mesa the average is 55, therefore Miramar College is way out of kilter with regard to fulltime faculty and the amount of students we serve. <b>McMahon</b> calculated what is actually needed (in order to be at parity with City and Mesa) is a total of 182 full time faculty rather than 126 that we have. What this means is that we need an additional 56 fulltime faculty members today at Miramar College to have parity with the other colleges. This is a big deficit. The Chancellor committed that Miramar would have a vast majority and the college would be disproportionately favored, however</p>	2 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>that hasn't happened. <b>McMahon</b> stated hypothetically, if we (District) got 13 new faculty position every year and used this current disproportionate allotment, it will take Miramar College at least 14 years to reach parity – however we will not even be at parity then, as the other colleges will continue to get more faculty as they rightly should. Therefore this is not a plan that is effective in meeting our needs. We have been left uninformed as to the rationale for this particular schema. This has an impact on everything we do. If we could think of one thing that could solve most of our problems in terms of workloads, it would be more full time faculty – we are at a supreme disadvantage. AS will advocate for addressing this. <b>McMahon</b> asks if <b>Hsieh</b> is aware of the rationale for this distribution. <b>Hsieh</b> says she wishes she could tell us but she is not aware.</p> <p><b>Hsieh</b> added the data is good and that the Classified Professional staff is also understaffed. <b>Hsieh</b> will continue to advocate for more fulltime faculty and classified professional staff. <b>Bell</b> asks if this data had been shared with the president. <b>McMahon</b> indicated that it had been talked about amongst all AS presidents and college presidents within the district. <b>Gonzales</b> asks for this data to be sent to him. <b>McMahon</b> states there has been some poor practices at Miramar College in regards to not having consistent practices with EEO certification.</p> <p><b>McMahon</b> calls out Miramontez for his great work as a screening committee chair in being accommodating with the faculty appointments made by the AS, and not excluding people with rigid interpretations of rules. <b>McMahon</b> states that, unfortunately, some practices by <b>Hopkins</b> have been poor and very exclusive, but states that she thinks these issues have been worked out. <b>McMahon</b> reminded <b>Hopkins</b> that we need to focus on being flexible to accommodation all classified, students, and faculty in decision making and not use the EEO certification to potentially look like you are trying to exclude people.</p> <p><b>Hopkins</b> states that she was following the practices dictated by district HR. Then they (HR) re-examined it and made changes and <b>Hopkins</b> was following through with what HR said.</p> <p><b>McMahon</b> states that the reason HR re-examined this and made their changed recommended was because <b>McMahon</b> asked them to re-examine this, as every other search committee chair was flexible and accommodating and that was the practice at Miramar and <b>Hopkins</b> was the exception to that practice. Due to the request by <b>McMahon</b>, changes in <b>Hopkins</b> practices were made and all faculty were able to be accommodated and that was a good thing.</p> <p><b>Hopkins</b> replies that she did ask HR as well, but it happened that the director was on jury duty. <b>McMahon</b></p>				
---	--	--	--	--

**\* 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>replied that it was a good thing that <b>McMahon</b> pushed the issue and got it resolved. <b>Kjartanson</b> stated that if people want to serve on these committees they should maintain their EEO certification. Why put yourself in the pool if EEO has lapsed, it gets the whole process behind.</p> <p><b>McMahon</b> states that since EEO goes for 3 years, most people have no idea when their training lapses. Also, it is the job of the search committee chair to check the EEO certification of committee members. <b>McMahon</b> states that's the whole idea of being flexible, if the committee chair realizes someone is not certified, they can suggest that they go to an upcoming training ASAP. These lapses are all over the place so we need to do our best to accommodate each other.</p> <p><b>Bell</b> asks why would we even recommend someone who is not EEO certified. <b>McMahon</b> responds that we have to be careful because it is not the duty/task of the AS president to check peoples EEO certification, neither does <b>McMahon</b> have the capacity to do that.</p> <p><b>Murphy</b> mentioned that some people are currently EEO certified but that it might lapse during the course of a search committee, and they should still be allowed to get re-certified. Murphy re-iterated that the AS president cannot look that EEO certification information up, it's not possible. <b>McMahon</b> states that most do not think that if the EEO lapses in the middle they won't qualify to serve - that is the only experience <b>McMahon</b> has ever had. There is confusion about what is being applied and that's the important thing to air out and have certainty on.</p> <p><b>Hsieh</b> states that the campus needs to be committed to more training in this area so that we can hire top candidates.</p>				
4	<p><b>Local Goals Alignment</b> (<i>standing item</i>) (attachment i_8)</p> <p><b>Miramontez</b> reports that this item went to all the constituency groups. <b>Miramontez</b> draws every ones attention to Miramar College Priorities which stems from the College's goals and the Vision for Success goals. <b>Grisham</b> and <b>Miramontez</b> did an alignment with the college priorities to the Vision for Success Goals. The College priority matches the Vision for Success goal. If it is indirect, our priority supports the Vision for Success goals. PIEC looked at this last week and voted on it "as is." <b>Grisham</b> spoke to <b>McMahon</b> and discussed involving some of the governance groups and have a standing group like the college has done in the past. The research committee might be a great place to get this serving as a basis to look at the bench marking process. Subject matter experts would still be consulted in this process. <b>Miramontez</b> is looking for approval to move this forward today from the constituency groups. <b>McMahon</b> states that they are working on it and the senate will review at their next AS meeting, as yet we cannot support it. <b>Miramontez</b> states that this is time sensitive. It is due in May 2019 to State Chancellor's Office and needs</p>	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez

**\* San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2020 Strategic Goals**

**Goal 1:** Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.

**Goal 2:** Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.

**Goal 3:** Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services, and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.

**Goal 4:** Develop, strengthen, and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.

**Please also see** <http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/plan> for **San Diego Miramar College 2013-2020 Strategic Plan**

	SDCCD Board approval prior. <b>Murphy</b> states that the recommendation that AS made was to convene a taskforce as Naomi said we have done in the past, and asks is that what we are taking about? <b>Murphy</b> suggests they work with AS to get this into a form that AS can approve. There was discussion to regroup and talk off online to find a solution. AS wants to see what they are actually approving.				
5	<b>Classified Hiring Prioritization</b> (attachment i_5) <b>Bell</b> briefly explains the process of getting to this current list. Thirty-seven new positions have been prioritized for when resources become available. Twenty-two from instruction, 4 from student services, 4 from admin services and 7 from PRLT. This in an informational item only. <b>Hubbard</b> expressed an interest to be more involved in this process. <b>Hubbard</b> says that if the college is growing than our staff needs to grow appropriately.	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Bell
6	<b>BRDS Request for Funding Prioritization</b> (attachment i_6) <b>Bell</b> reports a summary of the annual process that the college has used for about 8 years. This process has been streamlined by using program review to extract the data that is prioritized. BRDS has prioritized 26 requests for funding totaling \$287,000. There are requests from each school that have been funded. <b>Bell</b> broke down the funding which can be found in the attached power point. <b>McMahon</b> asked about the status of the grievance filed by the AFT regarding the minimum conditions not being met for replacing dilapidated audio visual equipment at Miramar College. <b>Bell</b> indicated it was currently going through the complaint process at the District.	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Bell
7	<b>Review Student Equity Plan:</b> <b>Teresh</b> reports that the college's student equity plan is due to the State Chancellor's Office on June 30, 2019. The quick process to get this done has begun. The Student Equity Advisory Group is charged with developing and updating the plan. They met in January. <b>Teresh</b> has assembled small groups of indicator teams that will help in the process moving forward. Orientations are underway. <b>Teresh</b> is here before CEC to get the timeline in order. In order to meet the June 30, 2019 deadline the college needs to backtrack through the entire process. The shared governance process needs to be completed by May. The indicator teams are committed to getting a draft done by the end of March so that it can be moved through the shared governance process by the end of April. <b>Teresh</b> wants a commitment from the constituency groups to get through the approval process. <b>Teresh</b> would like the constituency groups to have approval by April 23 or, at the latest, May 7. There was no consensus on this issue at this time.	5 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Teresh
8	<b>Technology Committee Recommendations</b> (attachment i_4) <b>Miramontez</b> asks that this item be tabled in the interest of time.	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
9	<b>Diversity Taskforce Update</b> ( <i>standing item</i> ) <b>Gonzales</b> reports that the Diversity Taskforce has met twice. It is pre planning meetings. The taskforce has not yet been formed. At the last meeting, 4 potential areas of interest where discussed: education and training around diversity,	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	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**

	hiring process, policy and procedures that could support diversity and student perspective. The general number that was discussed to have on the taskforce was 14 faculty, one per department, 5 managers, students and 5 Classified Professionals. That was a round number that will be taken back to the committee for discussion.				
--	--	--	--	--	--

**ii. Old Business**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<b>FCHC Electorate Change Proposal: Kjartanson</b> reports that basic changes have been made. There was a change to increase the number of faculty votes. MBEPS had an additional chair so they had 5 votes and everyone else had 4 votes. So they wanted to reach parity with the other schools. The other change was removing the Academic Senate Exec. from voting members and just use the Academic Senate President as the voting member. The EEO issue was removed. There was no objection	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Kjartanson
2	<b>Faculty Co-Chair Reassigned Time for IPR/SLO Com: Tabled</b>	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Murphy and McMahon
3	<b>Revised College Mission Statement</b> (attachment ii_3) <b>Miramontez</b> reports that in October the mission statement went out to all the constituency groups. There was one recommended change from Classified Senate. After a brief discussion over “collaboration of partnerships” it was recommended that “collaboration of partnerships” be removed and write in “collaboration and effective participation in governance.” Classified is ok with the change. CEC approves.	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
4	<b>Accreditation (Standing Item)</b> <i>a. Mid-term Report: Tabled</i>	2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
5	<b>Guided Pathways Update (Standing Item)</b>	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		2 min	1, 2, 3, & 4	I, II, III, & IV	
2	<b>Faculty Appointments to Committees:</b> Tabled time	5 min	1, 2, & 3	I, II, III, & IV	McMahon and Murphy
3	<b>Plan for College President to Respond to AS Document that has Shared Detailed Concerns?</b> Tabled time	2 min	1, 2, & 3	I, IV	McMahon

**ii. Old Business**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator

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

- Academic Senate: Tabled time

**\* 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**

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

**H. Announcements: None**

**I. Adjourn 2:30pm**

---

**\* 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**