

COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING

Tuesday, May 21, 2019 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. • N-206

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

Meeting called to order at 1:34pm

- A. **Approval of the Agenda (1 min)** Bell moves to approve the agenda. Young seconds. Motion passes.
- B. **Approval of Previous Minutes (10 min)**
- ii. 4/23 Minutes: **Gonzales** states that there are 3 recommended edits. Edits provided by **McMahon**, **Bermodes**, and **Young** are discussed. **Gonzales** says they all look accurate for the most part. **McMahon** suggests we use the least complicated, but most accurate version. **McMahon** indicated she went by what people said in the meeting, and contrary to what was stated at the last meeting, she didn't change anything from the original draft. There were consolidations and added detail. **Gonzales** explained **Young's** edits, which get the gist of the concerns, regarding the draft minutes and the protocol surrounding them, and getting it as short as possible. **McMahon** states it is her opinion that our commitments haven't been honored, as evidenced by what occurred in the meeting, and she wanted that reflected in the minutes. **Bermodes** explains her approach. **Bermodes** says it is important that we identify who said what and the discussion, as constituency leaders' have to advocate and promote for their group and that should be captured adequately in the minutes for the meeting. **Gonzales** summarized that this goes back to the recommended guidelines for the minutes. We have 3 versions and he points out that **Hopkins** has a concern about the discussion as to whether or not she saw a first draft or not. **Hopkins** indicated that she never saw the first draft just an edited version. That is a point that is being contended. **Hopkins** saw red edits only, which would indicate it was a later draft. **McMahon** states that this can't be accurate, as the only time her (**Hopkins**) statements existed was before she (**McMahon**) edited it. **Gonzales** states that there was a **Quis** draft and then a **McMahon** draft and what **Hopkins** wants understood is that she saw only a section of **McMahon's** edits. **McMahon** says that **Hopkins** indicated that **Quis** walked over and showed her a draft. **Quis** then asks how **Hopkins** could see **McMahon's** edits before **McMahon** even made the edits? **Quis** says he did not provide **Hopkins** with a first draft of the minutes before the co-chair was given a copy. **Gonzales** asks **Quis** which version he shared with **Hopkins**? **Quis** responds that he shared with **Hopkins** the version that came back from **McMahon**. **Quis** added that he came back to **Hopkins** and told her it looks like it's been changed from what you (**Hopkins**) had specifically asked me to write in the minutes. **McMahon** reasserted the concern that there was some sort of consultation about the first draft before **McMahon** got the first draft. **Quis** says that did not happen. **Murphy** points out that **Quis** just stated that he went to **Hopkins** and said 'it looks like they changed what you wanted me to say', so **Hopkins** must have told **Quis** what she wanted him to say. **Quis** says no. **McMahon** says that's what slipped out when **Hopkins** was in the last meeting. **Quis** then clarifies that he noticed that **McMahon** had made an edit to what **Hopkins** had said and he went to **Hopkins** to point out that there had been an edit that she should be aware of. **Quis** stands up and speaking loudly points at the screen and the statement in question in these minutes and says "Prior to the co-chair receiving it." **McMahon** suggests that **Quis** should calm down. **Quis** says that this statement is a lie, just another lie. **Gonzales** says we are discussing the language and that this is not a lie. **Gonzales** agrees that we can all sit down (**Quis** was still standing) and have a good conversation. **Quis** again says it is a lie. **Gonzales** says it is not a lie, we are trying to make edits and **Quis** reminds **Gonzales** that the events in the statement in question never happened. **Murphy** reads **Young's** version that 'Hopkins acknowledges she had not seen the entire draft minutes, only that section in question', before the co-chairs. **McMahon** reminds everyone how the minutes go based on the commitments and the arrangements. They go to the co-chairs first and then to everyone else for edits, and that does not appear to be what happened.
- iii. **Gonzales** states that the main objective here it to approve language, the protocol we can definitely continue to refine, using the guidelines presented last week to help get us there. **Gonzales** suggests someone make a motion to approve one of the three versions before the committee. **Bell** moves to approve **Young's** edits to the minutes. **Hubbard** seconds. **McMahon** asks that her section and **Murphy's** additions remain. Motion passes. **Bermodes** presents edits for a separate section of the 4/23 minutes. After a brief discussion, CEC elects to accept **Bermodes** edits with minor adjustments. **Hubbard** approves the minutes of 4/23, **Murphy** seconds. Motion passes.

* 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

iv. 5/14 Minutes: **Bell** moves to approve, **Hubbard** seconds. Motion passes.

C. **Guests/Introductions (1 min): None**

D. **Update from Chancellor's Cabinet (three minute maximum) None**

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

Hubbard asks two questions: Update on Convocation planning group meeting and what are we doing with SCO position. **Gonzales** responds that the SCO position went to DGC and that info would be shared and the College would then start the process. **McMahon** says that these types of calls are generally not made over the summer but rather in the fall. As for convocation, **Gonzales** talked to the co-facilitators of Guided Pathways who said they would be happy to help. **Ben Gamboa** is happy to remain as management rep. What needs to happen now is to confirm a date and a timeline and get a group together to figure out our next steps.

i. **New Business - None**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1					

ii. **Old Business - None**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1					

F. **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 - None**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1					

ii. **Old Business - None**

#	Item	Time Limit	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1					

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

- **Academic Senate: McMahon** reports that the last senate exec. meeting is later today. The first full senate exec. meeting of the fall will be August 22. First full senate meeting will be Sept. 3.
- **Classified Senate: Hubbard** reports that this is Classified Week. Events are ongoing around campus. During summer the CS meets once a month. **Bell** states that sales of food on campus is prohibited.
- **Associated Student Government: Bermodes** reports that students are in finals.
- **District Governance Council: McMahon** reports that the next meeting June 5.
- **District Strategic Planning Committee: No report**
- **Budget Planning and Development Council: McMahon** said meeting has been moved to June 5
- **College Governance Committee: McMahon** reports that the first meeting is Sept. 10. **McMahon** will be chair of this committee.

H. **Announcements: None**

I. **Adjourn: 1:38pm**

* **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