

COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, May 12, 2015 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

Members: Hsieh, Bell, Bennie (absent), Ramsey, Haidar, McMahon, Allen, Hubbard, Light (absent)

Attendees: Beitey, Ascione (for Bennie), Jacobson (absent), Irvin (absent), & Miramontez

Guests: Darrel Harrison

Hsieh thanked everyone for their faithful attendance to the CEC meetings, and their provided input. She noted that a few members were absent due to a change in Commencement plans. The Friday weather forecast predicts significant rain and wind, and they were concerned for the safety issue for the students and their families, and guests. The original plan been to incorporate rain guards to the tents, but the vendor had expressed concern for the wind and the weight of the rain on the tents. Hsieh shared that she had brought this up at Cabinet earlier that day (5/12/15), and the Chancellor had mentioned the use of the Field House. Hsieh had reminded the Chancellor about the undesirable sound effects and echo in the Field House, but ultimately, this was a better solution than not being safe. Consequently, the Vice Presidents, Dean Jacobson, and Quis were absent from the CEC meeting in order to make the preparations to inform the campus and guests of the location change. Hsieh asked the CEC members to please help the campus to understand the challenges, once the message goes out.

Haidar thanked Hsieh for the explanation of absent members.

Haidar called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m.

A. Approval of the Agenda

Motion to approve made by Hubbard, seconded by Ascione, and approved by all.

B. Approval of Previous Minutes

Hsieh noted a grammatical discrepancy on the second page of the 5/5/15 CEC minutes, under Section F. Item 1., reflected below:

“After a brief discussion, Hsieh wanted to make it a clear that if the college does in fact need to have the policy/process it better do it, if it doesn’t have that obligation, the college should move on.”

Hsieh communicated that it needed to be clarified, but if the CEC members were aware of it and okay with approving, then there would be no issue.

Hubbard clarified that they “needed to find out whether the campus or college needs a policy,” and all agreed that this was what the section was trying to convey.

C. Guests/Introductions

Haidar recognized Darrel Harrison’s presence at the CEC meeting.

D. Updates from the Chancellor’s Cabinet

Hsieh presented the weekly enrollment report from the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and reported that Miramar College’s numbers are increasingly improving. Hsieh extended a congratulations to the College for working together on a joint effort to ensure that everyone as a group continues to do very well.

Hsieh then shared that the previous week, there was discussion about City College’s establishing a transfer agreement with Point Loma Nazarene University (with a major focus of nursing), and the agreement was finalized as of that morning (5/12/15) and will go to the Board on Thursday (5/14/15). The Chancellor had suggested that the second program to go forward would be the Miramar “AJ” program. Hsieh mentioned that Interim Vice Chancellor of Instruction Shelly Hess would be contacting Dean Beitey (as well as the acting Vice President, Instruction)

starting on Monday (5/18/15), and the three of them would sit down and figure out (from the template) how to move forward with it.

Beitey responded that he will already be meeting with Shelly Hess on Thursday (5/14/15).

Hsieh continued to report that the District Student Services had developed a new app for veterans – a “handbook for vets” – designed so that students could go in and click on links. When the app project is finalized and approved by the Board, it will be linked to each College’s app (for example, the Miramar Touch). It is another feature to the veteran students that will enhance the College’s services to them. Hsieh mentioned that she could share a hard copy of the information if the group was interested, and commented for Ramsey and Miramontez to make a note so that when the feature is available, they can work with the web designer to make sure that it is available and widely publicized.

Hsieh commented that the next Board meeting will take place on May 14th at the District Office, and that while there were no items pertaining to Miramar, she did want to note that there will be an honors presentation, which will be led by Dr. Carmen Jay. They will also have a student, but at this time she is unaware of who it might be. Hsieh shared that she had the pleasure of attending the Honors Luncheon this year, and that Miramar College’s student did a superb job in beautifully representing the College by sharing his very compelling personal story about his journey.

With regard to the budget, Hsieh reported that for the 2015-16 fiscal year there is a new state formula for the growth dollar that is based on college attendance, poverty rate, etc. – things that the colleges cannot change in terms of where they are located. Generally speaking, they belong to a more affluent area, so this formula may not be within the San Diego Community College District’s best interest. However, the good thing is that any above cap FTES will still be funded if there is money left on the table.

Hubbard inquired if these numbers were based on the District as a whole, and Hsieh responded that they were.

Haidar asked if nothing was going to be mentioned at the Board meeting about a Miramar item, because at the DGC meeting there had been an item that was to go to the Board for a first reading. However, there had been an email from Lynn Neault that the item was not going to the Board. Hsieh replied that she did not recall the item, but would check the draft agenda to be sure.

Hsieh further reported that the planning for the Performing Arts Capital Campaign is now a standing item on the Chancellor’s Cabinet agenda, and that she had already asked for the Dean’s Council, College Executive Committee, and Manager’s meeting agendas to include this item as a standing agenda item as well, as it is a big deal for the College. Hsieh mentioned that she had asked Bell to take the lead in terms of the Facilities component, and that there is a lot of room for discussion at this point.

Haidar asked if the new building would be used for community use and generated revenue as well as for performing arts for instruction. Hsieh responded that they will do a capital campaign, and if this is the direction, then the District will have 100% control. It is a very exciting time for Ascione’s school, as well as the whole College.

Hubbard inquired as to where the building would be, and Ascione replied that it would be in front of the H building. Bell added that the building would occupy the east end of Parking Lot 2, and that in the Facilities Master Plan there is a plan for a parking structure in Lot 1, to help address parking concerns. Hsieh commented that the reason she wanted to put this topic on the meeting agendas for discussion is because everyone has their own expertise and responses that will aid in a comprehensive plan. Hsieh encouraged everyone to dream big in this endeavor, and Bell clarified that while big aspirations can be built, it should be done with the knowledge that plans do change, and not all recommendations can be incorporated in the final result.

E. New Business

1.) Convocation Fall 2015 – Planning Dialogue (carry over item from 5/5/15 CEC meeting) (Miramontez)

Miramontez reported that they had held the 2015 Planning Summit this past March, and since that time, the PIEC has been diligently working on the results from the event. Right now, they are proposing to have a planning dialogue at the fall Convocation. They have been in the process of collecting a lot of qualitative data that speaks to student success (done at each of the phases of their loss-momentum framework), and it is now time to take the information and analyze it as a College. Miramontez shared that this is key to building their student success platform at the College, and this item comes from the recommendations of the PIEC to the CEC so that they will be able to bring the data and infrastructure forward to the fall 2015 Convocation.

Hubbard asked what the hook is for getting the Classified staff to participate. Haidar inquired if the Convocation was going to be open to the College, and Hubbard responded that it would, but that there must be something of interest to draw the Classified staff. Miramontez responded that part of the hook is that it includes the Classified Panel portion in the discussion for degree completion. They have collected multiple data from different groups, including the Classified. Hsieh commented that she appreciated Hubbard's question, because student success is typically perceived as for instructional only, although this is not the case. The Classified staff are instrumental in being the first points of contact to bring the students in to enroll for classes, and the importance of their role needs to be promoted and communicated.

Allen said that it was their own responsibility to start the dialogue to do this, and to encompass all of the components rather than separate everyone into blocks. Hubbard agreed that the Classified are important as the first point of contact, but her concern is that if the information is sent out, most of the Classified staff will assume that the event and topic have nothing to do with them.

Miramontez clarified that the purpose of the Planning Dialogue item and attachment was to guide the conversation for the CEC meeting. At this point, they are going to pull all of the information together holistically at the Convocation.

Hsieh suggested that when Miramontez drafts the informational message, to work with the Classified Senate leaders for feedback prior to sending it out, and asked if this might be something that all would agree to.

Haidar added that at the Summit, it was clear from the alumni input that their success was due to their first points of contact as well as the instructional help that they received. Haidar stressed that the progress section of the Roadmap should definitely be incorporated, and asked that she be included as part of that section as well.

Hsieh inquired if everyone had a consensus that this will be the theme for the fall 2015 Convocation, and everyone expressed agreement.

McMahon asked when the planning for the Convocation was going to occur, and Miramontez responded that it would start this upcoming Friday (May 15th). Harrison inquired when the meeting was going to be held, and Miramontez replied that there would be a planning workgroup meeting on Friday morning, May 15th at 10:30 a.m. in L-108.

Harrison said that he would like to pitch something to do for Convocation, and Miramontez encouraged him to share his idea. Harrison presented that he had been approached by some of the faculty to introduce a topic called "Civility in the Workplace," and wondered if they could do a mini-workshop during the Convocation where they could address the District policy on civility and emails, along with breakouts on

different scenarios and brief report-outs. Harrison mentioned that this information was just a rough draft, and that he could bring an outline of the proposal.

Haidar asked how many hours they have for the Convocation, and expressed that while it was definitely a valuable topic, did it have to be done at Convocation and not as a workshop in itself? Harrison responded that he was more concerned about the audience, and where they could get the greatest amount of people in one place. If they make the topic a workshop with a voluntary breakout, they would probably end up with four or five people.

Hsieh agreed, and noted that even at the Convocation, many people have a tendency to leave before the session. The only thing that people will not leave is a lunch. Hsieh said that she is not saying that Convocation is the only option, but that she is open to the possibilities.

Hubbard expressed that she thought Convocation would be a good venue for the topic, with a captive audience of the majority of faculty, and that it may be something that the Classified might be interested in attending as well.

McMahon mentioned that she agreed this was a very important issue, and suggested that it could be dovetailed into the idea of ethics, and plant the seeds of the conversation at Convocation. If cased the right way, McMahon thought that everyone would be interested, as most people do not want to live under constant conflict. She shared that she was willing to participate in giving her input into the topic.

Hubbard brought up that at the DGC meeting they had a person from San Diego State University come and share what they were doing on civility trainings. Harrison noted that this issue is a national matter.

Hsieh commented that to her understanding, the District effort is focused on students and does not include faculty, however she agreed with Harrison and was glad that he, as a faculty member brought it up. Hsieh raised the topic and asked if there was a consensus that all agreed this was a good idea. She also asked if Harrison could provide a proposal outline with details of the desired format.

Miramontez noted that one of the biggest complaints from the last Convocation was that there was too much information crammed into one event. Hsieh asked if it would be better to just have a small workshop on the civility topic, and then follow up at the Convocation in spring 2016. Hubbard responded that if a small workshop is held, no one will attend. Hubbard referenced the Cultural Climate survey event, which drew only eleven people. She stressed that there should be a discussion at the Convocation, with a follow up at a later time. Allen commented that they would have to start the dialogue together.

Miramontez clarified if they were mentioning that the topic could be a kickoff, and Allen confirmed.

Harrison left the CEC meeting at 2:11 p.m.

2.) 2015-16 Annual Planning Calendar (Miramontez)

Miramontez reported that the 2015-16 Annual Planning Calendar had come out the previous week, after the Academic Senate had a chance to look at it. He shared the attachment and noted that the green sections highlighted anything that was related to Accreditation, the tan sections represented anything that was related to input from BRDS and Bell's office, the gold sections highlighted the changes in their program review process (for example, the implementation of Taskstream), and the purple was related to information in the program review process that was captured under the purview of the President's Office (such as PRIE, the PIO, etc.). Miramontez stated that these were the major updates, as well as some Academic Senate inputs with regard to Accreditation. He emphasized that a change that is not yet reflected in the calendar is a revised Accreditation timeline.

Haidar asked why the planning calendar was brought for approval if there were changes yet to be made, and asked that it be returned to the Senate and clarified/modified so that the Senate knows what it is that they are actually approving. This was what was agreed to if adjustments were to be made.

Miramontez clarified that the changes were only operational, and Hsieh said that it was the body's decision. Since this was the last CEC meeting of the semester, Hsieh asked the Classified if they thought the planning calendar needs to go back to the Senate, or if the group says it is fine as is. Hsieh stressed that they cannot hold on the planning calendar until the next CEC approval in September 2015. Hubbard responded that the item should go out as an FYI with a corrected copy. Hsieh added that the managers would likely be okay with this process as well.

Haidar stated that the Senate needs to receive the new planning calendar at the last meeting on Tuesday, May 19th.

Ascione asked about the due date for the program review, so that he could announce it at the beginning of the term, and Miramontez replied that it was October 2nd.

3.) **CGC Recommendations: Website Subcommittee, Curriculum Committee, & Staff Development Committee (McMahon)**

McMahon presented the reporting forms for the three recommendations and asked if the group would like her to go through them individually or if they were all okay as is. Hsieh responded that they had already been read, so they were fine. McMahon inquired if everyone was okay with the three recommendations. Haidar confirmed a unanimous consent, and Hsieh commented that the management had previously consented as well.

4.) **Faculty Co-chairing of Contract Faculty Hiring Committees (Haidar)**

Haidar reported that the item was moved from the Academic Senate by unanimous consent, and that a resolution was passed on April 7th to inform that when there is a faculty hiring committee, to expect a faculty co-chair. Haidar quoted,

Therefore, be it resolved that the San Diego Miramar College Academic Senate recommends that all contract faculty hiring/search committees should have both a faculty and an administrative co-chair; and

Be it further resolved that both the faculty and administrative co-chairs should be present with the College President and appropriate Vice President during the interviews with the candidates who are finalists.

Ascione asked for a clarification, as it seemed to him that the end result is to have representation in the final interview process. Why would they move to have a faculty member be a co-chair, as having two chairs in a group of only five or six people is confusing with no consistency.

Haidar responded that the intention of the resolution was to have faculty involvement with an issue that will affect them for a long period of time. It is a collegial matter that is not intended to take anything away from anyone.

Ascione commented on the use of the word 'co-chair,' that implies two equal chairs. Haidar replied that it was only for support.

McMahon mentioned that she did bring up the point that being a chair involves clerical responsibilities that the faculty do not have the disposal of, and she had posed the question to everyone there if they were willing to take on the additional workload. It was said that the administrative portion would do the clerical

aspect, but McMahon did raise it as a concern, because as a faculty member, it would mean a lot of additional work.

Bell began to pose a question about the interview process should it occur outside of the 10-month contract of faculty who would potentially be co-chairs, and Haidar responded that this would only be contract faculty hiring.

Hsieh mentioned that for the second-level interviews, she always invites both the chair and co-chair (if there are co-chairs) of the search committee, as well as the area Vice President. Sometimes there are co-chairs, and sometimes there are not – she leaves it open, however if there is one, he or she is never excluded from the final steps of the process. Hsieh acknowledged that the Academic Senate had produced a resolution, but she noted that it does not necessarily dictate that the College has to go through with a new process. Hsieh clarified that each search committee can do what they prefer to do. The faculty can have resolutions, like at a statewide senate, but does it mean that the State Chancellor's office needs to adhere to it? No, they do not, however they can take the information under advisement. Each committee has its own flexibility to determine these kinds of details. Hsieh stated that it is always a nice thing to let the search committee make that determination – this has always been the practice, and it has worked very well.

Haidar responded that what Hsieh is saying is that the Senate can pass resolutions, but ultimately everyone has a choice to do what they want to with them, or if they disagree, then there is some procedure that they have to go through.

Hsieh clarified that no, like the Classified Senate and Associated Student Council, the Academic Senate is just a constituency, and that this group can have a say like the rest of the constituencies. They can say to leave flexibility in the hands of each respective search committee. Hsieh said that her rule would never change regarding inviting the chair or co-chair (if there are co-chairs), but she would like to give the flexibility back to the search committee rather than tell them to have a co-chair or not. Hsieh expressed that she would rather leave this preference in the search committee's hands, as it is a collegial process. Shared governance is about working together, with committees working together, not about dictating.

Haidar stated that she would take Hsieh's response back to the Senate.

Hsieh mentioned that the search committees are represented by faculty, classified, managers, and sometimes even students, and that they should all have a say.

Haidar shared that she heard Hsieh's opinion and would share it back with the Senate.

Hubbard commented that when it came time to final interviews, there was always a faculty present, and Hsieh responded that if they had a faculty co-chair or a department chair who served as the chair of the search committee, then yes, but if they did not, it was unusual for that to be the case.

Ramsey asked for clarification on Hsieh's comment of being unaware of the composition of certain committees, and Hsieh replied that she does not know what happens on the faculty level, but she could say that for the hiring of managers, all of the constituency leaders receive a notice from her, and she then communicates to the campus that the constituency leaders were contacted for recommendations. Hsieh mentioned that for the co-chairs for faculty hiring committees, she does not see a need to say that they 'must' have one if a committee decides not to have one.

F. Old Business

- 1.) **Program Processes (Haidar)**
No report or discussion due to lack of time.
- 2.) **Accreditation (Miramontez & Woods)**
No report or discussion due to lack of time.

G. Place Holders

- 1.) **2015-16 BSI Action Plan (Ascione)**
No report or discussion due to lack of time.

H. Reports

(Please limit each following report to two minutes maximum. If you have any handouts, please e-mail them to Briele Warren ahead of time to be included for distribution electronically.)

- Academic Senate
- Classified Senate
- Associated Student Council
- District Governance Council
- District Strategic Planning Committee
- District Budget Committee
- College Governance Committee

Announcements

No announcements were made.

I. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 2:32 p.m.

Minutes taken by Warren, for Quis, 5/12/15.

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2019 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 see <http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/plan> for San Diego Miramar College 2013-2019 Strategic Plan.

As a courtesy, please let the President know if you cannot attend the meeting.