

COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, March 7, 2017 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

Members: Hsieh, Bell, Hopkins, Ramsey, McMahon, Murphy, Hubbard, Allen (absent), & Marin (absent)

Attendees: Ornelas, Jacobson (absent), Ascione, & Miramontez

McMahon calls meeting to order at 1:32pm.

- A. **Approval of the Agenda:** Bell approves agenda, Hsieh seconds. Motion passes.
- B. **Approval of Previous Minutes:** Hsieh approves minutes, Bell seconds. Motion passes.
- C. **Guests/Introductions:** George Beitey
- D. **Updates from the Chancellor's Cabinet:** Hsieh begins by reporting on enrollment as of March 4, 2017 ([see attachment](#)). The FTES target remains 9,337 for the College, 1,538 of which is the Public Safety FTES projection. Hsieh asks everyone to look at the left column and the FTES projection is 9121.8. The far right column shows difference projected vs. 2016-2017 target and that number shows -215.2. However, Hsieh points out that the district moved 230 FTES from '16-'17 to '15-'16. Hsieh stresses that the College is still in a positive direction. The summer target is 1218 FTES. The original summer budget only funded for 957 FTES. With the FTES augmentation for 186, the new total summer 2017 FTES target is 1404. Hsieh invites the College to schedule for 1459 FTES. Anything over FTES target of 1404 will really help the College for next year. Augmented FTES is based upon 15 FTES/FTEF. If the district funds to 15 for augmentation then the total cost will be \$2,335,000.00 with CE coming up short by 491 FTES costing \$700,000.00. The district bottom line is missing target by 500 FTES as of March 4, 2017. The Accreditation luncheon, hosted at the Mesa Commons on Sunday, March 12 will start exactly at 12:00pm with the Chancellor giving her address. For those who have been invited to attend, please show up a little earlier and be in your seats promptly at noon. Hsieh showed the agenda ([see attachment](#)). There is still no confirmation on what times the accreditation visiting team may want to meet with Miramar College constituents. The Chancellor is leading the California statewide accreditation taskforce group number 2 to determine accreditation body to use moving forward. Will the state remain with ACCJC or move to WASC. A survey will be sent out to the state's community colleges to gauge interest. A determination is likely ten years away. The VPI and VPSS on campus need to take the lead in terms of the statewide chancellor Pathway program. The funding will be allocated to the colleges based on FTES. The district has received 1,142 applications and they will accept 600 students into the Promise program. There will be a waitlist and the district is thinking about lessening the requirements to allow for students to be part time. 95 students have chosen Miramar College as their first choice to attend on the San Diego Promise. The immigration workshop for the campus is March 24. The Chancellor would like to see Miramar College schedule more English sections for the upcoming summer and fall to meet student demands. The student cross enrollment patterns document indicates Miramar's strong growth while Mesa's enrollment is trending down ([see attachment](#)). Hsieh reminded the cabinet that as a multi-college district we need to fight with outside district's and not within the district. Next year the College will take a hit in its Public Safety FTES and growth will slow. The College needs to focus on main campus growth. There are two board items heading to the March 16 board meeting: student travel for chemistry club officers who will present a poster at the national conference in San Francisco. Item #2, the College will receive a \$1-million dollar augmentation for the \$2-million ATFE grant awarded two years ago to the center and not the main campus. The district PIO department will no longer be content managers for individual vice chancellor's web page. The board retreat will be May 25 and the Chancellor wants to talk about campus immigration workshops. Per the EVOC joint partnership the district will commit \$5-million with the City matching that total. The San Diego County Sheriff's Department will assume the remainder of the costs.
- E. **New Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator

F. Old Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	ACCJC Annual Report: Miramontez reports the information for the annual report is due today (March 7) so he can get it populated and sent out to the constituency leaders by the end of the week so it can go through the participatory governance process.	1	I	Miramontez
2	2017-2019 Integrated Plan: Miramontez reports that there is	1	I & II	Miramontez, & Zhang

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

	nothing to update although he is working on getting the timeline updated.			
3	Update on Participatory Governance Committees Agenda & Minutes Postings on College Website (Deadline 2/24/17) Murphy reports that she did another scan on the website and everything appears to be up to speed. Murphy will reach out to the chairs and managers to see if anyone needs any help moving forward uploading minutes and agendas.	1	IV	Murphy
4	Accreditation: Miramontez reports that two big items remain. The visiting team sent the College a lengthy email over the past weekend to request who they may want to meet with when they visit. Miramontez was also sent a list of additional evidence needed. Miramontez will contact individuals he need additional information from and hopes they respond with answers by the end of Thursday, March 9. Hsieh reports that there is a meet and greet on Monday, March 13 at 4pm in K1-107.	1	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez
5	Professional Development Taskforce Update: McMahon reports that the taskforce meets Friday, March 10 at 11:30am. There are 2 representatives from classified, 6 from faculty and 2 from administrative team. This will be the first meeting. All are welcome to attend. No additional meetings have been scheduled.	1	I	McMahon
6	Status of Updating Program Information on College Website (Deadline 2/24/17) Hopkins reports that all the program information is update and was completed last week. Right now her team is looking at the individual websites linked to college website. Her team is still working on this.	1 & 2	I, II, & III	Hopkins, Ramsey, & Bell

G. Place Holders

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	Progress On Activities Focused on Increasing Faculty Use of OER: McMahon reports that she has contacted the OER team and she is waiting for input from the team to create a flyer to offer services to mentor any faculty hoping to create an OER.	1 & 3	II	McMahon
2	Performing Arts Center Capital Campaign – Proposed Instructional Program Plan: Ascione reports that his staff is continuing to have discussions on curriculum and how to integrate the Gospel program into current degree programs.	1, 2, 3, & 4	II & III	Ascione
3	Status Report on Progress of Faculty Online Teaching Certification: Hopkins reports that more TAO's are being written and there are still spots available.	1 & 2	II	Hopkins
4	Implementation of Cultural & Ethnic Diversity Plan (Report in April 2017 & November 2017) No report until April	3	I, III, & IV	Hubbard, & Arancibia

H. 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 the third meeting of the semester is today. The 2 important items they will discuss is the second reading of the faculty coordinator. The second item is the ACCJC annual report and the campus wide research agenda.
- **Classified Senate: Hubbard** reports that they met last week and reviewed the annual ACCJC report and there were no changes to the Student Services document.
- **Associated Student Government:** No report.
- **District Governance Council: Ramsey** reports that the last meeting was short and they discussed the two board agenda items moving forward. The next meeting is March 15.
- **District Strategic Planning Committee: McMahon** reports that the next meeting is March 17.

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

- **Budget Planning and Development Council: Bell** reports that at the last meeting on March 1 and the Executive Vice Chancellor discussed Guided Pathways. **Bell** will represent Miramar College to talk to the Accreditation Visiting team when they visit the district.
- **College Governance Committee: Murphy** reports that they have talked about updates to the college governance handbook. They are working on gathering a complete list of members serving on all the committees.

I. **Announcements:** none

J. **Adjourn:** 2:20pm

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

San Diego Community College District
2016/17 Outlook
FTES Compared to Targets (Resident Only)
As of March 4, 2017

230
 215

 15(+)

	Summer 2016		Inter-session			Summer 2017			2016-17 Total	2016-17 Target	Difference	
	Summer 1 Claim in 2015/16	Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17	Fall 2016	2017	Spring 2017	Summer 1 Claim in 2016/17	Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17	Summer 2 Claim in 2017/18*			2016-17 Target	Projected vs. 2016-17 Target
City/ECC												
Credit	1,128.3	111.1	4,683.7	116.7	4,584.9	1,128.3	0.0	111.1	10,624.6	10,866.4		
Non-Credit	0	5.6	31.0	0.0	28.4	0	0.0	5.6	65.0	63.6		
Total	1,128.3	116.6	4,714.8	116.7	4,613.3	1,128.3	0.0	116.6	10,689.6	10,930.0	-240.4	-2.2%
Mesa												
Credit	1,433.1	175.1	6,830.0	293.8	6,664.8	1,433.1	0.0	175.1	15,396.8	15,695.0		
Non-Credit	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Total	1,433.1	175.1	6,830.0	293.8	6,664.8	1,433.1	0.0	175.1	15,396.8	15,695.0	-298.2	-1.9%
Miramar												
Credit	762.8	80.2	3,354.6	159.8	3,521.9	762.8	0.0	80.2	7,879.2	7,778.5		
Academy	20.5	79.5	217.6	0.0	361.3	20.5	0.0	79.5	678.9	754.2		
In-Service	248.8	25.0	139.3	5.8	124.8	248.8	0.0	25.0	543.7	783.8		
Non-Credit	0	1.3	9.0	0.0	9.7	0	0.0	1.3	20.1	20.5		
Total	1,032.0	186.0	3,720.4	165.6	4,017.7	1,032.0	0.0	186.0	9,121.8	9,337.0	-215.2	-2.3%
College Total	3,593.4	477.7	15,265.3	576.1	15,295.7	3,593.4	0.0	477.7	35,208.2	35,962.0	-753.7	-2.1%
College Total w/ F-Factor									35,249.9	35,962.0	-712.1	-2.0%
Continuing Ed												
Regular	110.2	209.6	758.5	0.0	725.2	110.2	0.0	209.6	1,803.5	1,870.1	-66.6	-3.6%
CDCP	380.8	744.4	2,748.6	0.0	2,529.7	380.8	0.0	744.4	6,403.5	6,607.9	-204.4	-3.1%
Total	490.9	953.9	3,507.2	0.0	3,254.9	490.9	0.0	953.9	8,206.9	8,478.0	-271.1	-3.2%
Total w/ F-Factor									8,375.4	8,478.0	-102.6	-1.2%
Credit Total	3,593.4	470.9	15,225.2	576.1	15,257.6	3,593.4	0.0	470.9	35,123.2	35,877.9	-754.8	-2.1%
Non-Credit												
Regular (w/ College NC)	110.2	216.5	798.6	0.0	763.3	110.2	0.0	216.5	1,888.5	1,954.1	-65.6	-3.4%
CDCP	380.8	744.4	2,748.6	0.0	2,529.7	380.8	0.0	744.4	6,403.5	6,607.9	-204.4	-3.1%
Total	490.9	960.8	3,547.2	0.0	3,293.0	490.9	0.0	100.0	8,292.0	8,562.0	-270.0	-3.2%
District Total	4,084.3	1,431.7	18,772.4	576.1	18,550.7	4,084.3	0.0	1,431.7	43,415.2	44,440.0	-1,024.8	-2.3%
District Total w/ F-Factor									43,625.3	44,440.0	-814.7	-1.8%

Source: SDCCD Information System

Estimated Funded Cap 44,000.0 -374.7 -0.9%
Base 43,286.0 339.3 0.8%

1. Credit Colleges - Summer 1 Claim in 2015/16 and Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17 are actuals. Fall 2016 are actuals. Intersession 2017 FTES are actuals. Spring 2017 FTES are projections based on Fall 2016 yields and spring sections. Summer 1 Claim in 2016/17, Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17, and Summer 2 Claim in 2017/18 are estimates.

2. In-Service/Academy - Summer 1 Claim in 2015/16 and Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17 are actuals. Fall 2016 FTES are actuals. Intersession 2017 FTES are actuals. Spring 2017 FTES are estimates based on Spring 2016 actuals. It is assumed that the year-long in-services classes will end on or before June 30, 2017 and be claimed in Summer 1 Claim 2016/17. 230 In-Service/Academy FTES planned for 2016/17 were claimed in 2015/16.

3. Continuing Education - Summer 1 Claim in 2015/16 and Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17 are actuals. Fall 2016 are actuals. Spring 2017 FTES are estimates based on Spring 2016. Summer 1 Claim in 2016/17, Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17, and Summer 2 Claim in 2017/18 are estimates.

4. Summer 1 classes end on or before June 30; Summer 2 class census dates fall on or before June 30.

*FTES must be claimed in 2017/18 due to end dates.

5. Targets - 260 FTES moved from Miramar College's In-Service/Academy target and redistributed to the credit total as of February 18, 2017. F-Factor is included in college targets.

Targets are as of August 2016 Chancellor's Cabinet



SAN DIEGO PROMISE

CITY COLLEGE • MESA COLLEGE
MIRAMAR COLLEGE

2017-2018 College Promise Recipient Demographic Data

1142
600 + CE + Monoc
100 wait list
part time track

San Diego Promise Demographics

1,142 students from the San Diego Unified School District applied to the San Diego College Promise program of which 600 were selected to participate. The following is a breakdown of the 600 students who were selected for the 2017 -2018 academic year.

High School of Origin

High School	Number of Students	High School	Number of Students
Clairemont	18	Mission Bay	54
Crawford	89	Morse	11
East Village	13	Point Loma	16
Garfield	7	New Dawn	1
Henry	1	SD Business	17
Home and Hosp/Transitions	1	SD IB	17
Hoover	26	SD Metro	11
IHigh	2	SD Science	15
Kearny	18	SDCPA	9
La Jolla	41	✓ Scripps Ranch	8
Lincoln	68	✓ Serra	36
Madison	31	Twain	5
✓ Mira Mesa	65	✓ University City	19

129

College Designation

College Designations	Number of Students	Percentage
City	195	32.5%
Mesa	287	47.8%
Miramar	95	15.8%
Mesa, City	7	1.17%
Miramar, City	1	0.2%
Miramar, Mesa	8	1%
Undecided	7	1.17%

Gender

Gender	Number of Students	Percentage
Male	250	41.67%
Female	350	58.33%

95
9
104

Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Participants	Percentage
African American	61	10.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	79	13.2%
Filipino	48	8.0%
Hispanic	326	54.3%
White	67	11.2%
Multi-Ethnicity	19	3.2%

Grade Point Average (GPA)

Cumulative GPA	Participants	Percentage
5.0 - 4.0	46	7.67%
4.0 - 3.5	140	23.33%
3.5 - 3.0	176	29.33%
3.0 - 2.5	155	25.83%
2.5 - 2.0	83	13.83%
2.0 - Below	0	0.00%



Student Cross-Enrollment Patterns

2017

Prepared by:
SDCCD Office of Institutional Research and Planning
February 2017

Highlights

While it is not uncommon for students to enroll in classes at more than one credit college, it is clear that students are taking the majority of their classes at their home¹ college. When online classes are excluded from the analysis, the percentage of students taking classes at their home college increases. This suggests that students are more likely to enroll in a class at their home college when the course is taught on-campus.

City College/ECC

- Students who select City College/ECC on their application take, on average, 73% of their classes at City College/ECC, 22% at Mesa College, and 5% at Miramar College.
- The proportion of City-registered students who enroll in classes at City College/ECC has increased slightly over the last three years, from 72% in Spring 2014 to 74% in Fall 2016.
- When examined by modality, the percentage of cross-enrollments shifts considerably. City-registered students take, on average, 76% of their on-campus classes at their home campus but only 55% of their online classes.
- A similar shift can be seen when comparing enrollments at the subject-level, particularly in the sciences. City-registered students take, on average, only 54% of their science² classes at their home campus. The remainder are taken at Mesa College (35%) and Miramar College (12%).

Mesa College

- Students who select Mesa College on their application take, on average, 81% of their classes at Mesa College, 11% at City College/ECC, and 8% at Miramar College.
- The proportion of Mesa-registered students who enroll in classes at Mesa College has remained relatively stable over the last three years, from 81% in Spring 2014 to 80% in Fall 2016.
- Mesa-registered students take a higher percentage of both on-campus and online classes at their home college compared to the other credit colleges. Mesa-registered students take, on average, 84% of their on-campus classes at their home campus and 66% of their online classes.
- Mesa-registered students take, on average, 73% of their science classes at their home campus. The percentage of Mesa-registered student taking science classes at Miramar College has increased 6% over the last three years, which may be due to the increased number of science sections offered at Miramar College (+50 since Spring 2014).

Miramar College

- Students who select Miramar College on their application take, on average, 72% of their classes at Miramar College, 22% at Mesa College, and 6% at City College/ECC.
- The percentage of Miramar-registered students enrolling in classes at Miramar College has increased 4% over the last three years, from 69% in Spring 2014 to 74% in Fall 2016.

¹ College listed on application

² Includes biology, chemistry, and physics

- The percentage of Miramar-registered students enrolling at other colleges has decreased over the last three years, down 4% at Mesa and 1% at City College/ECC. This indicates that Miramar-registered students are enrolling in more classes at their home college and fewer classes at other colleges.
- Miramar-registered students take, on average, 74% of their on-campus classes at their home campus and 57% of their online classes. The percentage of Miramar-registered students taking on-campus classes at their home college has increased over the last three years from 71% to 77%, however the percentage of students taking online classes has remained stable.
- Over the last three years, the percentage of Miramar-registered students enrolled in science classes at their home college has increased 7%. This is likely due to the increased number of science sections offered allowing students to complete more of their course requirements at their home campus.

**Table 1. Enrollments by College Registered
City College/ECC**

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
City College/ECC	72%	73%	71%	74%	72%	74%
Mesa College	23%	22%	23%	21%	22%	20%
Miramar College	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Mesa College

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
Mesa College	81%	82%	81%	82%	79%	80%
City College/ECC	11%	10%	11%	10%	11%	11%
Miramar College	8%	7%	8%	8%	9%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Miramar College

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
Miramar College	69%	71%	71%	72%	73%	74%
Mesa College	24%	24%	23%	22%	21%	20%
City College/ECC	7%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: SDCCD Information System

Note 1. Drops, never attends, cancelled, and tutoring classes are excluded.

**Table 2. Enrollments by College Registered - On Campus Only
City College/ECC**

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
City College/ECC	74%	76%	75%	78%	75%	77%
Mesa College	22%	21%	21%	19%	20%	19%
Miramar College	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Mesa College

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
Mesa College	84%	85%	83%	84%	82%	83%
City College/ECC	9%	9%	10%	9%	10%	10%
Miramar College	7%	6%	7%	7%	8%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Miramar College

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
Miramar College	71%	73%	74%	75%	76%	77%
Mesa College	24%	23%	22%	21%	19%	18%
City College/ECC	5%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: SDCCD Information System

Note 1. Drops, never attends, cancelled, and tutoring classes are excluded.

Note 2. Online classes are excluded.

Table 3. Enrollments by College Registered - Online Only
City College/ECC

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
City College/ECC	55%	56%	52%	56%	55%	57%
Mesa College	30%	29%	33%	30%	31%	28%
Miramar College	15%	15%	15%	14%	14%	15%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Mesa College

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
Mesa College	63%	63%	67%	66%	67%	67%
Miramar College	19%	19%	17%	17%	16%	16%
City College/ECC	18%	18%	16%	17%	17%	17%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Miramar College

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
Miramar College	57%	60%	56%	56%	57%	58%
Mesa College	27%	28%	31%	30%	30%	29%
City College/ECC	16%	12%	13%	14%	13%	13%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: SDCCD Information System

Note 1. Drops, never attends, cancelled, and tutoring classes are excluded.

Note 2. On campus classes are excluded.

Table 4. Enrollments by College Registered - Science Only (BIOL, CHEM, PHYS)
City College/ECC

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
City College/ECC	55%	52%	54%	53%	53%	55%
Mesa College	37%	38%	36%	35%	33%	31%
Miramar College	8%	10%	11%	12%	15%	14%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Mesa College

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
Mesa College	75%	78%	74%	74%	67%	70%
Miramar College	15%	14%	16%	17%	22%	21%
City College/ECC	10%	8%	10%	9%	11%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Miramar College

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
Miramar College	66%	72%	70%	71%	72%	73%
Mesa College	27%	25%	25%	25%	23%	23%
City College/ECC	7%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: SDCCD Information System

Note 1. Drops, never attends, cancelled, and tutoring classes are excluded.

Table 5. Enrollments by College Registered - Science Only (BIOL, CHEM, PHYS)

City College/ECC

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
City College/ECC	1,526	1,436	1,545	1,523	1,696	1,694
Mesa College	1,047	1,059	1,033	998	1,051	959
Miramar College	226	278	306	352	481	436
Total	2,799	2,773	2,884	2,873	3,228	3,089

Mesa College

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
Mesa College	3,432	3,545	3,612	3,460	3,638	3,525
Miramar College	689	642	767	816	1,173	1,055
City College/ECC	475	368	477	412	583	478
Total	4,596	4,555	4,856	4,688	5,394	5,058

Miramar College

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
Miramar College	1,627	1,761	1,953	1,987	2,326	2,182
Mesa College	673	604	702	705	741	697
City College/ECC	164	93	127	123	147	114
Total	2,464	2,458	2,782	2,815	3,214	2,993

Source: SDCCD Information System

Note 1. Drops, never attends, cancelled, and tutoring classes are excluded.

Table 6. Sections by College - Science Only (BIOL, CHEM, PHYS)

	Spring 14	Fall 14	Spring 15	Fall 15	Spring 16	Fall 16
City College/ECC	93	77	94	83	107	93
Mesa College	187	191	198	193	202	196
Miramar College	98	101	114	121	159	148
Total	378	369	406	397	468	437

Source: SDCCD Information System

Note 1. Cancelled, honors contract, tutoring, non-state supported, and apprenticeship classes are excluded.



Chancellor's Cabinet March 7, 2017

Summer 2017 FTES Augmentation

	Target Summer FTES	FTES Augmentation	FTEF*	Total Summer FTES Target
City	1245	0	0	1245
Mesa	1608	305	20.33	1913
Miramar	1218 957+ 261	186	12.4	1404
CE	1445	0	0	1445
Total	5516 *	491	32.73	6007

↓
1459
(schedule + Ris)

bottom line

500 FTES

Notes:

*Augmented FTES based upon 15 FTES/FTEF

\$ 735,000 (17)

\$ 900,000 (15)

****** total Summer FTES based upon 15 FTES/FTEF

→ Short CE - 49 (FTEF -)
 700,000 ←

total cost \$ 2335,000



San Diego Community College District

ACCREDITATION WELCOME LUNCHEON

**San Diego Mesa College
Mesa Commons Building**

**Sunday, March 12, 2017
12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

**Hosted by: Culinary Arts Program and Students
San Diego Mesa College**

AGENDA

12:00 p.m.	Welcome and Introductions	Constance Carroll, Chancellor Doug Houston, District Team Chair
12:15 p.m.	Lunch	
1:15 p.m.	Districtwide Overview and Delineation of Functions: District, City College, Mesa College, Miramar College, and Continuing Education	Constance Carroll Lynn Neault, Vice Chancellor, Student Services
2:00 p.m.	Closing Remarks	Pam Luster, President, San Diego Mesa College

SSSP-SEP-BSI-CTE-SEM Alignment Meeting

Monday, December 12, 2016

12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

N-206

Minutes

Attendees: Patricia Hsieh, Paulette Hopkins, Gerald Ramsey, Daniel Miramontez, Marie McMahon, Xi Zhang, Laura Murphy, Naomi Grisham, Briele Warren

Absent: Brett Bell, Lynne Ornelas, Mary Kjartanson

Items: 1.) Discussion on roles/responsibilities of the taskforce

Hsieh said the taskforce needs a name and a charge. Miramontez said it is an official taskforce of PIEC, and had their last meeting Friday and shared this agenda of PIEC. Hsieh suggested adding Strong Workforce Plan (SWP) to the title to give support to Ornelas.

2.) Discussion on overlap/similarities of initiatives:

a.) Results of theme analysis

Miramontez said Zhang conducted a theme analysis and how they could align the initiatives cleaner. Zhang mentioned that she went into each plan and extracted the activities in those plans, and structured the activities by the loss-momentum phases in the planning framework, which shows horizontally what everyone is doing within each plan, and vertically, how the plans overlap. To work collaboratively, we can look at larger resources to support grant or initiative areas that are aligned with one another.

b.) Results of literature review on effective integration strategies

Zhang also did a literature review in terms of integration, and showed some examples. Xi noted that there were repeated themes across the board. McMahon asked if we would benefit from writing our own strategy, and Zhang responded that other institutions develop their strategies for their own gaps and goals, and we can learn from them to develop our own strategies based on our own gaps and goals. Our themes could include enrollment management, different collaborations of counseling and basic skills, following up on at-risk students, professional development, etc. By looking at such themes, we can see how to better align and address items strategically. Ramsey noted that they may want to take a look at the career piece and tracking/following up on student employment. Murphy commented that in setting up the alignment, it is done in line with the strategic plan, and Miramontez responded that it is part of their agenda. Murphy asked what is meant by integration or alignment of the plans (if it is funding, and how does it translate into integration of different funding sources), and Ramsey responded that this was more of a focus on integrating an alignment of different area processes and plans. Miramontez noted that

there was a possibility of streamlining and connecting everything in light of the student experience.

3.) Discussion on aligning initiatives based on the student experience:

a.) Student lifecycle

Miramontez reported that the goal is student completion, and all working parts contribute to this end. Zhang shared a diagram that outlined first-time students and their journeys at the college along a track, and how the different initiatives/areas contribute towards these journeys. This allows us to see the gaps and have a better idea in terms of where we can improve. Hopkins asked if there was quantitative analysis available to review, and Miramontez and Zhang responded that there was. Murphy noted that the diagram should heavily incorporate student learning outcomes.

b.) Identify gaps and overlaps between services, projects, and funding sources

4.) Discussion on how taskforce will communicate to committees regarding alignment efforts

It was agreed that the taskforce would communicate the information and diagram to their respective committees as chairs or co-chairs. Hsieh noted that the committees needed to be trained, and said for McMahon to stress this at the College Governance Committee meeting.

5.) Set Meeting Agenda for Spring 2017

SSSP-SEP-BSI-BSSOT-CTE-SWP-SEM Alignment Meeting

Monday, February 27, 2017

12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

N-206

Minutes

Attendees: Patricia Hsieh, Paulette Hopkins, Brett Bell, Gerald Ramsey, Daniel Miramontez, Lynne Ornelas, Jacque Honda, Marie McMahon, Mary Kjartanson, Denise Kapitzke, Xi Zhang, Laura Murphy, Naomi Grisham, Briele Warren

Absent: Steve Quis

Items: 1.) Introduce SSSP-SEP-BSI Integrated Plan 17-19 Template

Miramontez reported that since December, new information was received from the State Chancellor's Office. They want a two-year plan that integrates SSSP-SEP-BSI (with a deadline of December 1st). Within this two-year plan, they provided a template. Miramontez emphasized that the plan needs to be created and go through college governance process before going to the Board of Trustees. There is a budget plan that is also associated with the integrated plan, and the type of data needed includes goals for the general population, identified student groups, and activities designed to address disproportionate impact.

The college would need to look at previous plans and develop analyses for them. Miramontez noted that for future planning, the college would need to come up with five integrated goals. Some of the goals that the state is suggesting is already in line with what the college has.

2.) Go Over Game Plan & Timeline for SSSP-SEP-BSI Integrated Plan 17-19

Zhang reported that based on the template, there are three phases of work to complete in order to meet the deadline. The first phase is to review the previous plans. The outcomes should be identifying progress, the factors attributing to success (or lack of), goals that intersect BSI-SEP-SSSP and activities planned for achieving the goals, and best practices for student completion or close achievement gaps. Zhang presented the Miramar Crosswalk for SSSP, Student Equity, Basic Skills, and CTE, and how it could be of assistance to the process, as well as the trends. Zhang noted that the college has already 'crosswalked' the activities. Murphy asked if all of the plans were already assessed, and Ramsey mentioned that a summary report would help the college determine how they move forward. Murphy confirmed that the college already had some of the information, and they would not need to re-invent the wheel. Zhang reported that they ran into some issues where some plans did not specify any objectives (or had objectives that were not measurable), so this would need to be addressed.

Hopkins asked for clarity, as Basic Skills was implementing two different grants (Basic Skills Initiative grant and the BSSOT grant), and she wanted to know

which one was being discussed. Miramontez responded that this would be addressed a little later on in the meeting, with regard to alignment.

Kjartanson asked what percentage of the campus students would be the recipients of the monies and activities. Zhang responded that with the SSSP, it targets all incoming students. For SEP money, there are specific student subpopulations. About 60% are placed into basic skills.

Hsieh encouraged Hopkins to review the email that she had forwarded to the group regarding the program goals and planning details. During the LAO visit, they did not ask for all of the goals, and the college was able to pick and choose. Internally the college should align everything for accountability.

Zhang said that what worked out of the old plans would be brought into the new plan. Zhang presented the second phase addressing future plans, and the objectives and activities associated with these plans. Bell asked if there would be more than five activities, as they were required to report based on the five activities. Miramontez noted that there was a budget worksheet provided from the state, and Bell expressed a concern about how the college sets up their structures to report on both goals and activities (it would take a lot of work). Hsieh commented that the internal budget request process identifies the needs (some areas are obvious, but some have multiple possible sources). The alignment will allow the available resources to be utilized in different areas. Murphy said her understanding was to try and focus on the commonalities of the three plans they currently have rather than go outside of it. Miramontez responded that as they work on their strategic goals, they also want to make sure they are not doing it independent of the larger picture, so the answer was yes and no. Hsieh re-read the attachments sent to the group, and confirmed that there would not be three stand-alone plans; the plans need to show that they are clearly integrated. Zhang noted that they would probably have more than five common goals across the three plans, and it would be a matter of prioritizing what to include in the integration plan. Ramsey expressed that each plan has very distinctive characteristics, and they would have to take a close look and possibly re-assess. Hsieh stressed that dialogue needed to take place.

Zhang said that the last phase (phase 3) was finalization and approval – very straightforward. She then presented a more comprehensive plan with the timeline attached. Hsieh thanked Zhang for her extensive work and preparation for the group to start the report (as well as Miramontez' guidance and organization). Hsieh noted that perhaps the document needed to be more inclusive, as Honda was currently listed as a lead for each section. Hsieh mentioned that the BSI Committee work and dialogue would also be important, and recommended expanding it a little bit. Hsieh noted that Ramsey's area had more work than the others. Miramontez said they would make the modification and send out the information to everyone.

(Hopkins left at 1:22 p.m.)

Hsieh reminded the group that the timeline needed to be addressed, as there were deadlines as soon as the end of March.

3.) Set Expectations of Subsequent Initiative Alignments Based on Template

Bell asked if the Chancellor's Office supported any online or in-person training

related to this integration project that they could go to, and Hsieh responded there was an Expenditure Guidelines webinar that afternoon, and another one on Thursday, March 2nd.

Miramontez reported that the focus for now was the integration of the three, but the beauty of it was that the college has a template to work from. This taskforce is charged with integrating the seven, not just the three. Miramontez proposed two levels of alignment: One would show how the operational plan serves the students (not for reporting purposes), and another would be CTE-SWP. There would be three types of alignment SSSP-SEP-BSI, BSI-BSSOT, then CTE-SWP-SEM.

Hsieh said that everything should align with the strategic plan. The college will get there if they are faithful with what they say they are going to do.

4.) Set Meeting Dates for Spring 2017 Based on Timeline

Ramsey asked if the alignment meetings could be tacked on to another existing meeting. Murphy asked about communicating to the various committees, and Hsieh said that the conversations needed to be taking place now; sooner rather than later.

Hsieh commented that Monday afternoons seem to work for everyone.

Miramontez said that the following alignment meetings would be status updates from this point forward. Hsieh asked for a deadline of when to hear back from everyone as to who needs to be involved in the next meeting, and Miramontez said by the end of Wednesday would be ideal. Hsieh recommended that the information be communicated from the group to the committee chairs via email, and by putting it on committee agendas, etc. Miramontez asked for the updated information to be provided to him from the group to populate in the document, and he would send it out. Hsieh recommended Monday, March 20th at 12:30 p.m. for the next alignment meeting, but at a different location (due to the BSI meeting in N-206 at 1:15 p.m. that day). Everyone was in agreement. Hsieh indicated that those who needed to leave the alignment meeting early for the BSI meeting could do so.