COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, March 18, 2014 • 1:00 – 2:30 P.M. • L-108

Members: Hsieh, Bell, Ramsey, Haidar, Figueroa, Allen, Hubbard, Ledbetter and Akbari
Attendees: Trevisan, Beitey, & Jacobson

- **A.** **Approval of the Agenda**
- **B.** **Approval of Previous Minutes**
- **C.** **Guests/Introductions:**
- **D.** **Updates from the Chancellor's Cabinet**
- **E.** **New Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Initiator
1	College Governance Committee Recommendations (attachment)	1	Figueroa

- **F.** **Old Business**

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Initiator
1	Feedback on ACCJC's Institutional Internal Quality Assurance and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Workshop and Next Steps	1	Miramontez
2	Strategic Enrollment Management – Next Step (Due to CEC on 3/25/14)	1	Hsieh & Haidar
3	College Hour (Due to CEC 3/18/14) (attachment)	1	Haidar
4	Progress on Draft San Diego Miramar College Student Equity Plan	1	Ramsey
5	2014 ACCJC Annual Report (Draft Report due 3/4/14. Due to CEC on 3/18/14) (attachment)	1	Hsieh, Miramontez
6	Status Regarding 3/27/14 On Campus Board Meeting	1	Beitey & Trevisan
7	2014-2015 College Annual Planning Calendar (Due to CEC on 4/15/14)	1	Miramontez & Figueroa
8	Update from Program Processes Task Force (College completion due date 12/10/13) – Review (3 attachments)	1	Haidar
9	Progress on Student Support & Success Program Implementation (attachment)	2	Ramsey
10	Updated College Operational Plans (Due to CEC on 5/6/14) (attachment)	1	Miramontez & Figueroa
11	Completion of Updating College's Master Educational Plan (Due to CEC on 5/6/14)	1	Hsieh
12	Environmental Scan Recommendation (Due to PIEC on 3/14/14 and to CEC on 4/15/14)	1	Miramontez & Figueroa
13	Revised Miramar College ISLO's (attachment)	1	Haidar

- **G.** **Reports**
  (Please limit each following report to two minutes maximum. If you have any handouts, Please e-mail them to Lexie West 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

- **H.** **Announcements**
- **I.** **Adjourn**

---

* **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**
For courtesy, please let the President know if you cannot attend the meeting.

Minutes
Miramar College Academic Senate
Location: L-309
Feb 18, 2014   3:30-5:00pm

Senators Present: Buran Haidar, Daphne Figueroa, Gina Bochicchio, Joan Thompson, Frederica Carr, Mark Hertica, Dan Igou, Clara Blenis, Sean Bowers, Rebecca Bowers-Gentry, Dawn DiMarzo, Otto Dobre, Isabella Feldman, Cynthia Gilley, Naomi Grisham, Rich Halliday, April Koch, Andrew Lowe, Eric Mosier, Wheeler North, Wayne Sherman, Dan Willkie, M. Patricia Beller, Johnny Gonzales
Other Attendees: Darrel Harrison, Juli Bartolomei
Absent: Erica Murrietta (proxy: I Feldman), Marilyn Espitia (proxy: D. Igou), Bob Fritsch, Jeff Higginbotham, Jordan Omens, Lawrence Hahn, Shawn Hurley, Lisa Selchau, Shayne Vargo (proxy: F. Carr)

Meeting called to order at 3:36pm.

A. **Approval of Agenda and Previous Minutes**
   The agenda was approved. The previous minutes were approved unchanged.

B. **Senate Reports**
   1. Treasurer – Erica Murrietta was not present.
   2. President's Report –
      i. Spring Barbecue: It was decided by consensus to hold the Senate barbecue on Thursday, April 17th to start at 12:30pm. Wheeler will take charge of the barbecue and Daphne and Juli volunteered to organize the list of faculty contributions of sides and desserts.
      ii. The Board of Trustees is considering updated Students Services policies and procedures on Academic Accommodations and Disability Discrimination for Students with Disabilities, and Nondiscrimination Prohibition of Harassment.
      iii. Committee membership update:
         (1) Vacancies on some committee for faculty from Library/Tech and Public Safety due to limited number of faculty for the former and logistics of travel for the latter. Possibility of filling the vacant positions with faculty from other areas was mentioned. Joan Thompson clarified that the memberships of the Professional Development Committee and the Tenure and Promotion Committee are set by AFT contract.
         (2) Two remaining faculty vacancies: one for an instructional faculty on the Student Services Committee and another for a Liberal Arts faculty on the Marketing and Outreach Committee.
         (3) The Instructional PR/SLOAC Committee's current challenges and over representation of faculty from MBEPS. Currently, the College-wide SLO Facilitator, Laura Murphy, is the acting Co-Chair and B. Haidar is filling an at-large faculty position. Buran solicited a replacement from the School Liberal Arts. A question was asked as to why L. Murphy couldn't be the Co-Chair. Buran explained that the Campus-wide SLO Facilitator position has a description of duties that come with reassigned time, and one of the responsibility is as a non-voting resource person. That role is separate and distinct from that of governance committee Co-Chair. Daphne reminded that the Campus-wide SLO facilitator is a non-voting resource member on all three Program Review Committees and she informed that the CGC is working on sorting out the issue.
         - Two vacant senator positions: Biology and Fire Protection.
      iv. Open Dialogue between Senate Presidents the College President and all the management teams. Buran shared ongoing mischaracterization of the dialogue that took place on Jan 16, 2014. She expressed that she and other Senate Presidents are happy to clarify any issues. B. Bowers-Gentry raised the issue of definition of "open" dialogue and the "criteria" of leadership for this and future dialogues. Buran explained that the "dialogue" was between the Senate leadership and the College leadership and she pointed out that elected leadership comes with responsibilities such as those of upholding the constitution, and that performance of duties in that context takes place with no need for additional input. She explained that the meeting minutes/notes might clear the confusion. She projected a highlighted version showing the participants as the College President and her management team and three Academic Senate Presidents, and the discussed items. Few Senators expressed lack of awareness of the "open dialogue". Some discussion followed of listed summary of areas to pursue in the near future and ended with agreement that Buran will be sending out the meeting minuets/notes to all Senators.
   3. Past-President – Daphne Figueroa reported on several items from the Chancellor's Cabinet. These included:
      i. Recommendations from the MOOC task force will be coming to next DGC. Not in favor of MOOCs in our district. Interest is focused on the use of online technology for Academic Support Services (e.g. online tutoring pilot) and assisting students with preparation for taking placement exams.

      ii. Boards of Trustees for several community colleges are preparing resolutions in support of offering baccalaureate degrees at community college. However, there are still challenging issues.

      iii. Prop 39 funds – These are for sustainable maintenance projects. State funds have been set aside and projects submitted by our district are pending approval. If approved, the District will receive approximately $1.2 million.

C. **Special Reports**
1. ACCJC 2014 Annual Report (Information) – Buran reported that we received the annual report from ACCJC, and she projected a highlighted document that she prepared highlighting differences between the 2013 and 2014 ACCJC Annual Reports.
2. Taskstream Implementation –The taskforce formed a small workgroup to complete the Taskstream training by end of March. The workgroup will be reporting to and updating the Implementation Team. Fall 2014 is the Taskstream implementation date. Dept Chairs and Deans will receive training prior to Fall 2014 Flex to act as trainers for faculty during the 2014 Fall Convocation. SLOJet remains the repository of course SLO assessment for spring 2014.

D. **Committee Reports/Information**- None

E. **New Business**
1. Part-Time Faculty Nomenclature: The State Academic Senate has asked for information on this subject. Freddie Carr conducted a survey to see how the adjunct faculty population would like to be addressed. Of 17 respondents, The majority (9) voted for "adjunct faculty", and 6 voted for "associate faculty." Freddie said that Jim Mahler asked if he could use the instrument for the entire SDCCD and Grossmont District. Patricia Beller said that she would have participated in the survey with more background information about it. Wheeler suggested that we wait for AFT to conduct the survey using a larger population.
2. Digital Technology and Instruction – Mark Hertica expressed concern about the lack of a District entity for discussion of issues of Digital containers (storage space) and Campus wireless speed. He pointed out that instructional material stored in digital containers, behind our firewall, is accessible to instructors for editing only when they are physically on campus. Mark has discussed the issue with Kent Keyser, with no mutually agreeable resolution. The new Dean of Online and Distributed Learning, Kats Gustafson, was apparently unaware of the problem. He added that the campus wireless speed is too slow for many educational applications and newer laptops and tablets used by students have no ports for Ethernet cables. Other colleges with the same resources manage to have workable wireless systems. It was agreed that the issue is to addressed at the DGC after concurrence of all the District Academic Senates.
3. CGC Recommendations – Daphne Figueroa reported that the CGC has made a recommendation regarding the FLEX Subcommittee. This subcommittee had its parent committee changed from Staff Development to Academic Senate. All the faculty representative positions remain vacant. The CGC reviewed the status of the FLAX Subcommittee and is recommending that we disband it. The FLEX Coordinator would instead act as a liaison and resource for the Staff Development Committee. The Senate approved by consensus a motion to support the recommendation of the CGC.

F. **Old Business**
1. Program Initiation and Institutionalization Processes (Second Reading) – Item was postponed pending anticipated input from our managers regarding the document Appendix detailing the process and procedure for submitting grant proposals. Buran clarified the issue by showing a document she prepared of the current College Procedure as reported in the accreditation 2013 Midterm Report, highlighted with specific changes and cross-references to the steps of the draft process and procedure under discussion. Greg Newhouse will working with the Program Processes taskforce. Becca raised a separate issue and she questioned the need for the Program Prioritization "Task Force" proposed in the draft document. She asked if it was necessary to form another "committee" and could it not be handled by the current governance structure. Buran clarified that no current governance structure deals with this important issue that determines the direction of the college given the limited resources.
2. Course Caps – The California State Academic Senate has a clear position on the issue of Course CAPs through a paper that was adopted in spring 2012. This will be studied further in the near future.

G. **Announcements**
1. College Retreat: March 7, 2014 (Mark your calendar!)
2. Board of Trustees Meeting: March 27, 2014 (Mark your calendar!)
3. ACCJC Annual Report due March 31, 2014
4. Invest in Success: April 16, 2014

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04pm. The next meeting will be on March 4th. Please submit agenda items to both Buran Haidar and Juli Bartolomei.

Respectfully submitted,
Gina Bochicchio

<p style="text-align:center">**Draft Minutes**</p>

Miramar College Governance Committee

<p style="text-align:center">February 11, 2014
L-108
2:45 PM – 3:45 PM</p>

Called to order: 2:40 pm

Members In Attendance: Joyce Allen, Daphne Figueroa (Chair), Bob Fritsch, David Navarro, Wheeler North
Members Absent: Sara Agonafer, Mariam Akbari, Emalina Ledbetter, Gerald Ramsey
Guests: Anne Gloag, Buran Haidar

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

The agenda was approved.
Minutes of December 10, 2013 were approved.

New Business:

1. Update on FLEX workshop – Daphne stated that there was good attendance at the FLEX workshop held the day after convocation. Many new hires and adjunct faculty attended. Anne commented that she learned a lot about faculty roles.

2. Committee Service – the committee reaffirmed that Spring semester should be the time for reviewing years of service, total voting slots available, and for recruiting future members. Rotation should happen if it is needed, but it is also important to keep members serving committees for the historical perspective. Buran mentioned that all newly hired faculty now have a committee assignment. The committee noted that, in particular for faculty, who have "committee service" required by the AFT contract, that there is a great disparity in how much time it takes to prepare for and attend various committee meetings. The committee felt that all committee members should use they proxy system, if they cannot attend. There are procedures in the College Governance Handbook that allow for a committee chair to recommend that a member who has not been attending be replaced. With regard to committees that have faculty members with reassigned time, the Curriculum Committee and the Basic Skills sub-committee have clearly defined roles for the reassigned duties to include chairing the committee or sub-committee. However, for FLEX Coordinator and SLOAC Facilitator, the job description lists them as resources, not as committee chairs. In the case of the SLOAC Facilitator, that person is a non-voting resource member. There was some discussion of the difficulty encountered by the FLEX Coordinator in trying to recruit members for the recently revised FLEX Committee.
   Recommendation: The committee recommended that a FLEX Committee may not be necessary and that the FLEX Coordinator could act as a resource to the Staff Development Committee when activities are related to classroom faculty. It should be the Staff Development Committee that takes on the role of recommending Staff Development activities for the entire college.

3. CG Handbook Review (work groups) – all members will review pages 4-7 and Appendices I-V of the College Governance Handbook. Daphne will conduct a "technical review" of all of the committee and sub-committee pages. Committee members will report back at the next meeting.

Old Business:

Review of the College governance committee structure – the committee agreed that the links to the accreditation standards and committee goals should be reviewed after the new accreditation standards have been approved and adopted by ACCJC.
Recommendation: The committee recommended that all committee chairs link their agenda items to the College Strategic Plan goals, such as is the current practice for CEC, Facilities, and PIEC.

Committee Reports/Other: None

Next Meeting: February 11, 2014, 2:45 pm

Adjourned: 3:18 pm

Proposal for College Hour at San Diego Miramar College

With the completion of the Student Services building this coming summer, students will now have a place to congregate while they are at Miramar College. This is an opportunity to provide meaningful engagement on the college campus, which will ultimately lead to student success.

The Student Support (Re)defined report by the RP group highlights 6 factors for success identified by students that support the idea of College Hour:

The Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges (RPGroup) strengthens the ability of California community colleges to undertake high quality research, planning and assessments that improve evidence-based decision making, institutional effectiveness and success for all students.

1. *Engaged: Students actively participate in class and extracurricular activities*
2. *Connected: Students feel like part of the college community*
3. *Valued: Student skills, talents, abilities are recognized. Opportunities to contribute on campus exist.*
4. *Nurtured: Somebody wants to and helps students to succeed*
5. *Directed: Students have a goal and know how to achieve it*
6. *Focused: Students stay on track*

In addition, College Hour would support the College Goals

Goal 1: Focus college efforts on student learning and student success through quality education that is responsive to change.

If student's have identified success as relating to engagement, connection and being valued, then we need to meet the student needs by conducting business differently. College hour can address many of the 6 factors identified by students.

Goal 2: Deliver instruction and services in formats and at sites that best meet student needs.

The excuse we hear from students often is that the classes overlap with office hours or workshops and they can't get involved. This would provide an opportunity for students to meet with faculty, attend workshops, and perhaps even enjoy lectures in areas they never thought about.

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

If there is purposeful, meaningful interventions in the way of continuing with classes such as College Hour, more and more departments could add on activities and services

that help enhance the college experience for students and the community. Student clubs can engage in more activities, individuals can highlight their own talents.

Goal 4: Initiate and strengthen beneficial partnerships with business and industry, other educational institutions, and community.

College Hour can be a time for lectures, outreach, tabling, and admissions information sessions, career information sessions, from partner universities, industries, and community.

Some ideas for College Hour:

- Workshops
- Office hours
- College visits and employee tabling opportunities
- Brown bag lunch meetings with various discipline faculty
- Student Club meetings
- Poetry readings, music, bands, fun stuff
- Department showcase
- Community engagement

Even if we started with 1 or 2 days a week, we could provide enough activities that would allow for purposeful engagement with students. An hour perhaps between 12:30-1:30 is too short of a time to head home, but long enough to participate in any of the activities above. We know the peak period for classes is between 10-2. Ideally, a time within the peak period would keep students here and engaged in the college process.

Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

2014 Annual Report
REVIEW

San Diego Miramar College
10440 Black Mountain Road
San Diego, CA 92126

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm logged into the correct institution's report	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Daniel R. Miramontez
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	619-388-7308
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	dmiramon@sdccd.edu
5a.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the section of the college catalog which states the accredited status with ACCJC:	http://studentweb.sdccd.edu/docs/catalogs/2013-2014/miramar.pdf#view=Fit&pagemode=bookmarks
5b.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the colleges online statement of accredited status with ACCJC:	http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/accreditation
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	Fall 2013: 12,080 Fall 2012: 11,487 Fall 2011: 12,920
7.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses for fall 2013:	11,525
8.	Headcount enrollment in pre-collegiate credit courses (which do not count toward degree requirements) for fall 2013:	1,715
9.	Number of courses offered via distance education:	Fall 2013: 136 Fall 2012: 131 Fall 2011: 141
10.	Number of programs offered via distance education:	~~5~~ 27
11.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Distance Education:	Fall 2013: 3,523 Fall 2012: 3,575 Fall 2011: 4,025
12.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	Fall 2013: n/a Fall 2012: n/a Fall 2011: n/a

| 13. | Were all correspondence courses for which students enrolled in fall 2012 part of a program which leads to an associate degree? | No |

Student Achievement Data

#	Question	Answer
14a.	What is your Institution-set standard for successful student course completion?	72 %
14b.	Successful student course completion rate for the fall 2013 semester:	74 %
15.	Institution Set Standards for program completion: While institutions may determine the measures for which they will set standards, most institutions will utilize this measure as it is core to their mission. For purposes of definition, certificates include those certificate programs which qualify for financial aid, principally those which lead to gainful employment. Completion of degrees and certificates is to be presented in terms of total numbers. Each student who receives one or more certificates or degrees in the specified year may be counted once.	
	a. If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, what is it?	1063
	b. If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	601
	c. If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	469
16a.	Number of students (unduplicated) who received a certificate or degree in the 2012-2013 academic year:	1,068
16b.	Number of students who received a degree in the 2012-2013 academic year:	601
16c.	Number of students who received a certificate in the 2012-2013 academic year:	467
17a.	If your college has an institution-set standard for the number of students who transfer each year to 4-year colleges/universities, what is it?	840
17b.	Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2012-2013:	745
18a.	Does the college have any certificate programs which are not career-technical education (CTE) certificates?	Yes
18b.	If yes, please identify them:	CSU-GE Breadth; IGETC-GE
19a.	Number of career-technical education (CTE) certificates and degrees:	89
19b.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees which have identified technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other standards, including those for licensure and certification:	84
19c.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for licensure passage rates:	1
19d.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for graduate employment rates:	19

| 20. | 2011-2012 examination pass rates in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study: |

Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Examination	Institution set standard	Pass Rate
Medical Lab Technician	1504	state	80 %	100 %

| 21. | 2011-2012 job placement rates for students completing certificate programs and CTE (career-technical education) degrees: |

Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Institution set standard	Job Placement Rate
See attached Table		0 %	0 %

22. Please list any other instituion set standards at your college:

Criteria Measured (i.e. persistence, starting salary, etc.)	Definition	Institution set standard
Persistence Rate (53% -Fall 2012-Fall 2013)	Annual persistence rate is the percentage of official census enrolled first-time to college students in a fall term who received a grade notation then enrolled in at least one course in the subsequent spring and fall terms and received a grade notation.	48%

23. Effective practice to share with the field: Describe examples of effective and/or innovative practices at your college for setting institution-set standards, evaluating college or programmatic performance related to student achievement, and changes that have happened in response to analyzing college or program performance (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

One of the innovative practices we utilize has been the creation and expansion of the Basic Skills (BSI) English Center and Instructional Assistant (IA) Program. IAs work both inside BSI English/ESL classes as well as in the English Center under the direction of faculty members. This program not only improves BSI students' success, retention, persistence, and GPAs, it also provides IAs with classroom experience to complement their graduate curriculum. This program strengthens their preparation to teach Basic Skills in the future. Similar to other BSI projects at Miramar, to receive funding, this project had to apply by stating how the goals of the project connected to Miramar's Strategic Plan, BSI Action Plan, as well as to the Effective Practices of the BSI grant. Projects are then rubric-group-rated. Additionally, each BSI Project works directly with the researcher and unsuccessful projects have been culled and defunded by the BSI Committee. As external validation, this innovation was awarded Advanced Certification from the National Association of Development Education (NADE), the highest possible certification offered by NADE. Miramar is currently only the second campus in California to hold this distinction.

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Note: Beginning fall 2012, colleges were expected to be at the proficiency level of Student Learning Outcomes assessment (see the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III, Student Learning Outcomes). At this time, colleges are expected to be in full compliance with the Accreditation Standards related to student learning outcomes and assessment. All courses, programs, and student and learning support activities of the college are expected to have student learning outcomes defined, so that ongoing assessment and other requirements of Accreditation Standards are met across the institution.

#	Question	Answer
	Courses	

24.	a.	Total number of college courses:	766
	b.	Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	529
		Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	69.1

25.	Programs		
	a.	Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs as defined by college):	27
	b.	Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	27
		Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	100

26.	Student and Learning Support Activities		
	a.	Total number of student and learning support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation):	18
	b.	Number of student and learning support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	18
		Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	100

27.	URL(s) from the college website where prospective students can find SLO assessment results for programs:	http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/slos
28.	Number of courses identified as part of the GE program:	179
29.	Percent of GE courses with ongoing assessment of GE learning outcomes:	100 %
30.	Do your institution's GE outcomes include all areas identified in the Accreditation Standards?	Yes
31.	Number of GE courses with Student Learning Outcomes mapped to GE program Student Learning Outcomes:	179
32.	Number of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:	5
33.	Percentage of college instructional programs and student and learning support activities which have Institutional Student Learning Outcomes mapped to those programs (courses) and activities (student and learning support activities).	100 %
34.	Percent of institutional outcomes (ILOs) with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	100 %

| 35. | Effective practice to share with the field: Describe effective and/or innovative practices at your college for measuring ILOs, documenting accomplishment of ILOs in non-instructional areas of the college, informing college faculty, staff, students, and the public about ILOs, or other aspects of your ILO practice (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

Over the past several years, we have continued to develop our ILO assessment methods to better reflect all aspects of the college student learning experience, most notably non-instructional areas. In the past, we had difficulties integrating non-instructional functions and outcomes into our ILO structure. In the 2012-2013 year, we used a college-wide retreat and convocations for cross-division discussion and input on our ILOs. This allowed us to identify gaps with respect to non-instructional areas and resulted in modification of our ILOs to more closely align with the AACU's Essential Learning Outcomes. We also developed and piloted an ILO survey that addresses the range of outcomes expected of our degree students and will distribute it college-wide in the coming year. Course and program SLOs are currently mapped |

to ILOs, and we are working on additional mapping using more comprehensive software (Taskstream), currently in the implementation phase. This will allow us to look at all college activities that support our ILOs, highlighting areas that might need improvement. In addition, we are planning on expanding our informative capabilities, especially for the public, with online reporting using the new software platform.

Each of the following narrative responses is limited to 250 words. As you develop your responses, please be mindful of success stories that can be reported in the last question of this section. We look forward to including this information from colleges in our report to the Commission and the field in June.

36.	Please discuss alignment of student learning outcomes at your institution, from institutional and course to program level. Describe your activities beyond crosswalking or charting all outcomes to courses in a program (often called "mapping"), to analysis and implementation of alignment in the planning of curriculum and delivery of instruction. Discuss how the alignment effort has resulted in changes of expected outcomes and/or how students' programs of study have been clarified. Note whether the described practices apply to all instructional programs at the college (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words). Currently, course and program SLOs have been mapped to ILOs, with courses forming the basis for student learning. In our work on alignment and mapping of program SLOs, we found the need to revise instructional program SLOs to more accurate measure student success at the level of the degree and certificate. We are in the process of making these changes, and will then be able to align the revised program SLOs with appropriate course and institutional outcomes. As we include both program and course level SLO data in program reviews, faculty can directly identify strategies and actions that can increase student success. It has allowed us to identify bottlenecks, key informational deficits and multi-course outcomes for individual programs, and adjust scheduling and instruction across disciplines to improve in these areas. We have also used surveys, at the course, program and institutional level, to get student feedback which is valuable in modifying delivery of instruction to meet student need.
37.	Describe the various communication strategies at your college to share SLO assessment results for usage by internal and external audiences. Explain how communications take into account how the information is expected to influence the behavior or decisions of particular audiences. Discuss how communication of student learning outcomes assessment information and results impacts student behavior and achievement (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words). Our focus in communicating outcome assessment has been primarily at the internal level, as we move towards continuous quality improvement. Outcome assessment discussions have become standard at convocations, retreats, and meetings. We have also organized a group to function as SLO Liaisons for instructional and non-instructional programs. These Liaisons are a point of contact between the SLO Facilitator and faculty/staff and have improved overall awareness/alignment of outcome assessment practices between the instructional and non-instructional areas. Students are made aware of course SLOs on syllabi, and program and institutional SLOs are published in our catalog. This allows students to focus in on key themes in courses and identify critical outcomes for success. In addition, with ILO surveys, students are individually asked to assess how their experience at Miramar aligns with the outcomes at the institutional level. Currently, we have posted results of program outcome assessment on our college website. With the adoption of the Taskstream software, we anticipate the ability to easily produce additional reports appropriate for varied audiences.
38.	Explain how dialog and reporting of SLO assessment results takes place at the departmental and institutional levels. Note whether practices involve all programs at the college. Illustrate how dialog and reporting impact program review, institutional planning, resource allocation, and institutional effectiveness (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words). We have relied on department meetings to dialog on instructional SLO assessment at the course and program levels, as this is a faculty driven process. The results of these course level analyses are reported by all faculty using a homegrown database. Summaries of faculty discussions regarding outcomes assessment are entered by lead faculty and are available to department chairs. Summary reports of course level assessment are provided to Academic Affairs and passed to the college at large through the governance system. Both course and program level changes that result from these discussions are reported in program reviews, and any resource requests must be linked to outcomes and strategic plan goals. For non-instructional areas, specifically student support services, administrative services and instructional support services, outcomes and assessment are reviewed by the faculty/staff and committees in their area, and results are included in their division program reviews. With

	the implementation of the Taskstream software, we will be able to map all division level outcomes to our revised ILOs and use collective data to measure success and guide planning in ways that that will increase institutional effectiveness.	
39.	Please share with us two or three success stories about the impacts of SLO practices on student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. Describe the practices which led to the success (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).	
	One significant achievement with regards to SLO practices affecting institutional effectiveness has come from the college-wide efforts to assess the impact of all facets of the college on student learning. Our Spring 2013 retreat resulted in significant changes to the way we approach outcomes assessment at the institutional level, and resulted in a modification of our ILOs. Starting in Spring 2014, we adopted the AAC&U's LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, with the inclusion of verbiage that highlights the role that non-instructional areas play in student learning. This has greatly increased the communication between instructional and non-instructional areas with regards to factors affecting student learning and success. Another significant success story is the impact of outcomes assessment at the program level, as seen in our Basic Skills programs in English and Math. Both areas have used the analysis of outcomes, as well as student achievement data, to create projects that have increased student success in these Basic Skills areas. Specifically, English created the "English 049 Coordination Project," which resulted in increased success and completion rates for students who were engaged in the identified interventions.	

Substantive Change Items

NOTE: These questions are for monitoring purposes only and do not replace the ACCJC substantive change approval process. Please refer to the Substantive Change Manual regarding communication with the Commission.

#	Question	Answer
40.	Number of submitted substantive change requests:	2012-13: 0 2011-12: 0 2010-11: 0
41a.	Is the institution anticipating a proposal for a substantive change in any of the following change categories? (Check all that apply)	No changes planned
41b.	Explain the change(s) for which you will be submitting a substantive change proposal:	N/A

Other Information

#	Question	Answer
42a.	Identify site additions and deletions since the submission of the 2013 Annual Report:	N/A
42b.	List all instructional sites other than the home campus where 50% or more of a program, certificate, or degree is offered:	N/A
43.	List all of the institution's instructional sites out of state and outside the United States:	N/A

Go To Question #: 2 ▼   **REVIEW/EDIT**

The Annual Report must be certified as complete and accurate by the CEO (Dr. Patricia Hsieh). Once you have answered all the questions, you may send an e-mail notification to the CEO that the report is ready for certification.

Only the CEO may submit the final Annual Report.

[**Send e-mail Notification to CEO to certify report**]

ACCJC | Contact Us

© 2010 ACCJC

Marked modifications to the existing Miramar College Resource Development Procedure

San Diego Miramar College

Resource Development ==Process and== Procedure

1. Faculty and/or staff that identify a potential grant, contract, or other business relationship that they feel would benefit San Diego Miramar College will:
   a. Obtain relevant descriptive information that defines the potential funding source or partnership such as: (Step one 1a)
      i. A grant announcement ~~ii. A draft contract~~
      ~~iii. A draft memorandum of understanding (MOU)~~
   b. Identify the appropriate strategic goal and/or Program Review priority addressed by this proposed opportunity. (Step one 1b)

      (Step one 1c) ==Communicate intention to CEC==

   c. The faculty and/or staff will then submit a completed "Funding Concept Approval Form" to the appropriate Department Chair for review, including all background materials listed in 1. a. and 1. b., above. (Step two d) (Step two d)
   d. After discussion with their department, the Department Chair provides all the above information to the appropriate Instructional Dean, along with the recommendation of the Department Chair. (Step two e)
   e. The Instructional Dean will then present the funding concept to the Deans' Council for consideration. (Step two f)
   f. **If the concept is approved**,
      ==The Dean/Manager will forward information and recommendation to appropriate VP==

      ==The VPs will forward the recommendation to the College President and the constituency leaders at the CEC.==

      ~~the Vice President of Instruction will~~ the initiator and the appropriate manager will be directed ~~direct the appropriate Instructional Dean~~ to complete a "~~Funding Source~~ ==Grant Funding Submission== Approval Form."
   g. The "~~Funding Source~~ ==Grant Funding Submission== Approval Form" and all relevant supporting information, including a detailed budget listed by object code, will be presented to the College President's Cabinet for ~~consideration.~~ final approval. (Step three g)

   Edits are yellow-highlighted; Blue highlights represent parallel steps of the process and procedure in the revised "Appendix IV" of the Program Processes Initiation, Institutionalization Processes revised draft.

MM Feedback on Proposed Program Initiation Document

"...there is NO link between the approval process steps as laid out in the Appendix A. SD Miramar College Resource Development Process and Procedures (Revised draft), the time required to obtain that approval, and the time given to submit a grant.

While there is one reference to the CEC meeting weekly in the document....the approval process as set forth requires much more than just presentation to and approval by CEC. The consequence of this failure to address a preparation schedule is to literally place one who is writing a grant in the position of writing it while getting approval for it at the very same time. If one wants to believe that this work with partners and obtaining commitment during the time when no proposal has been approved by ones' own campus is an acceptable course....I would say I hope some folks have great negotiation skills."

*For any major grant - to have written the entire grant proposal, to have worked with partners to obtain commitments on grant outcomes and participation in grant deliveries, and accomplish like commitments can take a good 4 weeks to accomplish. If we assume that the grant proposer must do this before the initial submission to CEC fine....or that the proposer must do this after the final approval by the President, fine....but we now have **at best** a 12 week process before a proposal can be submitted.*

In addition, the 3 steps required to approve submission of a new grant proposal does not take into account the time limits of many grants . There are times when we may be asked to be a subcontractor or partner on a large regional, state or national grant and are given 2-3 weeks to get the grant proposal submitted. When this happens, some provision should be provided for expediting approval such as online approval, special one agenda meeting or agreement to consolidate steps 1-3. Hopefully this would occur on rare occasions but we need some mechanism in place when it does happen.

Draft San Diego Miramar College Program Initiation, Institutionalization, and Discontinuance Processes
November 2013

Prepared by the *ad hoc* Program Processes Taskforce (PPT)
Convened by the College Executive Committee (CEC)

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The initiation of a new program, significant program expansion, and other initiatives, as well as institutionalization or discontinuance of such efforts can have broad short and long-term impact on college operations and personnel.

In April 2013, the Academic Senate forwarded to the College Executive Committee (CEC) a Senate-approved request to form a taskforce to develop formal processes for approval of initiation and institutionalization of internally-funded programs and grant-funded programs, and for program discontinuance. The CEC approved the formation of the Program Processes Taskforce (PPT) and its membership to develop processes and to forward its recommendations to the CEC. The PP Taskforce was convened and held meetings in May 2013 and forwarded the recommendations included in this document.

Taskforce Membership

Administration Representatives (4 3)

- Patricia Hsieh, College President
- Brett Bell, Vice President Administration
- Gerald Ramsey, Vice President of Student Services & Acting Vice-President of Instruction

Academic Senate Representatives (4 3)

- Buran Haidar, Academic Senate President
- Daphne Figueroa, Academic Senate Past-President
- Wheeler North, Aviation Faculty

Classified Staff Representatives (2)

- Joyce Allen, Classified Senate President
- Terrie Hubbard, Classified Senate member

Associated Student Council (ASC) Representative (1)

- Emalina Ledbetter, ASC President

II. Definitions

Definition of programs varies for instructional, student services and administrative services programs. The Taskforce explored definitions and it was agreed that the Program Review Committees of the College divisions will review and revise their definition of program, as appropriate to guide the College Program Processes, in accordance with the Title 5 definition. *(Forward to the Program Review Committees)*

A. Instructional Program & Services

Alternative definitions explored by the taskforce for consideration during the review/revision of the Current SD Miramar College definitions, included:

1. *Title 5* § 55000. Definition
   "**Educational program**" is an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education.

2. ASCCC Curriculum Institute presentation, 2011
   An **Instructional Program** is defined as a discipline and as an organized sequence or grouping of courses leading to a defined objective such as a major, degree, certificate, license, the acquisition of selected knowledge or skills, or transfer to another institution of higher education.

3. Other
   An **Instructional Program** is defined as a state approved degree or certificate or a series of basic skills courses that serve as a pathway to degree or certificate completion. (*Foothill College*)

Current Miramar College PR/SLOAC committee definitions of:

- **Program:** An instructional "program" is a field of study that includes at least one award and at least one subject area. Programs are designated by "grey box" sections in the Degree Curricula and Certificate Programs chapter of the San Diego Miramar College Catalog with the exception of Interdisciplinary Studies which is a grey box section but is not a program.

- **Instructional Service**: An instructional service is an organizational unit that has its own distinct mission, separate budget, and at least one full-time employee.

B. Student Services

Alternative non-limiting definitions explored by the taskforce for consideration during the review/revision included:

1. A **Student Services Program** is defined as an offering of student services that primarily serve a non---instructional function and/or does not qualify as an Academic Program as defined above.(*Foothill College*)

2. A **Student Services Program** is defined as a unit providing non-instructional student services

of guidance and counseling at all levels, for new and for transfer students. (Definition discussed at the PP Taskforce meeting on 05/28/13)

3. Instructional PR/SLOAC-approved definitions 102511 part of "[SLO Glossary of Terminology](#)"

Student Support Program	Non-instructional services, such as advising, counseling, learning resources, financial aid, tutoring, mentoring, etc., that facilitate student success and provide strategies for students to overcome the many factors in life that may disrupt their education and reduce their success

C. Administrative Services
(Alternative non-limiting definitions for consideration)
1. An Administrative Services is defined as an offering of support services, primarily supporting faculty and/or staff, indirect student support, and/or does not qualify as an Instructional Program as defined above. (*Foothill College*)

III. New Program Initiation Process using Internal or external Resources

The initiation of a new program and significant increase in a program or other work area can have broad short and long-term impact on college operations and resources. The new program initiation process is developed to ensure that all proposed programs align with the San Diego Miramar College Mission, its Strategic Plan, and its Educational master Plan to meet substantiated student need. And that before the program is in development stages, the college has the capacity to commit short-term and long-term resources to an additional program while maintaining fair and equitable distribution of resources to serve students in existing programs.

Taskforce members recognized the importance of setting up a process for prioritization of new program development and the PP Taskforce will be working on developing further details of the process to include identification of a "Program Prioritization Group" for College approval. *(PP Taskforce, Fall 2013)*

Proposed membership of "Program Prioritization Group" by the Program Processes (PP) Taskforce

College President	Academic Senate President	Classified Senate President
VPs	Curriculum Chair	ASC President
PR Co-chair	PR Faculty Co-Chairs (Instruction & Student Services)	
PIEC Co-chair	PIEC Faculty Co-Chair	

1. Program areas or Schools identify new programs, significant program expansions, or other initiatives to meet emerging student needs. This identification could be based on program review data, changing demographics or workforce needs, or developing technologies, etc…

   a. To address initiation of a new program, program expansion, or other significant initiative using internal resources, the proposal must be addressed in the Program Review report, by filling the section on "New Program Proposal", a new section to be added to the Program Review annual update and three-year reports. *(Forward to the Program Review Committees)*

   b. To address initiation of a new grant-funded program, program expansions or other initiative funded by external resources, the proposal must align with the program goals as specified in the Program review report or its annual update and the college Mission and the Strategic Plan goals, and in-keeping with the College-approved program prioritization. Proposals for new grant-funded must be submitted using the College Resource Development Process and Procedure (Section VI. Appendix A, B, C & D)

   c. All proposals for new internal/external funded programs must briefly address, as applicable:
      o Demand for the program external and internal.
         ▪ Projection of number of students served, articulation, or transfer data
         ▪ Employment data and other relevant information for CTE programs
      o New curriculum development, course offerings, and learning outcomes
      o Opportunity to realign or strengthen existing programs through: shared Curriculum with other programs, and cross-listing of courses
      o Faculty and Classified Staff and administrative workload and availability
      o Use of college facilities and services
      o Technology and Informational Technology
      o Supplies and Equipment
      o Health and safety considerations

      i. New internally funded programs.
         1. All new internally funded program proposals are forwarded for discussion to the "Program Prioritization group", for a preliminary recommendation to evaluate that the proposal matches the College priorities for new programs and to ascertain that the College has current adequate and potential future resources (budget including FTEF allocation, faculty, staff, technology, facilities, and other services) or current and future capacity (special safety considerations, impact on resource allocation to other college programs) to offer this new program.

         2. The recommendations of "Program Prioritization group" based on the long-term enrollment planning are next forwarded to the College constituencies following the college participatory governance process.

         3. After the new program proposal has been approved by the CEC, the program faculty

and Deans will then proceed with the development of the program curriculum through the Curriculum Committee and other college processes, as applicable.

    ii. <u>New externally funded programs</u>
Development of all new externally-funded programs will follow the three steps of the college-approved Resource Development Process and Procedure (Appendix IV). Step one, completion of the initiation process; step two, completion of the concept approval process; and, step three, completion of the submission approval process. Steps one and two are intended as a "Quick Check" for the following purposes and outcomes

Purposes
- Establishing that the proposal fits with College mission and that other college mission efforts will/will not be disrupted by the proposal implementation.
- Identifying the proposal champion(s) and timeline to develop full proposal.

Outcomes
1. Proposal does not fit college mission or will be exorbitantly disruptive to other college operations.
2. Proposal does fit college mission and will affect other college areas, or will require external grant (e.g. new program or work effort that will increase or reallocate FTEF, staffing and other resources, will impact other service areas such as increasing demand on student services.)

If outcome is #1 – do not develop proposal
If outcome is #2 – engage process for full proposal development of new program and grant (as applicable)

The College Executive Committee (CEC) will be the oversight governance body for the "quick check" for the following reasons:
- Meets weekly
- Four constituent leaders can be reached even quicker if needed
- Approval is only to proceed with proposal development
- Urgency shall not be a legitimate criteria for circumventing due process
- Keeps constituent leaders directly in the loop on any items that may bear significant impact
- Provides opportunity for high-level feedback to improve proposal

2. All new internally and externally-funded programs will complete a program review report after the first year and begin assessing student learning outcomes on an annual basis once the courses have been taught. All new initiatives will submit an annual update in the program review report of the appropriate area.

IV. Program Institutionalization

Institutionalization of Current Programs funded by External Resources

Program areas or Schools will submit a proposal for institutionalization of programs funded by external resources to ensure that the programs and initiatives, after the external resources is discontinued, still meet substantiated student need, and that the college is able to the commit long-term resources to the program, as it maintains its commitment to serve students in the existing programs

1. Program Directors, Deans and/or appropriate manager will submit a request for institutionalization, at least one year prior to the ending date of the external funding, to the "Program Prioritization Group" for consideration and recommendation to the CEC for approval and College adoption.

   Institutionalization of externally-funded programs will be considered alongside existing program with considerations that include among others factors:
   a. Continued external or internal demand
   b. Quality of outcomes
   c. Size, scope, and productivity of the program
   d. Costs and other expenses associated with the program

2. Institutionalization of programs with course offering and/or services beyond the grant funding period will take place in accordance with the college-approved prioritization and resources.

   Institutionalization of instructional programs with course offerings will be considered together with other existing programs serving all students. No additional course offerings or scheduling of grant-funded programs can take place beyond the grant funding period prior to approval of the VP and College President, in accordance with the college-approved prioritization.

   The institutionalization of services beyond the grant-funded period will focus on integrating such services within our existing college services and resources, pending successful renewal of the grant funding. Otherwise, grant initiated services and their delivery format will be re-evaluated for consideration in accordance with the college-approved prioritization and resources.

V. Program Vitality and Discontinuance

This section is under development in accordance with SDCCD Board of Trustees Policy BP 5020:

"The Board hereby directs the Chancellor to develop procedures for the approval of courses of instruction and of educational programs that satisfy the requirements of the Education Code and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. The procedures for the development and review of all curricular offerings, including their establishment, modification or discontinuance shall remain flexible to permit timely response to change.

Furthermore, these procedures shall assure:

a. The Colleges and Continuing Education faculty and Academic Senates assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.
b. The Colleges and Continuing Education curriculum committees are recognized as the primary decision-making bodies that offer recommendations regarding courses, degrees and certificates to the Curriculum and Instructional Council (CIC), the Board of Trustees, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, as appropriate.
c. Regular review and justification of courses, degrees and certificates.
d. Opportunities for training for persons involved in aspects of curriculum development
e. Consideration of job market and other related information for vocational and occupational degrees and certificates.

Summary of Tasks to be forwarded to governance committees/group

(Cross-referenced to sections of the Program Processes document draft)

Forward to Program Review Committees

- Review and revise Program Definitions as necessary (Section II)
- Develop a new section for a new program, program expansion, or other significant initiative to be added to the Program Review annual update and three-year reports. (Section III.1.a)

Forward to the proposed "Program Prioritization group"

- Develop a process for new program prioritization with guidelines, criteria, timeline, and rubrics for evaluation of requests for program initiation/institutionalization (Sections III. & IV.B.2). The College's prioritized new programs identified by the new process developed by the Program Prioritization group will guide the prioritization of faculty needs and classified staff needs of these programs.

VI. Appendix

A. SD Miramar College Resource Development Process and Procedures (Revised draft)

Resource Development Process and Procedure –

Step one: Grant Funding Initiation

1. Faculty, and/or administrator who identify a potential grant will:

    a. Obtain relevant descriptive information that defines the potential funding source such as the grant announcement and source.

    b. Identify the appropriate College strategic goal and priority, Division Plan goals, and/or Program Review priority addressed by this proposed opportunity.

    c. The initiating faculty, staff, and/or administrator will communicate the intention by contacting their constituency leader and/or the College President with the above documentation to inform the CEC about the intent, at its first upcoming scheduled weekly meeting.

Step two: Grant Funding Concept Approval

    d . The initiating faculty and/or staff will then proceed with submitting a completed "Grant Funding Concept Approval Form" to the appropriate Department Chair for review, including all background materials listed in 1. A, above.

    e. After discussion with their department or service unit, the Department Chair or manager will provide all the above information to the appropriate Dean or administrator, along with the recommendation of the Department or service unit.

    f . The Dean or manager will then present the funding concept to the Deans' Council for consideration.

    g. If the concept is approved,
        - The Dean or manager will forward the information and recommendation to the appropriate vice-president

        – The appropriate Vice President will forward the recommendation to the College President and the constituency leaders at the CEC

Step three: Grant Funding Submission Approval

    h. After approval of the concept, the initiator and the appropriate Dean or manager will be directed to complete a "Grant Funding Submission Approval Form."

    g. The "Grant Funding Submission Approval Form" and all relevant supporting information, including a detailed budget listed by object code, will be presented to the College President for final approval.

B. Grant Funding Initiation Form (New)

Miramar
SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Funding Initiation Form

Today's Date:	Prepared by:		
Phone/Ext:	Email:		
Granting Agency			
Type of Funds	Federal	State	Private
Project/Program Purpose			
Application Deadline	Date:		❐ Postmarked ❐ Received
Funding Start Date			
Funding Duration			
Project Director		Department:	
Presented to College Executive Committee (CEC)	Date:		

C. Grant Funding Concept Approval Form (Revised draft)

Miramar
SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Funding Concept Approval Form

Today's Date:	Prepared by:
Phone/Ext:	Email:
Project Title	
Project Period	
Proposal Author	
Project Director	Department:
Project Purpose	
Funding Source	
Application Deadline	Date: ❐ Postmarked ❐ Received
Duration of Funding	
Funding Amount	$ Match Requirement: $ Indirect Amount: $
Contract Obligations	List all College Obligations – o New Curriculum/degrees/certificates: o Facilities: o Staff: o Other instructional areas or student services: o Research: o Matching Funds: o Institutionalization Requirement: o Other:
Technology Resource Requirements?	
Partners / MOUs	
Approval Date:	Approval Signature (Chair) **X**
Approval Date:	Approval Signature (Dean) **X**
Approval Date:	Approval Signature (appropriate Vice President) **X**
	Route Information Copies to: Appropriate Vice Presidents

Form 05-003a

D. Grant Funding Submission Approval Form (Revised draft)

![Miramar — SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT]

CEC Approval Date:_____

Grant Funding Submission Approval Form

Today's Date:	Prepared by:
Phone/Ext:	Email:
Project Title:	❏ New Project ❏ Continuing
Project Period:	
Proposal Author:	
Project Director:	Department:
Project Purpose:	
Funding Source:	
Application Deadline:	Date: ❏ Postmarked ❏ Received
Duration of Funding:	
Funding Amount: Attach proposed budget Listed by object code	$ Match Requirement: $ Indirect Amount: $
Contract Obligations:	List all College Obligations – o New Curriculum/degrees/certificates: o Facilities: o Staff: o Other instructional areas or student services: o Research: o Matching Funds: o Institutionalization Requirement: o Other:
Technology Resources Funding source:	
Partners / MOUs:	
Conflict of interest Disclosure	
Approval Date:	Approval Signature (Chair) **X**

Approval Date:	Approval Signature (Dean) **X**
Approval Date:	Approval Signature (Appropriate Vice President) **X**
Approval Date:	Budget Approval (Vice President Administrative Services) **X**
	Route Information Copies to: Appropriate Vice Presidents
Approval Date:	Approval Signature (Academic Senate President) **X**
	Route Information Copies to: Academic Senate President
Approval Date:	Recommend Approval of Grant Proposal Submission Approval Signature (College President) **X**

Form 05-003
Presented to CEC 11/18/13

1. MMHS established date for Outreach/Assessment to visit MMHS for purposes of FYE/Jump Start Orientation and assessment scheduling. ***This year's date is March 18, 2014 and was MMHS' decision.***
   a. An earlier date was requested by SDMC, but HS counselors prefer a date closer to 4-year admissions notification dates
   b. Historically MMHS counselors and staff work with their students prior to SDMC's arrival to ensure that admission applications have been submitted (Jay Leach, Counselor is point of contact)
      i. Attendance of students has been exceptionally high (about 300 of a 500 student class)
      ii. Of the 300 students (i), the percentage that have actually completed the SDCCD admissions application, at the time of SDMC's visit, has been historically low, approximately 20%, which causes major processing delays
      iii. MMHS is encouraged to let us know how we can help improve the number in ii, above.
2. Assessment will occur for all student from March 11 – 31
   a. To ensure that the maximum number of students are serviced, scheduled times dedicated to HS students (available to all feeder HS) have or will be established (target date for finalizing the assessment schedule is 3/7/14)
      i. 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. twice p/week - Miramar (initial proposal is Tuesday & Wednesday but details are not complete)
      ii. Pending HS response of available times some sessions will be scheduled at HS (facilities challenge)
      iii. A Saturday schedule (Miramar) is under review for MMHS [w/plans to use the services of existing MMHS counselor, as an adjunct counselor]
3. Month of April
   a. Continued assessment (as needed)
   b. Pre-ed planning
   c. Initial acceptance notifications to students
4. Month of May
   a. Continued assessment (as needed)
   b. Continued assessment (as needed)
   c. Continued pre-ed planning
   d. Summer registration
5. Month of June
   a. Jump Start Orientation
   b. Summer session begins
   c. Continued assessment (as needed)
   d. Final ed-planning

---

[1] MMHS is referenced specifically but most dates apply to other feeder high schools as well

Review of Educational Master Plan for Discussion at PIEC February 2014 (Draft)

Divisional Plan	Status/Comment	Next Update Due/Comment	Responsible Party	Status as of 2/21/14
Instructional Services	Last annual updated 2012/13	Update of the 3-year plan (Fall 2014-Spring 2017)	VPI	In progress-review format of plan
Student Services	Last annual updated 2012/13	Update of the 3-year plan (Fall 2014-Spring 2017)	VPSS	In progress- review format of plan
Administrative Services	Last annual updated 2012/13	Update of the 3-year plan (Fall 2014-Spring 2017)	VPA	In progress- review format of plan

Draft – Review of Operational Plans for Discussion at PIEC February 2014

Operational Plans	Status/Comment	Next Update Due/Comment	Responsible Party	Status as of 2/21/14
Human Resources	Updated 7/12/12	July 2015	VPA	N/A
Technology	2010-13	Now	Dean, PRIE, Lib & Tech	Initial review by Tech comm on 2/25 for update
Marketing & Outreach Plan	2006-12	Now	PIO	Ready to go to constituency groups for review
Matriculation Plan	Committee recommended suspension of update / revision on 5/2/12; on 10/15/12 decided to extend suspension and to revisit in late spring 2013 pending State guidance	Now (in progress)	VPSS	Updated 1/13/14; out for circulation approval on 1/21/14.
Student Equity Plan	Updated 12/2012 (draft); Update to be submitted Nov. 2013	Now (in progress)	VPSS/Dean of Student Affairs	In circulation for review.
Basic Skills Plan	Updated 2012-13	Spring 2014	Dean Lib Arts	In Progress
Career & Technical Education Plan	Updated April 2013	April 2014	Dean, BTCWI	In Progress
Student Learning Outcome (SLO)Plan	Last updated March 2013	?	SLO Facilitator	? PIEC co-chairs to review
~~Student Services SLO Plan~~	~~Updated annually PIEC co-chairs to review~~	~~Now~~	~~VPSS/ Student Services/PRSLOAC Sub-comm~~	~~? PIEC co-chairs to review~~
Cultural and Ethnic Diversity Plan	Reviewed annually	?	Diversity Committee	Email co-chairs to find out status
Facilities Plan	Identified goals for this year	?	VPA/Facilities Comm	Goal is to update this term

Draft Revised Miramar ISLOs
Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World Study in sciences, math, social sciences, humanities, histories, language and the arts; _**or a specialized field of study**_
Intellectual and Practical Skills Communication Critical Thinking Problem Solving Quantitative Literacy Information Literacy
Personal and Social Responsibility Local and global civic knowledge and engagement Intercultural knowledge and competence Ethical reasoning and action Foundations and skills for lifelong learning _**Pursuit of high quality, collegiate educational and extracurricular experiences**_ _**Successful navigation of the postsecondary education system to achieve educational goal(s)**_
Integrative and Applied Learning Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies _**Demonstration of applied skills required for the student's chosen career field**_