

Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes
December 10, 2010
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Room A101a

Co-Chairs: Kathleen Werle and Linda Woods

Present: S. Nguyen (for A. Jacobson); B. Bell; B. Haidar; C. Smith; D. Gutowski; D. Sheean; K. Werle; L. Woods; M. Hart; M. Lopez; P. Hopkins; J. Hankinson (for P. Fong); V. Nguyen; D. Figueroa (for D. Short); M. Guevarra; D. Kapitzke; W. Hamidi; D. Harrison; J. Egidio; Julie Stotts; N. Sinkaset; P. Hsieh; K. Todd

Call to Order: Co-Chair Kathleen Werle called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

- I. Agenda. It was moved, seconded and approved to accept the Agenda as presented.
- II. Old Business.
 - A. Minutes. It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the revised Minutes of October 8, 2010. Minutes to be revised to remove "Classified-at-large" from Duane Short's name. Recommended changes to the Effectiveness Committee and the committee name and membership have been approved by the College Governance Committee (CGC), but have not been approved by all constituent groups. The changes recommended by the CGC will go to all constituency groups for approval, then to the College Executive Committee (CEC) for final approval.
 - B. Review/Modification of 2010-11 CWMP Timeline. The committee agreed to postpone discussion and ranking of the College-Wide priorities for 2011-2012 until next semester, as the need for finalization in the fall semester no longer exists. The impacted Budget and Resource Development (BRDS) had already modified its own timeline to accommodate integration of its process with that of the Instructional Program Review process. BRDS prioritization of submitted Requests for Funding (RFFs) now takes place in the fall instead of the spring semester.

The college vice presidents have developed a joint list of college-wide goals for 2011-12, which are not prioritized or ranked, and haven't been modified from their original structure -- just combined, with only some minor changes to make them less specific to a particular division. Last year, not knowing how the process had gone previously, they had worked them into a short list, and the work of the committee was just to rank them. The vice presidents have also developed a prioritized list of classified hiring positions. The faculty hiring priorities have not been completed yet, but that's expected by the beginning of the spring semester.

The I.E. Steering Committee will need to express the list of College Goals into priorities, come back to I.E. in February and rank it at I.E. It was moved,

seconded and carried to amend the 2010-11 timeline to make it early March instead of February 2011 for submitting the college-ranked priorities to CEC. Discretionary Budget Worksheets (DBW) are due to the Vice President of Administrative Services on Dec. 15. Some of the deans have given input to the Vice President of Instruction. The DBW is used for the 2011-2012 budget cycle. Budget will be the next area of emphasis in addition to finishing out the prioritization plan. This body reviews the timeline (not the budget), but that's where we are in planning.

- C. Name Change to Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee. The recommended name change has been approved by the College Governance Committee and must be next submitted to constituency groups for review and recommendation to CEC in the spring.

III. New Business.

- A. Accreditation Planning Agenda Items. The accreditation planning process should be reviewed and assessed in early spring and a plan of action developed.

- B. Assessment of Planning Procedures. B. Haidar summarized elements of Institutional Assessment Plans and Organizational Development that are implemented successfully by other Community Colleges to meet Accreditation Standards. The summary included:

1. Highlights of the challenges in need of attention in the areas of attitudes, structural organization, and shared knowledge. Most notably collective awareness that the "drivers" of our campus are Accreditation Standards, the campus Strategic Plan, the Educational Master Plan, and the adopted core competencies.
2. Distinct areas for assessment of effectiveness that include: a) Achieving our Strategic Objectives, b) Current CWMP process, and c) Integration of our planning processes.
3. A process to define and educate campus constituents about: common terminology, performance indicator, timelines for assessment of each area, responsible parties, and allocation of resources.

Haidar proposed involvement of the IEC members and others, to be recommended by leaders of the campus constituencies, in the process.

B. Haidar was designated as chair of a taskforce to review these issues. This process needs to be wrapped up by late April to report out in May and in time to assess finalization of Campus-Wide Master Plan timeline for the following year and to address the process to improve integration of goals.

- C. Faculty Hiring Priorities. The Faculty Hiring Committee is still working on developing priorities and hopes to finish at the beginning of spring semester.

- D. Classified Hiring Priorities. The top handful of names from over 50 requests were alphabetized and submitted to the Classified Senate President within the timeline. The list will go to CEC next week and then to the Classified Senate. Campus-wide priorities were considered in prioritizing the list. A question was asked: Does SB 1725 apply to classified employees? If so, the list should go to the Classified Senate; if not, the process is different than the faculty process. The vice presidents will meet with the Classified Senate President and will provide a narrative input of what process was used within each of three areas.
- E. Review of College-Wide Goals and Objectives for 2011-12. The six priorities will be ranked every year using objectives assembled from the three divisions. The Steering Committee will meet to express the goals into priorities and bring to the February 11, 2011, I.E. meeting for ranking.
 - 1. Review and Assessment of Miramar College Strategic Plan. It was suggested to take six goals and decide each year which to focus on Strategic Plan. The chair will work as a liaison with the District committee to align with the District plan and provide input as to how the college plan is connected to the District plan.
 - 2. Mission Statement. B. Haidar suggested edits to the Mission Statement for consideration that includes a clear reference to the groups of students we serve, consistent with accreditation standards. It was suggested to liaison with District committee regarding recommendations for planning. Daphne Figueroa is a member of the District committee that will review the strategic plans of all the campuses to determine whether there's any overlap, and to assist each other. The committee will meet with Otto Lee (Chair) in February to review all recommendations and bring them back to campus. Any revisions to the college mission statement must be in the college catalog and must first be Board-approved. The Mission Statement can be sent to the various groups at the beginning of spring for recommendations. At the beginning of spring ask each Shared Governance committee to put the Strategic Plan on its agenda and send out the Mission Statement with some comments to consider for revisions.
 - 3. Things to Do This Year/Goals for This Academic Year include updating the Campus-Wide Master Plan and the election of a new co-chair to serve for 2011-2012 through 2013-2014 (three-year term).

IV. Next Meeting: Friday, February 11, 2011.

- V. Other Issues/Around the Table. Dan Gutowski commented on his experience with the Field house in this climate of shrinking budgets and expanding facilities. A total of 11 FTE in positions was requested before the new facility was opened and instead of increasing staff, it was decreased 0.40 FTE. The campus needs to embrace this fiscal challenge by learning to work smarter and more

efficiently. The Hourglass Support Service Department was able to accomplish much and not interrupt services by directing effort toward core responsibilities, increase staff accountability, reduce non-value-added activities, and reducing the amount of time it takes to complete routine tasks. Our goal as a committee should be to find an avenue to share skills, methods, and organizational tools that will allow each of us to do business differently by working smarter and more efficiently.

How are we measuring diversity/complicated matters? IE members should take back to their people how important Program Review is, and Program Review should guide most everything we do. It's important to be involved in the Program Review process or lose the right to complain later; we must give it thought. Paulette Hopkins thanked Kathleen Werle for her hard work, followed by group applause.

VI. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 11:46 a.m.