



APPROVED 04/26/13

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

April 12, 2013

Co-chairs: Jerry Buckley and Buran Haidar

MINUTES

Present: Jerry Buckley, Buran Haidar, Joyce Allen, Lou Ascione, Brett Bell, MaryAnn Guevarra, Lawrence Hahn, Denise Kapitzke, Daniel Miramontez, Sadayoshi Okumoto, Gerald Ramsey, Duane Short and Katinea Todd. Guest: Laura Murphy.

Absent: Gene Choe, Kanchan Farkiya, Daphne Figueroa for Mary Hart, and Dan Gutowski. Michael Lopez, Dennis Sheean, Sandi Trevisan.

- 1. Call to order:** The meeting was called to order at 10:32 a.m. by J. Buckley.
- 2. Approval of minutes.** At B. Haidar's request, revisions were made to Paragraphs 2.c, 4.a, and 5.c of the March 8, 2013, draft minutes; and it was moved, seconded and carried to approve the revised minutes.
- 3. Approval of agenda.** It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the agenda of April 12, 2013.

4. Old Business

***Strategic
Goals**

a. TaskStream software – update.

5.1

J. Buckley said that we have received approval from CEC to move forward with this TaskStream project. However, the District is currently reviewing the contract, which runs out in January 2014, and is renegotiating a contract with TaskStream for another five-year period. B. Bell confirmed that at this point we're simply looking for the specific budget from which to draw the funds when the contract is drawn and we know what the exact amount will be.

J. Buckley and L. Murphy presented and discussed a draft document which they developed to create a framework for implementation of TaskStream. The draft document was provided to the committee for review and input, and the document will go to CEC and DGC next week. J. Buckley invited feedback to be considered for inclusion in the next step.

b. Spring 2013 college retreat – review outcome.

5.1/5.4

J. Buckley presented and discussed the March 22nd Retreat outcomes, both the successful elements and those to improve in future activities, and said he thought that overall it could be considered a success. He thanked the task force leader, M. Guevara, and her team for their organization and follow-through.

L. Murphy presented and discussed her assessment of the retreat comments concerning ISLOs and items that were added post-retreat in meeting with B. Bell, D. Short and M. Guevara. She suggested next steps as we continue to develop our program-level SLOs and processes for evaluating them and hopes to meet with the committees in those areas for their approval. The topic will be going to the Instructional PR/SLOAC Committee for further consideration. Suggestions for the committee to consider at that meeting should be emailed to D. Short.

B. Haidar emphasized the non-restrictive Title 5, Section 550000, definition of an "Educational program" which states it to be "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." D. Short said it is more specific than our campus definition of program as defined by the IPR/SLOAC Committee, and that most of our defined programs have multiple programs as defined by Title 5 that are encompassed within one program as defined by our college. J. Buckley said that he would be bringing up at PR/SLOAC next week, based upon information he received at a recent ACCJC workshop and discussion with other CIOs, that areas needing attention are general education and basic skills.

JB suggested using the information garnered from the retreat to help form a task force as a sub-group to this committee to look at institutional effectiveness and take this summary under consideration as one form of additional information. B. Haidar indicated her agreement, and we will ask for volunteers at our next meeting. J. Buckley said it would be helpful in generating our annual institutional effectiveness report in August and he would like to have discussions in late April and May on that topic.

c. College statement regarding new contracts, grant and partnerships. 5.2/5.4
Information item; tabled until April/May for discussion.

5. **New Business**

a. Annual planning calendar - Draft. 5.1
Information item. J. Buckley presented and discussed a draft generic calendar to help guide our integrated planning process and asked for suggestions on structure. A second calendar will be prepared annually with specific due dates based upon our academic calendar. President's Cabinet has seen the present draft and briefly reviewed it for consistency, but the structure and contents can be improved upon. He requested that committee members review it and email feedback to the committee co-chairs. They will discuss the feedback, make improvements to the instrument presented today, and bring it back next month for further review.

b. Revision of the college strategic plan for 2014-2020.

5.1/5.3

i. Task force identification.

J. Buckley said that revision of our college Strategic Plan to 2014-2020 will require the identification of a work group which should include representatives of each governance group. Interested committee members should email the committee co-chairs. G. Ramsey said he and M. Guevara will represent Student Services.

ii. PIEC member input.

J. Buckley requested that each member give feedback on at least one of the strategic goals and anonymously send that feedback to K. Todd. Feedback will be collected and forwarded to the work group which will then review and organize it. He emphasized that we're improving and facilitating evaluation of the revised plan. He presented and discussed examples of other colleges' Strategic Plans which include key performance indicators and specific activities stressing the Importance of identifying key performance indicators that can be incorporated into the next six-year Strategic Plan.

B. Bell confirmed the difficulty the work group had in trying to assess our current Strategic Plan without knowing what the performance indicators were intended to be when it was developed, and he strongly recommended that any strategy that is agreed to must have a corresponding defined key performance indicator. D. Short recommended that each strategy should also have planned activities. J. Buckley said that everything we build in concerning planned activities should be coming out of our program reviews -- existing activities that can be clearly identified, elaborated upon, and expanded upon. This will provide direction for our Institutional Effectiveness Report every year.

iii. Timeline to completion.

A draft including revisions to the five goals, strategies, activities, and key performance indicators should be finished by mid-May to bring back for editing and vetting in fall 2013.

c. SLO Joint Taskforce.

5.4

L. Murphy discussed the progress that has been made and emphasized the amount of work still to be done. She observed that we have three different PR/SLOAC committees on campus and each is working in silos on the entire piece and they're charged with working on all the outcomes and assessment and program review. She has done research and all the colleges she looked have a dedicated outcomes and assessment committee, because the work involved is substantial. Those colleges also identified departmental SLO leads, which she is in the process of identifying through the instructional chairs. She emphasized the need of the college to have an integrated body which can work on outcomes and assessments, rather than three separate groups, and which can move the process

forward quickly and efficiently. She recommended the single program review committee to look at that process college-wide, as well as single learning outcomes and assessment committee or group to work on these two different areas. They're integrated and related to one another, but the work is significant enough that it's important to have those two functions.

She said that last week a recommendation was made by CGC to CEC for a program review task force -- that chairs and co-chairs of the individual chairs and co-chairs of the individual PR/SLOAC committees would get together and work on integration. She suggested that rather than just integrating processes in yet another task group, we use this task group to form a more functional committee structure to work on these processes. She said that she has been requesting that this group be formed since November and she's concerned that it has not been moving forward. B. Haidar clarified that the CGC recommendation was for the co-chairs of the three program review committees to get together and come up with how best to move forward.

After discussion, it was moved, seconded, and unanimously carried to support the recommendation that the PR/SLOAC Chairs/Co-Chairs for all divisions and the SLOAC Facilitator meet to recommend the structure and functions of one or more proposed task forces, work groups, or sub-committees that would be responsible for college-wide Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment processes.

d. PIEC Co-Chair nominations and election. 5.1

J. Buckley called for nominations for faculty co-chair, nominations to remain open until the election is held at the next meeting on April 26th. B. Haidar announced that D. Figueroa has been nominated for the position of faculty co-chair.

e. Information item – Program level outcome data. 5.1/5.4

J. Buckley advised that as a response to the ACCJC annual report as modified this year, we produced a document which is now posted on our Institutional Student Learning Outcome web page under Program Learning Outcome Summary. He presented and discussed the document, which lists outcomes for 26 of 27 programs, and said that transfer data will be incorporated in the future. This data, with supporting data spreadsheets, will be presented to Academic Affairs next week.

6. Reports/Other

a. Research Subcommittee (RSC). None. 5.1/5.3

b. Budget and Research Development Subcommittee (BRDS). None. 5.1/5.2

7. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 12:27 p.m.

Next regular meeting: April 26, 2013.

Reporter: K. Todd

***San Diego Miramar College 2007–2013 Strategic Goal 5: Refine the college's integrated planning process.**

5.1 Improve and strengthen the integrated college planning process driven by the college's Strategic Plan. This efficient and accountable process facilitates transparent college wide planning, budgeting and resource allocation.

5.2 Develop a process for evaluating and responding to alternate sources of funding.

5.3 Strengthen coordination with the District to maintain equitable, courteous and quality service delivery to students, especially during state and local budget crises, and preparedness for unexpected catastrophic events.

5.4 Continue to refine the college participatory governance structure processes and activities to align with the formalized integrated college planning process.