

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

April 27, 2018

10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., L-108

Co-chairs: Daniel Miramontez and Naomi Grisham

MINUTES

Present: D. Miramontez, N. Grisham, X. Zhang, S. Quis, G. Choe, D. Sheean, M. Patel, D. Mehlhoff, R. Olson (for M. Hart), M. Lopez, R. Marine

Absent: Hopkins, Ramsey, Bell, Kapitzke, Allen, Hart, Bermodes, Gutowski, and Okumoto

Guests: B. Warren, T. Teresh

Meeting called to order at 10:31 a.m.

1. **Approval of Agenda.** Moved by D. Mehlhoff, seconded by X. Zhang, carried to approve agenda of April 27, 2018.
2. **Review of Minutes from April 13, 2018.** Minutes for April 13, 2018 was moved by S. Quis, seconded by M. Lopez, and carried to approve.

[*Strategic Goals](#) [Accreditation Standards](#)

New Business:

1. **PIEC and College Governance Committee Feedback** 1-3 I.B, IVA

PIEC put together a committee evaluation that included the committee's mission, accomplishments, and meeting attendance. CGC had collected this information from all of the governance committees, and the deadline was May 2017. Now, one year later, PIEC has received feedback.

Presented was the report PIEC had submitted - they had reviewed their goals, membership, and schedule; showcased the planning website; updated the planning framework, mission, and vision in SPAS; updated the educational master plan and division plans; put on the Planning Summit; provided feedback on Convocation; done the program review landing page; and reviewed the alignment for SSSP/SEP/BSI/BSSOT/CTE/SWP/SEM. Last year was a productive year.

CGC provided some observations and recommendations. 1) CGC recommended to change the term 'School of Library,' 2) only 25% of minutes were posted within timeline, 3) there was a high number of meeting hours with no release for the faculty committee co-chair. The corresponding recommendations were for PIEC to 1) record and post timely minutes, 2) consider release for PIEC faculty co-chair, 3) fill vacant classified positions or reduce committee membership, and 4) revise the handbook to say 'School of PRIELT.' Question was asked to see if these have been addressed. Changing of title will not be hard to do. As for the minutes, this speaks to staff workload. Concern was raised about required timeline for committee minutes, and how it could be addressed. According to the handbook, each respective committee could decide on their desired timeline for handling draft minutes, but once the minutes are approved, they needed to be posted to the website within two days.

At the Technology Committee, there was a discussion regarding their evaluation feedback, and found that some of the feedback was inaccurate. One inaccuracy was the high level of vacant

classified spots. The committee was not sure where this feedback came from, as the report the Technology Committee submitted to the CGC revealed sufficient classified participation. Another question that came up was about quorum – the committee did not know what CGC was basing their information on. The committee walked away with more questions than answers. Based on this conversation, the PIEC co-chairs thought it would be good to bring PIEC's information and see if the feedback made sense to the committee.

Per the 'high number of meeting hours with no release for faculty committee chairs,' , faculty co-chair said that she has not felt once that serving as a co-chair was too much work to do. She was not sure where this came from, or why should would need release. She has only been doing this for two years, but this is not a recommendation that she would make.

Question was asked for clarification on where the observations and recommendations originated from, and it was confirmed that it was CGC. For the verbiage of the phrase 'School of _____' – there seems to be an error or inconsistency in the term, and clear delineation is needed. What does the college mean by saying 'office, department, unit, school, etc.'? It was agreed that the use of these terms needs to be clarified.

Question was asked if a response was needed from the committee to CGC's observations and recommendations. A workshop had been scheduled for April 20th, which was canceled, and part of the agenda was to teach the committees how to set goals. Confirmation is need on how this evaluation was connected with the direction the committee needed to go. A list of committee accomplishments does not do much, and she was not sure where the CGC observations came from. It was not clear why release for the PIEC faculty co-chair was considered without even talking to PIEC faculty co-chair. If CGC is making recommendations, what do they expect? Action plans and/or a response? Part of the process is to bring it back to PIEC for discussion, and determine what is feasible to address, then follow up with questions. If the release time recommendation did not come from PIEC, it may be something being discussed in general amongst individuals who are trying to get release time for chairs. Recommendations need to be based on committee assessment, but did not see any information coming out of this evaluation that speaks to that the committee needs release time for PIEC faculty co-chairs –t here is no evidence supporting this. Per the Research Subcommittee co-chair, when evaluation form was filled, understanding was that this evaluation was to increase committee effectiveness, however, bearing that in mind, the information the evaluation called out is not sufficient to guide continuous improvement. What defines an ineffective committee? It is noted that one of the disconnects was that at the CGC workshop (that was canceled), a packet of information was going to be provided, and they would have liked to have seen that. In addition, in terms of setting goals, PIEC did not have any problems with setting goals (achieving goals). A lot of questions came out of this, more than answers. The information provided in the report was helpful as far as organizing the accomplishments for the year, but anything above that the committee felt was not going to be very useful, and the Research Subcommittee felt the same way and saw the same deficiencies. The Technology Committee felt like this feedback was not very helpful, does PIEC feel the same way? Something that demonstrates how PIEC effectively supports their goals for continuous improvement, and identifying loss points would have been feasible.

Research Subcommittee took a stab at this evaluation and collected more information to better support PIEC (their parent committee). They identified a few domains that are essential to an effective committee. They asked two open-ended questions at the end (what are the accomplishments/what changes can be made?), and also had a PowerPoint – an internal scan of

how effective it is. They looked at their goals, agendas, minutes, membership, committee functions and charges, climate, communication, and logistics. They also answered the two open-ended questions. The answer to the second open-ended question is connected to improving communication. They then concluded with a probability model.

From a faculty's perspective on the Research Subcommittee, and going through this evaluation, has changed the subcommittee's approach – they are now being more purposeful about taking information back, and where to take it back to (productive discussions, strategies, and action items came out of it as well). When asked what was PIEC's impression overall of this assessment, it was recommended that PIEC needs to respond to each item with the CGC (whether one of the problems is terminology clarification, and if there is a timeline for minutes - PIEC needs to know the timeline. Any vacant classified spots were for 2016/17 – and if needed they could show the data then vs. now, and address the number of meeting hours with supporting details). CGC evaluates a lot of committees, and somehow CGC saw high number of hours for faculty co-chairs, and decided that there possibly needs to be release time. If PIEC decides there should be release time, would the committee advocate for it or would CGC? Question was asked if this comment was across the board for other committees (IPR/SLOAC could possibly have one). Perhaps there is another committee that needs reassigned time, but wonders if CGC had inside knowledge of this group, noting that previous PIEC faculty co-chair served on both the Academic Senate and as CGC chair. It was noted that one committee of a similar size to PIEC may feel the need for reassigned time, and maybe allocated it to PIEC as well. The evaluation seems to be technical, not functional. How does CGC even come to that information, as they are not here? Did PIEC not give them enough information, and that's why they have a surface-level response back? Recommendation was for PIEC should do what Research Subcommittee did. Research Subcommittee did their scan for internal improvement only. Recommendation was that CGC should be drilling down a little deeper, or should PIEC be providing more information? Probably both. PIEC should respond to the questions asked, then move on. Consensus was reached to move the Research Subcommittee's evaluation up to PIEC's level and fill it out with suggested revisions based PIEC findings – communicating feedback findings to CGC workshop. Recommendation was made to stand by with the responses to the four surface observations recommended by CGC, as a response was not solicited or seemed to be required. PIEC would continue with their internal evaluation, and would respond to the CGC recommendations only, and anything over and above PIEC would only respond if asked. No concerns were raised. Comment was made that PIEC is a professional organization

Concern was raised about PIEC's membership in the handbook, as the current membership may need to be updated. Committee membership was current, unsure where the CGC data was coming from.

Old Business:

1. Planning Summit 2018: Miramar ACT* (Wrap-up)

1-3 I.B

Previous PIEC meeting was a feedback session in L-105 - they had people who had played a key role in the Summit give PIEC feedback, and there was a lot of good information that came out of it. The resulting information was taken back to the managers, as if PIEC wants to move on to any of the suggested activities, they want to have the support and see if it is feasible. There needs to be a concerted effort if they will be moving forward on the recommendations. The information was well-accepted by the managers, and they acknowledged that everyone did a great job at the Summit. Good information and dialogue had come out of it, along with wonderful activities. Fire Technology made a presentation, and the information was well-received and such a hit at the

PIEC meeting and with the students that presentation was brought to managers. They seemed very impressed by it as well, as it gave them an idea of how faculty are taking the initiative and acting on the needs. The topic came up of talking to faculty to put it in their program review. Automotive Department presented their ed plan as well, and how to read it easily and ensure students really understand it. Also discussed was Administration of Justice's idea/design. These conversations have now caught the attention of the managers in talking with faculty in helping to move these things forward at the unit level (which is one of PIEC's goals this year). It was encouraged that the group to take the information back to their units. PIEC thanks the group for their dialogue and contributions.

2. Annual Planning Calendar Update

1,2 I.B

The annual planning calendar update was moving through governance. The managers provided feedback and support, the Academic Senate has approved it, and he needs to see where it is at with the Classified and students. He expects to put it on the May 15th CEC agenda for final approval.

3. Outcomes Assessment and Unit Level Planning

1,2 I.B

Goal this year is to tie everything back to unit-level planning, and the big picture is often not really looked at (there is a tendency to look at mechanics rather than purpose). Thinking about where this information flows and how it all connects, a planning flowchart was discussed and how everything is tied to the college's mission and vision. The flowchart drills down from the college level planning to unit level planning, and how it flows back up to connect to college level planning. The flowchart shows how everything is tied together and how it connects and impacts the institution's strategic goals, college-wide priorities, etc. for continuous quality improvement. The chart is basically the college's framework in action. One of the things that needs to be done is to assess institutional student learning outcomes. How that is measured is something they should think about and look to improve. The college's multidimensional framework is one of the main goals, extracting out the planning from the unit to college level, and create the flowchart. Although the cruise ship is built for student success (for doing internal continuous quality improvement), there needs to be a continuous loop going from the mission all the way to the parallel planning going on (at the college level and unit level) - and the two feed information to each other. This process has taken years, but have finally been completed.

4. Update to Division Plans Based on EMP (Due 12/8/2017)

1-4 I.B

Observation was made that none of the vice presidents were in attendance at today's meeting, and that he was still waiting on the division plan updates from Instruction and Administrative Services. Student Services is done. When looking at the college level and unit level division plans (this will be for next iteration of division plans), it is important to take more of the unit level and incorporate it more tightly to higher college level planning. For the next revision (not update), they will tighten it up more.

5. Update to Operational Plans

1-4 I.B

Division plans are being worked on with the vice presidents, and the other one is the CTE plan - under the new BTCWI Dean, Jesse Lopez, and the new Associate Dean, Ben Gamboa. both will be updating that plan during the summertime. Classifieds will be taking the received feedback for the outcomes assessment to their next meeting, and this should be done by the end of the semester. It is going through the governance process, and would go to the last CEC. There were no questions on the operational plans.

6. SER Action Plans/QFE Updates

1-3 I.B

Outcomes assessment plan is going through. Currently working with Student Services, and reviewing the annual assessment to see what can be done. The disaggregation recommendations were finalized at CEC. There was no update from Research Subcommittee. Most institutional items will be the focus for next year. Any time an item is completed it is noted in grey.

Reports/Other:

1. Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee (BRDS)

1.2 & 2.3 I.B, III.D

BRDS did not meet, so there was nothing to share.

2. Research Subcommittee (RSC)

1.1, 2.1, 4.1 I.B

No report.

3. Informational Items

1-4

There were a lot of conversations happening about Taskstream, and Taskstream is switching over to Watermark (as a new term), so everyone will be hearing this term. Currently getting feedback from the users, and received some helpful feedback earlier this morning on what the college wishes the system could do. Focus will not be so much on the mechanics, but the flowchart and asking 'does this system meet the college's needs?' We are not stopping this right away, but the contract with Taskstream/Watermark ends in December – so the question is, should the college extend the contract, or move on to another system? Other feedback meetings are planned, but it seems premature to move toward a new system at this time. Some of the feedback received is in favor of not changing, as the college just learned the system. They will be looking for more of this kind of input at the next feedback session. It was noted that the feedback meeting today was for the most part non-instructional, and for the next feedback session the call will go out to the faculty.

Watermark is making a lot of changes in revamping the tool, merging of three companies (and Taskstream is one of them). The company is not making changes to one the college is using, however if the college has needs, we can have a conversation with them, and they can address the needs by shaping a new product. This is why the college will take the feedback to them. Today's conversation surrounded how the college has already invested a lot into Watermark, and since the faculty already have to use Campus Solutions and Canvas, learning another outcomes assessment review system is not likely a good decision. It may be wise to wait until the next planning cycle and keep the current system for now, but will see what the faculty say at the next feedback meeting. Question was asked if Taskstream serves more purposes - this is one of the things they are going to find out.

Noted in this PIEC meeting is a very important item – what kind of pie should be served at the last PIEC meeting of the semester? Requests were on the table for apple dutch, double dutch chocolate cream, and peach. It was recommended to send out an email to the committee. Any other suggestions for pie will be sent to D. Miramontez.

Next Scheduled Meeting: Next meeting will be on May 11, 2018

Adjournment: Motion by X. Zhang, seconded by D. Sheean, adjourned at 11:59 a.m.

***San Diego Miramar College Fall 2013–Spring 2019 Strategic Goals:**

1. *Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.*
2. *Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.*
3. *Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services, and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.*
4. *Develop, strengthen, and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.*