

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

October 12, 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, P. Hopkins, A. Gonzales, B. Bell, D. Kapitzke, J. Allen, R. Marine, X. Zhang, S. Quis, G. Choe, M. Hart, M. Lopez, D. Sheean, and M. Demcho

Absent: A. Neff, S. Okumoto, and A. Bermodes

Guests: G. Beitey, L. Woods, and K. Kilanski

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

1. **Approval of Agenda.** Moved by S. Quis, seconded by X. Zhang, carried to approve agenda of October 12, 2018.
2. **Review of Minutes for September 28, 2018.** Tabled.

*Strategic Goals Accreditation Standards

New Business:

1. **None.**

Old Business:

1. **PIEC Committee Review.**

1-2 I.B

a. Communication – Discussion has been continued from previous PIEC meeting in regards to communication and clarification of representative roles and who to report back to. Suggestion was made to delineate governance structure and the symptoms. Based on previous discussion, will try multiple methods (communication packet, assign report-out after reading of agenda, or tool/form similar to ASG). Exercise today will involve other methods to strengthen communication. Research Subcommittee (RSC) has also been having the same discussion and has engaged in research. RSC brought forward to PIEC an activity using the nominal group technique, which they took part during their previous meeting. Activity included questions inquiring about the work PIEC does that the campus would benefit from knowing, barriers or challenges to communication, and opportunities that PIEC offers for overcoming challenges. Reminder was made that the function of PIEC is of a governance committee and does not get into the operations of the Dean's job or department chair's job - things to be shared should be shared to the college as a whole. Mechanisms are being examined that can enhance synthesis of information and communication process. Nominal group technique activity continued with writing ideas on successful and useful strategies that can be used to increase communication on our campus. Ideas included the following:

- a. Standard PIEC agenda item to identify either action required or request for information - who is responsible and a report back schedule.
- b. Clarify when we are seeking input versus when we are making a decision.
- c. With communication, there still has to be participation from the other end (i.e., to go to an Academic or Classified Senate meeting). To inform more than just a line item, but if something needs campus wide discussion, then encourage people to go to meetings.

- d. Sometimes getting on the Academic Senate's agenda is difficult, if information is to be discussed to possibly send a PowerPoint slide that includes items, senate, or PIEC members that can be consulted with for questions. To put this into a concise way that can be recorded or read – a major agenda item. Noted was that from Academic Senate meeting, there were topics discussed. But Academic Senate does not take an action, more discussion to get input, but not what the senate's position is on an agenda topic. As we start to clarify when we need that input or decision, the senate needs to be better about doing an official "this is our position on this topic". What was seen multiple times is a broad discussion, but not an action taken by the senate. There are times we need to know if the senate is ok with a topic. Can't be a loose discussion, but an official position – a motion to agree to a decision. Need definitive answer and not conflicting information.
- e. Identify what groups need the information and find the best avenue to get information to the groups.
- d. PIEC members need to have a clear understanding on what responsibilities they have when they take out information or message. To make sure to take decision made back to PIEC.
- e. Clear responsibility for members to understand what needs to be done with constituency communication.
- d. Need to be clear on what procedures are (to the committees that members represents).
- f. For process and procedures to groups on campus, a three-minute recap at the end of meeting to identify who is sharing what information and with whom. To know if Co-chairs or committee members will take message forward (who is taking information to where). A standing item for committee members to know action items generated and what was learned.

As an example, for informational items that either BRDS or Facilities needs to go through constituent groups, co-chair (or co-chairs go together) is asked to take it to either Academic Senate or go directly to CEC. Academic Senate is asked to add agenda item to be discussed. With 90% of the time items are approved, there was only one instance with one item requiring a second reading. Process happens regularly, just need to know how to work the process to get the results needed – to learn what is required. There is a difference between action and information, and need to be careful on what is being asked for approval. If you don't need approval, you don't want to ask for approval. Comment was made that we don't need approval to share information, but to get on the agenda and inform others how it will benefit them. There are four groups on campus that have to engage and support what this entire campus does. As governance committees are successful, they have buy-in from all four constituencies and the campus. When one or others are not included (or don't understand), the chances for failure are greater. What PIEC is trying to look at are strategies to reduce the risk of failure and to increase the ability to send information out to increase success. The crux of the problem is if one of the constituent groups doesn't agree, then we are high-and-dry and have to start over. The next step of this nominal group technique will be to type out responses and at the next PIEC meeting, look at the ideas gathered and rank and prioritize most impactful and effective practices (action). PIEC has collected data, organize it, and report-back will be provided next meeting to keep conversation going.

2. **Collegewide Planning Summit 2019.**

1-2

I.B

Purpose of this planning summit is for career exploration, focusing on student skill sets in securing jobs. To bring cross-functional groups together for discussion. There will be a three-

panel discussion by industry partners, by school, teaming up Liberal Arts, BTCWI, Public Safety, and MBEPS. This concept was presented at Dean's Council (robust discussion). Some discussions from faculty were regarding industry partners – about students and the skills they are learning in the classroom in order to secure a job. From a student's perspective, they are still attending college (not in the industry). So rather than industry panels by school, to look into having a combination of industry and students for this planning summit. It was suggested that if we want industry partners to tell the faculty that these are the skills that we want from the students, from a student perspective, this should have happened at the beginning (i.e., CTE and their advisory group). From the academic side, this is not the message we'd like to take out for the students. In terms of planning for student success, suggestion was to have students be the voice for the academic side. There will not be an industry partner for some areas (i.e. Geology, Liberal Arts, Humanities, etc.). The idea behind skill sets is to be aware of what is beyond minimal qualifications to do the job - looking into soft skills which applies to various areas. For SLOs in the classroom, from the syllabus, would like students to gain communication skills and critical thinking skills. If students hear from other students that have graduated and secured a job, then these students can hear on what projects, presentations, and workgroups they experienced in class and what they have brought with them into the work environment. These are the skills that can be brainstormed on so that students can get these skills.

At Dean's Council (for programs that are featured for this planning summit) after planning has been done, faculty sign-up has been difficult. Recommendation was for Dean's to be part of the planning process so that it will be easier to recruit faculty participation. Industry topic is in Public Safety, Business School, but not in Liberal Arts and MBEPS – this should not be separated. With the career piece, suggestion was to tie this in with Guided Pathways – to tie in career path with Guided Pathways. The vast majority of students are in college to make money, help with family, and to get a job. Explanation was made that the job will be more meaningful if it relates to understanding why you are doing the job you are doing. What will be more powerful for the planning summit is if there is a presentation by industry (what they are looking for from students), students present what was learned in college, and the decisions student made to create the path towards their career. This will be more powerful than having industry ask what they are looking for.

With throwing in Guided Pathways and using the Four Pillars, this can address the student's thinking toward their education. This will be an opportunity for our students and faculty to explore what is happening as the student is deciding their career path. Also suggested was to highlight faculty who teach some form of professionalism that relates to being successful in a complex and dynamic world. Suggestion on how to get intentional action to think about in the classroom (to provide tools for exploration in the classroom). This planning summit is the transformation piece for faculty and classified, to better serve students. Question for this planning summit is that if we are trying to have faculty be more mindful and incorporate more into their course with regards to career path end-goal. Response was that this is the intent. What needs to be figured out is the message for the faculty attending the planning summit that will be valuable and applicable to their classroom that can impact the students more effectively. This will be an opportunity for faculty to share best practices with others. We want to be purposeful and creative on how to create an environment to address student critical thinking after the end of the semester. Outcomes for this planning summit will be to give faculty tools to intentionally enhance soft-skills for students and linking learning to the workforce.

Consensus was made for recommended format for this planning summit to include student life exploration, and/or development (starting conversation with students early on in educational journey), as well as focusing on student skills-set in securing jobs (speaking to link between SLOs and ISLOs). Panel discussion to include an employment skill panel, alumni panel, and faculty panel. Recommendation was made to take Information will be taken back to PIEESC, to discuss more in detail, and report back to PIEC.

3. Outcomes Assessment and Unit Level Planning.

1-2 I.B

Training has been scheduled for IPR/SLOAC on October 29, 2018 which will help faculty develop quality SLOs. Faculty leads for PIEC was asked to pass the message to increase attendance. This is the time to review SLOs for the upcoming three-year cycle.

4. Update to Operational Plans.

1-4 I.B

Tabled.

5. SER Action Plans/QFE Updates

1-3 I.B

Received District spreadsheet on SLOs in Curricunet. Because the college is going into the next three-year cycle, there may revisions to SLOs. Will upload current information and updated information will be provided at the end of the semester. It was requested for PIEC faculty to take back information to their schools – to look at SLOs and make sure they are meaningful, measurable, and current for uploading during winter break.

Progress is being made for Institutional Effectiveness and Quality Focus Essay. The Program Viability Discontinuance was approved at the end of last spring semester – it is now an official process for the college to use. It will be initiated for program viability when starting a new program and closing a program. The IEPI grant has finished. For collecting annual information for planning purposes, currently looking into tools that will help collect planning documents. One of the tools being considered is Watermark and their new features. Will beta-test product for outcomes assessment, program review, governance, and planning. Also, the college will be engaging in strategic planning, by PIEC in spring 2019.

From Research Subcommittee, dashboards were developed that examine student performance data. Will be able to solicit comments and feedback to finalize. For the College Government and Assessment Tool, results are posted to the College Governance Committee website and there will be targeted trainings for committees this year.

Reports/Other:

1. Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee (BRDS)

1.2 & 2.3 I.B, III.D

BRDS is preparing for the RFF submissions. VPA reviewed SCFF with BRDS with the main focus on the new funding formula and how the District will determine how monies will be divided between the campuses (no longer based on FTES). There were three action items accomplished during last week's BRDS meeting. There was an approval for the BRDS Unrestricted Fund. Approval was made for \$237K in the categories of athletics, fitness center equipment reserves, campuswide equipment and supplies, and professional development. The \$56K for campuswide equipment and supplies will be included in the funds available for the RFF process this month (increase of \$3,000 from last year). Motion to approve the BRDS Unrestricted Fund was made by S. Quis, seconded by M. Hart, and moved to approve. The PPIS Allocation 5-year Plan was presented (formerly IELM Allocation) with 75% going to Technology Resources, 15% to Library

Resources, and 10% going to AV Resources. Funds allocated for 2018-19 was \$105K, down from \$254K last year, and down \$586K from 2016-17 (this is a variable fund). With approved allocation, \$79K will go to Technology Resources, \$15K to Library Resources, and \$10K to AV Resources. Set aside was \$50K for discretionary funds. Also identified that of the \$79K, Instructional Computing Services has \$35K for required expenditures. Remaining \$44K cannot be used for replacing an entire lab on campus, and has been moved to AV resources. Motion was made to approve PPIS Allocation 5-year Plan was moved by B. Bell, seconded by S. Quis, and moved to approve. Prioritization for AV equipment was made at Dean's Council to use \$104K for replacement of classroom AV equipment (prioritized classroom presented). Motion was made to approve classroom AV prioritization by G. Choe, seconded by S. Quis and moved to approve. For informational purposes only, total funding available for this year's RFF process is \$56K of BRDS Unrestricted Funds that can be used by the entire campus for any piece of equipment or supply. Also available is \$238K for Lottery than can only be used for instructional materials under \$200 per unit, \$15,881 reserved for equipment, and \$10,587 for equipment (swapped from PPIS, for equipment items for Library and AV). For the BRDS equipment, \$226K is only for instruction. There is a total of \$321,187 available for RFF funding. After the RFF process, BRDS will give the gross amount funded in each unit and total amount of RFF funded. For clarification on routing, these three items will be presented to Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Student Government as informational items. Constituent groups are primarily responsible for planning. This is not a planning item, but allocation of resources based upon the approved planning process. These will then go to CEC for final notification. Plans on how resources will be allocated were approved. These plans are what governance comments on, not the actual allocation.

2. Research Subcommittee (RSC)

1.1, 2.1, 4.1 I.B

Collected strategies that can be used to increase communication with constituencies through the nominal group technique. Annual Collegewide tutoring report was shared, and will be taken to the Academic Success Center (ASC) Taskforce for further discussion.

3. Informational Items

1-4

Five copies of the Redesigning America's Community Colleges will be available in the Library. Chairs of the Guided Pathways Steering Committee is looking into purchasing a set for the steering committee.

Next Scheduled Meeting: Next meeting will be held on October 26, 2018.

Adjournment: Motion by X. Zhang, seconded by S. Quis, adjourned at 12:28 p.m.

****San Diego Miramar College Fall 2013–Spring 2020 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.*