1-4

1-4

I.B

I.B

# Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

October 11, 2019 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., L-108 Co-chairs: Daniel Miramontez and Co-chair Dennis Sheean

## MINUTES

Present: D. Miramontez, B. Bell, P. Hopkins, D. Kapitzke, A. Neff, X. Zhang, G. Choe, M. Hart, M. Lopez, D. Sheean, and M. Stuart

<u>Absent</u>: A. Gonzales, J. Allen, R. Marine, S. Quis, M. Demcho, M. Patel, and S. Okumoto <u>Guests</u>: S. Nguyen and N. Julian

Meeting called to order at 10:36 a.m.

- 1. <u>Approval of Agenda</u>. Agenda was moved by A. Neff, seconded by X. Zhang, and carried to approve.
- <u>Review of Minutes for September 27, 2019.</u> Minutes was moved by M. Lopez, seconded by M. Hart, and carried to approve.

|               | * <u>Strategic</u> | <b>Accreditation</b> |
|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|
|               | <u>Goals</u>       | <b>Standards</b>     |
| Now Business: |                    |                      |

New Business:

1. <u>Planning Summit 2020 – Guided Pathways</u>.

Research Office met with Guided Pathways Co-facilitators and began dialogue on Guided Pathways. Suggestion was made for Guided Pathways Co-facilitators to be added to PIEC as an official committee member – this was approved to move forward. From last college convocation, momentum will continue with theme of Guided Pathways for next year's Planning Summit. When the Planning Summit Workgroup is formed, it will come up with recommendations.

### Old Business:

### 1. SPAS – Progress on Meeting Strategic Goals.

From last PIESC meeting, notes were reviewed and previewed. Meeting consisted of robust discussion on ADTs. From State mandate, number of ADTs were counted as benchmark - ADTs are at a saturation point, with no new ADTs to be added. What will be recommended to PIEC is to drop this metric and look at the actual count of ADTs awarded (referring to Vision for Success, Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF), and Strong Workforce). For Transfer Prepared Rate, aspirational and floor benchmarks only had a 1% difference. Question was asked on what students were captured with this rate (who was transfer prepared, or those not transferring). This may have shifted due to SDSU and San Marcos, and Vision for Success (transfer with lowest number of units). Label may be confusing with transfer prepared rate, with definition for this metric that was discussed at District. This metric needs more discussion and analysis for Guided Pathways. Need to consider other impact factors such as decreasing unit accumulation as outlined in Vision for Success. PIESC recommended to retain benchmarks for now. Suggestion was made to remove this metric, more centered on SCFF, and discuss replacement metric. With Student Educational Plan, Guided Pathway conversation in the integration of Student Services and Instruction, key component of GP is to get students on a path. For Successful Course/Completion Rate, recommendation was to retain floor and aspirational benchmarks, because of 10,000 FTES

as an example of outside factor affecting trend. For Retention Rate (students complete course, receive any grade, and don't withdraw), retain floor and aspirational benchmarks. Discussion will also be needed in regards to the gap between student success and student retention – students remain in classroom, but do not pass. Possible question to collect qualitative information via online. For Outreach Activities and Programs, to retain floor and aspirational benchmark as a starting point. Question was asked on how data is being accounted for. Need a rubric to determine how to collect data across the campus. Does there need to be a set of criteria to count/quantify outreach activities. Further discussion needed to refine metric on how data is collected throughout the college, to be more integrated. The criteria should determine collegewide integrated outreach opportunities and metric needs to be further operationalized. For External Partnerships, the measure of this metric may be unreliable. Need to establish criteria and tighten definition for partnership - need to further operationalize. As for Articulation, definition is way too broad, may be regional articulation. Recommendation is to change metric to ratio. Next PIESC meeting, will discuss everything not discussed and metrics with data no longer available - PIESC to provide recommendation. Last discussion will be on student journey and momentum points with Guided Pathways co-facilitators.

## 2. <u>Strategic Planning</u>.

Discussion will begin in regards to the college's Student Success Framework relative to Guided Pathways.

## 3. ACCJC Annual Report - Benchmarking.

Research Subcommittee (RSC) will have benchmarking recommendations for the next PIEC meeting. Last year, benchmark was not discussed in depth, this time around, will be able to open conversation for vetting.

## 4. Update to Main/Operational Plans.

Currently, Main and Operational Plans are on track. Back in September 20, 2018, request was made for District Strategic Committee to create an HR Districtwide Plan - will bring back to committee's attention this fall 2019. Inquiry will be made to Diversity/International Education Committee as to the status of the Cultural and Ethnic Diversity plan. Findings will be reported back to PIEC.

## 5. <u>SER Action Plans/QFE Updates</u>

Only update was to the "College Governance Assessment Tool" to evaluate day-to-day operations and effectiveness of governance committees. From Collegiality in Action (CIA) meeting on September 4, 2019, CIA will continue review of the college's governance structure and committees. Next CIA meeting is scheduled for October 31, 2019.

### Reports/Other:

## 1. Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee (BRDS)

From last BRDS meeting, there were two items discussed; 1. Annual Identification of Resources to BRDS, and 2. Request for Funding process (with open forum for questions and answers). There are two separate process agreed upon by all constituent groups on campus. What was done was taking these agreed upon processes and applying the resources available to those processes. This is an update of the resources available (informational item only, no approval). First resource is the Physical Plant and Instructional Supplies (PPIS), in which this year, there are only \$46,787 available which is down from a high of \$586,666 a few years ago. Agreed upon allocations for this year was that 75% of resources will go to Technology, 15% will go to Library, and 10% will go to

#### 1-4 I.B

I.B

## 1-4 I.B

1, 2

# 1-3 I.B

Audiovisual. This plan was adjusted overtime, which was previously an 80/20 split. There will be \$35K to Technology resource, to repurchase or renew service agreements and licenses for existing instructional computing systems on campus. There are \$7K for Library resource and \$4,678 for Audiovisual resources (for projector bulbs), respectively. Set aside are \$50K of general fund monies (one-time only) to replace classroom audiovisual equipment. Allocation of \$46K was increased by 50K, which totals allocation to \$96,787 (PPIS). These monies comes from the State Chancellor's Office, with 60% goes to facilities management (to repair/replace equipment and facilities on campus), 40% goes to each of the four campuses. Allocation of monies available is based on FTES (pot of money that is available has shrunk). For BRDS Unrestricted, these are monies set aside for Athletics/Fitness Center to replace existing equipment and not to purchase new equipment. BRDS Unrestricted fund also supports campuswide equipment and Professional Development. Allocation for 2019-20 is 100% of what is available to Athletics/Fitness Center. With \$87K, for equipment and supplies, is what is being used for the current RFF allocations, with 10% held for emergency reserves. Lastly, allocating 100% of resources to Professional Development, set aside for campuswide activities and to support supervisory travel. In summary for BRDS RFF process, there \$181K of Lottery funds available for instructional supplies only, under \$200. Some PPIS monies were swapped for Lottery monies so that more monies can be spent on equipment. Totaling for RFFs on campus this year is \$280,912, with \$181K for supplies only. There were comments regarding revision to the RFF process, which was accommodated, information was relayed back to the college. Reminder was made that RFFs are due to BRDS on October 16, 2019, with no late submissions being accepted.

2. <u>Research Subcommittee (RSC)</u>

At next meeting, discussion will be on ACCJC benchmarking and Environmental Scan. Results will be reported back to PIEC.

1.1, 2.1, 4.1

1-4

I.B

### 3. Informational Items

Research Office attended the RP Group Strengthening Student Success Conference. Two major topics included Guided Pathways (including Bakersfield's program mapper) and AB705 (best practices).

**Next Scheduled Meeting:** Next meeting will be October 25, 2019.

Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 12:09 a.m. Motioned by D. Kapitzke.

\*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.