



Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

December 14, 2012

Co-chairs: Jerry Buckley and Buran Haidar

APPROVED 03/15/13

MINUTES

Present: Jerry Buckley, Buran Haidar, Joyce Allen, Lou Ascione, Brett Bell, MaryAnn Guevarra, Dan Gutowski, Denise Kapitzke, Michael Lopez, Sadayoshi Okumoto, Gerald Ramsey, Dennis Sheean, Duane Short, Katinea Todd and Sandi Trevisan. Guests: Patricia Hsieh and Adela Jacobson.

Absent: Gene Choe, Kanchan Farkiya, Daphne Figueroa for Mary Hart, Lawrence Hahn, Mary Hart and Daniel Miramontez.

1. **Call to order:** The meeting was called to order at 10:34 a.m. by Jerry Buckley.
2. **Approval of agenda:** It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the agenda of December 14, 2012.
3. **Approval of minutes.**
 - a. September 14, 2012. Buran Haidar requested revisions to Paragraphs 4.c., 5.a., 5.b. and 5.d. During discussion, Jerry Buckley requested that in future only the person whose comments are recorded in the minutes should edit those comments, rather than somebody else, and it was agreed by general consensus to do so. After discussion, it was moved, seconded and carried to approve the minutes as modified on December 14, 2012.
 - b. September 28, 2012. Buran Haidar requested revisions to Paragraphs 5.a. and 5.b. Gerald Ramsey asked for clarification on whether it is the intent of the minutes to capture an item as presented by the speaker, or to add clarification of the intent of the statements made. Buran responded that it was to capture and represent what was said, not clarify what was said or not said. Jerry repeated his point that the person who made the comments contained in the minutes should be the one to edit them unless there is some egregious error. It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the minutes as modified on December 14, 2012.
 - c. October 12, 2012. Buran Haidar requested revisions to Paragraph 5.a. to expand the discussion concerning the status of the formatting changes to the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan. It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the minutes as modified on December 14, 2012.
 - d. October 26, 2012. Buran Haidar requested revisions to Paragraphs 5.a. of the October 26, 2012, minutes which were previously approved on November 9, 2012. She said she was not present at the November 9th meeting, but wanted to clarify which documents were discussed at the October 26th meeting. It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the minutes as modified on December 14, 2012.

e. November 9, 2012. Buran Haidar requested a revision to the date in Paragraph 2, and Sadayoshi Okumoto requested a correction to the link in Paragraph 7. It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the minutes as modified on December 14, 2012.

***Strategic Goals**

4. Old Business:

a. Review the enhanced 2007-2013 Strategic Plan.

5.1 & 5.4

Buran Haidar reported on the work group's progress and requested that any edits or comments be sent to her and Jerry Buckley, and the matter was postponed to January 2013. Jerry Buckley stressed the importance of the document and any editorial changes represent the workgroup's collective input.

b. 2007-2013 Strategic Plan outcome measures.

5.1 & 5.4

Dan Gutowski described the work group's progress to date. The group took information from various sources to assess strategies and outcomes and to develop a simple snapshot, with ongoing refinements to be added in future. Buran Haidar said this was a good, systematic way to look at the outcomes and suggested that more consideration could be given to the other indicators. Jerry Buckley and Patricia Hsieh complimented and thanked the work group for its efforts and good work.

Patricia Hsieh said that CEC discussed having the vice presidents and constituency leaders/representatives review the recommendations from the 2012 employee and student satisfaction surveys to be sure that all are interpreting them the same way, then lead individuals will be identified from different areas, for example, one each from Instruction, Student Services, Academic Senate and Classified Senate, and they can engage other individuals, programs, offices and/or committees in discussion and agree to come up with activities to address those recommendations. President's Cabinet has discussed how those activities will tie into our entire planning.

c. March 2013 College Retreat.

5.1 & 5.4

MaryAnn Guevarra continued the discussion of possible venues for the retreat and reported the expenses from the last retreat. It was moved, seconded and carried to host the spring 2013 and fall 2013 retreats at the Scripps Ranch Library, contingent upon the ability to bring in food. Once confirmed and notified to proceed, Sandi Trevisan will include the March 22nd retreat, which will be open to the entire campus, in the eNews, and the President's office will identify and invite key campus groups to ensure broad participation. After discussion of the retreat structure, it was agreed by consensus to let the work group incorporate today's discussion into the event planning and refer back to the committee if necessary.

d. Spring 2013 PIEC Task List.

Jerry Buckley will meet with Buran Haidar and the PIE Steering Committee in early spring to create a task calendar for spring 2013 as was done for fall 2012.

5. New Business:

a. Review of the mission, vision and values – Draft proposal from PIE Steering Committee (PIESC).

5.4

Jerry Buckley presented and discussed the PIESC proposal containing modifications which emphasize guiding principles and include institutional student learning competencies.

After discussion, it was agreed by consensus to send the proposal back to PIESC to reformulate its proposal consistent with today's suggestions, with three options to consider, and then each constituency group will vote on the options. The PIESC meeting will be advertised, and additional people will be invited to attend.

Duane Short observed that the college catalog contains a list of institutional student learning outcomes that are similar to the institutional student learning competencies in the proposal. It was agreed to revise the catalog to replace "outcomes" with "competencies" and Duane will prepare a draft for the PIESC, which will meet around January 7th to reformulate the draft proposal.

b. 2012-2013 updates to the three-year Division Plans – Drafts.

5.1

Jerry Buckley presented and discussed the annual updates for the three division plans which were distributed electronically on December 13, 2012. These annual updates to the three-year plans for Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services contain specific goals and objectives for the next year, and represent a distillation of program review information taken from department-level discussions and rising up through the dean and vice president levels. Discussion will continue at the next meeting.

c. Update on the 2013 Accreditation Midterm Report – recommendations and planning agenda items.

5.1 & 5.4

Jerry Buckley said the mid-term report must address the accreditation recommendations, as well as internal planning agenda items, that relate to program review (PR) and our three independent PR processes that function independently of each other. It was recommended that we consider aligning those three processes, but not necessarily making them one college-wide process. A suggestion has come forward from several venues to form an Uber committee to help guide alignment of structural issues related to the three independent division PRs. He invited Buran Haidar to address this from the CGC perspective as well.

Buran Haidar presented two CGC recommendations based on the ACCJC recommendations regarding the PR processes:

- Formation of a campus-wide PR taskforce or workgroup to include the new SLO Facilitator with new responsibilities to periodically meet to merge and better interface the PR processes of all areas and divisions of our campus. It is a governance issue and we need to create a better process.
- Systemizing and documenting review processes for services and areas that are not currently part of the existing PR processes, including the instructional deans' offices, offices of Administrative Services and the office of the PIO. The CGC doesn't say how it should be done, but recommends that it be addressed.

i. Joint program review work group.

Jerry Buckley suggested that since all of the campus PR committees have members represented at PIEC, this committee can recommend formation of a work group or taskforce to begin planning implementation of a TaskStream-type product if we go in that direction. There's a lot to be done and we need to get a group considering what it should look like and what the function should be for the oversight group. Buran

Haidar said it should be a subgroup like the steering committee and should include the PR committee chairs who are part of the steering committee, the SLO Facilitator, and any other persons that the PR committees think are necessary.

Duane Short reminded the committee that when Institutional Effectiveness was being developed in about 2007, we recommended consolidating the three PR committees as an IE subcommittee, and the PR chairs would have to serve on this consolidated PR committee because it would answer to this one, but CGC did not approve. He asked whether CGC has changed its position about consolidating these, or are we going to make another new committee? Buran Haidar said we wouldn't make a new committee because the natures of the PRs are different and they will remain doing exactly what they do, but could simply be better coordinated if that would suit the SLO Facilitator.

She suggested that the steering committee and SLO Facilitator could meet once a month for PIEC issues and once a month for PR issues, and invite whoever needs to be there for that discussion.

Moved, seconded and carried to formulate a short-term taskforce of chairs and co-chairs of the various committees to meet sometime in January to discuss options and bring back to PIEC. It will be added to our calendar of events for spring as a taskforce assignment.

ii. Updates to the program review planning cycle. Postponed.

iii. TaskStream update. Jerry Buckley proposed creation of an implementation team for TaskStream and suggested a three-by-three matrix with a minimum of three members representing each of the three divisions. Within those divisions would be three different levels of representation in this implementation team: faculty/staff, manager/supervisor and administrator. This would be the nine-member core group to begin the work, with more members to be added if needed, and which would report back to PIEC, or other participatory governance group, as designated.

Structure of proposed implementation team:

	Administrative Services	Instructional Services	Student Services
Administrator	Vice President	Vice President	Vice President
Manager/supervisor	Manager/supervisor	Deans/supervisor	Dean/supervisor
Faculty/staff	Staff	Faculty/staff	Faculty/staff

It was moved, seconded and carried to recommend adoption of a three-by-three matrix with membership to be expanded as necessary.

6. **Reports/Other:**

a. Research Subcommittee. None.

5.1 & 5.3

b. Budget and Research Development Subcommittee (BRDS).

5.1 & 5.2

Brett Bell said that through PR each school submitted requests for funding through BRDS, and Sadayoshi Okumoto explained how the committee prioritized the requests. Brett added that it was the first time that BRDS has looked at requests for funding from the entire campus -- Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services -- and there was good representation from all schools; and all divisions have been funded for at least two requests for funding in this current proposal. BRDS approved the proposal by unanimous vote.

It was moved, seconded and carried to accept the findings of BRDS and its approval.

7. **Adjournment:** It was moved, seconded and carried to adjourn the meeting at 12:13 p.m.

Next Meeting: February 8, 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.