

COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, May 14, 2013 • 1:00 – 2:30 P.M. • L-108

Members: Hsieh, Bell, Buckley, Figueroa, Shepard, Ramsey, Haidar, Allen, and Hubbard

Attendees: Trevisan, Schwarz, & Jacobson

- A. Approval of the Agenda
- B. Approval of Previous Minutes
- C. Guests/Introductions:
- D. Updates from the Chancellor's Cabinet
- E. New Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Initiator

F. Old Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Initiator
1	Acceptance of 2013 College Midterm Report (<i>attachment & link: http://www.sdmiramar.edu/webfm_send/13129</i>), June 11, 2013	1	Hsieh
2	Early College Program with Mira Mesa High School – Recommendation due 11/5/13	4	Hsieh, Woods, Buckley
3	Proposed Change of Spring Convocation to Friday or on Thursday and School and Department Meetings on Friday	1	Figueroa, Allen, Shepard
4	Follow Up on Program Review Work Group Recommendation (<i>attachment to be sent out before CEC meeting</i>)	5	Bell, Ramsey, Buckley, Murphy, Short, Guevarra
5	Follow Up on Membership Appointment on Task Force to Identify a Process for Approving New Programs, Institutionalizing Grant Funded Programs, and Program Discontinuance	2	Figueroa

G. Reports

(Please limit each following report to two minutes maximum. If you have any handouts, Please e-mail them to Lexie West ahead of time to be included for distribution electronically.)

- Academic Senate
- Classified Senate
- Associated Student Council
- District Governance Council
- District Strategic Planning Committee
- District Budget Committee
- College Governance Committee

H. Announcements

I. Adjourn

*** San Diego Miramar College 2007 – 2013 Strategic Goals**

Goal 1: Focus college efforts on student learning and student success through quality education that is responsive to change

Goal 2: Deliver instruction and services in formats and at sites that best meet student needs.

Goal 3: Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing campus facilities, programs and student-centered co-curricular activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices

Goal 4: Initiate and strengthen beneficial partnerships with business and industry, other educational institutions, and the community

Goal 5: Refine the college's integrated planning process

Please also see <http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/plan> for San Diego Miramar College 2007-2013 Strategic Plan Folders

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Jerry Buckley	Vice President of Instruction; Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee Administrative Co-Chair
Buran Haidar	Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee Faculty Co-Chair
Joyce Allen	Classified Senate President
Lou Ascione	Dean of Liberal Arts
Brett Bell	Vice President of Administrative Services
Gene Choe	Diesel Technology Faculty
Gerald Ramsey	Vice President of Student Services
Mary Ann Guevarra	Student Services Program Review/SLOAC Subcommittee Co-Chair
Dan Gutowski	Hourglass Park Coordinator
Lawrence Hahn	Business Faculty
Mary Hart	Library Science Faculty
Denise Kapitzke	Accounting Supervisor
Michael Lopez	Philosophy Faculty
Daniel Miramontez	Planning and Research Analyst; Research Subcommittee Chair
Dennis Sheean	Fire Technology Faculty
Duane Short	Instructional Program Review/SLOAC Subcommittee Co-Chair
Sandi Trevisan	College Information Officer

Research Subcommittee

Daniel Miramontez	Research Subcommittee Chair
Jerry Buckley	Vice President of Instruction
Gerald Ramsey	Vice President of Student Services
Naomi Grisham	Transfer Center Director
Lawrence Hahn	Business Faculty
Joseph Hankinson	Job Placement Officer
Susan Schwarz	Research Liaison to the District
Sandi Trevisan	College Information Officer
Julia Gordon	Math Faculty
Trinh Nguyen	Student Representative

BH-Comment- Add the CGC and its membership to the PIEC and RSC membership? There is a specific recommendation of College governance that was addressed through work of the CGC.

College Governance Committee

Buran Haidar	College Governance Committee Faculty Chair
	Academic Senate Vice President
Lou Ascione	Dean of Liberal Arts
Joyce Allen	Classified Senate President
Bob Fritsch	Arts Faculty, Past Academic Senate President
Wheeler North	Aviation Faculty, Past Academic Senate President
Terrie Hubbard	Classified Staff, Classified Senate Vice President
Sara Agonafer	Classified Staff
Elizabeth Del Rio	Student Representative

2013 Midterm Report

Responses to Recommendations

2010 Recommendation 1: Culture of Evidence

The team recommends that the College increase its capacity to foster a culture of evidence to support not only the assessment of progress toward achieving its stated goals, but also its planning processes, resource allocation, and evaluation mechanisms as they relate to the improvement of institutional effectiveness. (I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.7, III.C).

Executive Summary

After the 2010 Accrediting Commission on Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) site visit, San Diego Miramar College revised its integrated planning processes to integrate evidence from program review and other sources into the College's planning, resource allocation, and evaluation mechanisms. As a result, the 2011 ACCJC evaluation team determined that the College has demonstrated access to sufficient data and information for the purpose of planning and decision-making but recommended that "...at the next regularly-scheduled site visit, the evaluation team check the College's progress toward assessing the first full iteration of its completed planning cycle." While the next regularly-scheduled site visit will not occur until October 2016, the College is pleased to report that it has now successfully assessed its first cycle of integrated planning, culminating in a College-Wide retreat on August 13, 2012. In addition, the College has significantly increased its capacity to foster a culture of evidence by focusing its efforts on building a culture of collaborative inquiry. These efforts include an assessment of the College's progress toward achieving its strategic goals as well as the use of collaborative inquiry to drive measurable improvements in student success in both instructional and student services programs. The College has also continued its integration of the Planning and Research Analyst and Research Subcommittee into college assessment, planning, resource allocation, and evaluation processes. At the November 1, 2012 accrediting commission's follow up visit, the visiting team concluded that "The College has fostered a culture of evidence, which is observable in the ongoing assessment of stated goals, resource allocation, evaluation mechanisms and overall integrated planning model. The team found abundant evidence of a thriving culture of "collaborative inquiry," which appears to be both associated with tangible gains in institutional effectiveness and sustainable over time."

Introduction

San Diego Miramar College has had an established planning process in place since 2007 that incorporates program review, planning, and resource allocation processes. During the 2010 ACCJC site visit, the team noted that "...while a planning cycle exists and program reviews have been completed, it is not clear how the results of these program reviews are evaluated, used for resource allocation, or integrated into overall College planning." The team also could not find "...evidence that demonstrates systematic, ongoing assessment of progress toward achieving stated goals occurs." Finally, the team urged the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC) to conduct an evaluation of the College's planning efforts.

One example of the College's progress in this area is its work to assess the College's Strategic Plan. PIEC worked collaboratively with both the Research Subcommittee (RSC; a subcommittee of PIEC) and the District Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) to develop an outcomes portion of the larger Miramar College Institutional Effectiveness (IE) report that assessed Miramar College's Strategic Goals.³ The Miramar Scorecard⁴ (the outcomes portion of the IE report) shows 3 of the 5 strategic goals have been directly measured. As a follow-up to this endeavor, in fall 2012 the a PIEC commissioned a workgroup was charged with formatting an assessment scorecard for measurable outcomes of with the goal of assessing the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan.⁵ In March 2013, the Strategic Plan Assessment workgroup concluded their work and shared their findings⁶ with the college during a spring the College-Wide Retreat on March 22, 2013.

The effort to measure progress toward the achievement of the College's strategic goals has also collaboratively initiated by the PIEC and the College Governance Committee (CGC) (PIEC minutes 12/01/10) resulted in a college-wide effort to map major participatory governance committee functions and agenda items to specific strategic goals and strategies.⁷ The completed participatory committee functional mapping is among the key elements informing the CGC current review of the college participatory governance structure and processes, (CGC minutes 10/30/12) Over time, these processes are expected to provide the College with additional mechanisms for tracking progress toward achieving its strategic goals as they relate to the participatory governance structure and processes (i.e., Strategic Goal 5).

The College has also made progress in building its culture of collaborating inquiry at a more concrete level. One example can be seen in the college's efforts to increase student success among the Basic Skills population. Over the past four years the English department has allocated resources and made other changes intended to improve course completion rates in the Basic Skills pre-collegiate writing course. Specifically, after assessing course completion rates and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) data, the faculty developed the "English 049 Coordination Project."⁸ First implemented in fall 2009, this project implemented the following changes:

- **Planning process** - Initial and ongoing dialog and coordination between adjunct and full-time faculty have led to the following changes:
 - The course exit requirement has changed from a final, timed, in-class essay exam to a portfolio of student work.
 - Each instructor has been assigned to a cohort with a leader and 4-5 other instructors. Instructors in these cohorts collaborate throughout the semester to discuss items such as textbooks, assignments, writing prompts, and grading rubrics.
 - The English/ESOL Basic Skills Lab has been augmented to provide tutoring and other types of learning assistance to students in basic skills English classes. It is staffed by Instructional Assistants and professors.
- **Resource Allocation**- Basic Skills Initiative funds have been allocated on an ongoing basis in support of implementing the planning efforts stated above. Furthermore, there are now collaborative discussions occurring between the English/ESOL Lab and The Personal

³ 2010-2013 PIEC Strategic Plan Measurable Outcomes

Planning and Research Analyst has been integrated into the College's participatory governance and committee structure, and was elected chair of the RSC in November 2011.²⁰ In addition, the Planning and Research Analyst has been regularly attending the Instructional Program Review/SLOAC Subcommittee meetings to assist with incorporating program review and institutional level SLO data into the integrated planning process.^{21;22} As another example, the RSC has shifted from focusing on establishing a research infrastructure to building a culture of collaborative inquiry on campus. The committee's work in this area includes recommending a revision to the committee's mission statement and membership; informing the College at large about research projects, processes, and procedures; and expanding the group of people actively using research information in collaborative decision-making.^{23;24;25} As of spring 2013, the RSC's recommended revisions to its membership and mission statement have been approved through the participatory governance structure at Miramar College²⁶

As part of the College's efforts to assess its planning and evaluation mechanisms, in spring 2012, PIEC conducted an institutional effectiveness survey to identify gaps between current planning processes at Miramar and ACCJC standards.²⁷ Results from the survey indicated that the most prevalent gap in Miramar's planning process was the lack of opportunities for reflective dialogue about achievement and outcomes data.²⁸

Since then, San Diego Miramar College has worked to close this gap by utilizing venues such as convocations and college retreats to dialogue about achievement and outcome data. These efforts were effective, as reflected in the results of the 2013 institutional effectiveness survey.²⁹ Overall, results show high consensus (81% among respondents for the institution to maintain an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes, focusing on student achievement and learning outcomes data.

2013 institutional effectiveness survey results were one of several performance indicators shared at the spring 2013 college-wide retreat, held on March 22, 2013 at the Scripps Ranch Library.³⁰ Also discussed in detail were student achievement data as reported in the 2013 San Diego Miramar College Fact Book,³¹ such as enrollment trends, course completion rates, and student success rates, as well as educational goal attainment as indicated by certificate and degree completion, and student transfer metrics. Also discussed was the a prototype of the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan Scorecard,³² and the status of accomplishment of defined planned actions linked to the PIEC-prioritized objectives for 2010-2013 College Strategic Plan.^(Add new evidence XX 2010-2013 SP Accomplished Objectives) The retreat which provided an opportunity for the college community to assess the importance of establishing key-performance outcomes indicators for strategic plan initiatives and action plans. Another aspect of the planning retreat focused on student learning and service outcomes, and the relationship between course level, program level and institutional level outcomes as well as

²⁰ RSC minutes 11/28/2011

²¹ Instructional Program Review/SLOAC Subcommittee minutes 4/10/2012

²² Instructional Program Review/SLOAC Subcommittee minutes 4/24/2012

²³ RSC minutes 12/12/2011

²⁴ PIEC minutes 3/23/2012

²⁵ CGC agenda 5/14/2012

²⁶ CEC minutes 4/9/2013

²⁷ 2012 PIEC Institutional Effectiveness Survey

²⁸ 2012 PIEC Institutional Effectiveness Survey results - Gap analysis

²⁹ 2013 PIEC Institutional Effectiveness Survey results

³⁰ Spring 2013 College Retreat program

³¹ 2013 San Diego Miramar College Fact Book

³² 2007-2013 Strategic Plan Scorecard

³³ 2010-2013 Strategic Plan Accomplished Objectives

assessment.³³ Participants were asked to re-evaluate current institutional student learning outcomes for relevancy and currency to the College's mission, vision and values. Participants were also asked to review and re-evaluate the College's 2012-2014 planning priorities³⁴ established finalized by the PIEC at after the August 13, 2012 college retreat. Evaluation of the spring 2013 college retreat indicate that participants were very satisfied with the organization and structure of the event, as well as the opportunity to have a cross-campus dialogue regarding planning-related information and outcomes. Continuous improvement predicts that as faculty and staff practice reporting their achievements each year, analysis and interpretation of planning activities will be continue to be more meaningful each successive year.

The College has also utilized a comparison of student and employee satisfaction survey results from 2009 and 2012 to assess needs and correlate with integrated planning activities.^{39,40} CEC requested⁴¹ that President's Cabinet members and participatory governance leaders prepare action plans and cross references⁴² to existing College planning processes to address all recommendations generated from the fall 2012 student and employee surveys.^{43,44}

Analysis

As indicated by the 2011 evaluation team, San Diego Miramar College has effectively fostered a culture of evidence. Campus leaders use data from a variety of internal and external sources to make evidence-based decisions in the areas of planning, resource allocation, and evaluations. These efforts culminated in a data-informed collaborative assessment of the first full cycle of the College's integrated planning process. The integration of the Planning and Research Analyst into the College's participatory governance and committee structure (including his election as chair of the RSC) has also been an instrumental component of the College's progress in this area.

By maintaining a culture of evidence while simultaneously building a culture of collaborative inquiry, San Diego Miramar College continues to improve institutional effectiveness through planning, resource allocation, and evaluation. This point is best illustrated in the 2013 institutional effectiveness survey results⁴⁵ in which a majority (71%) of the respondents agreed "The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data."

Additional Plans

³³ PowerPoint Presentation – ISLOs – 3/22/2013

³⁴ 2012-2014 College Priorities

³⁹ Fall 2012 Student Satisfaction Survey results

⁴⁰ Fall 2012 Employee Satisfaction Survey results

⁴¹ CEC agenda and minutes 3/12/2013

⁴² CEC agenda and minutes 4/30/2013

⁴³ 2012 Student Satisfaction Survey Action Plan

⁴⁴ 2012 Employee Satisfaction Survey Action Plan

⁴⁵ 2013 Institutional Effectiveness Survey results

2010 Recommendation 2: Participatory Governance Structure

The team recommends that the college regularly review and adjust its participatory governance structure to assure clear and widely understood pathways for decision-making and planning (I.B, III.C,IV.A.1, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.A.5).

Executive Summary

The College Executive Committee (CEC) is the designated San Diego Miramar College final body for aligning decision-making with the principles of collegial consultation, and effective participatory governance as codified in California Education Code and its Title 5 regulations, and as defined by the San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) in Board Policy 2510. The College Governance Committee (CGC) monitors, facilitates, and evaluates College governance processes and structure with its fifteen participatory governance committees and thirteen subcommittees. During fall 2012 and spring 2013, the CGC identified strengths and key challenges of the college's current governance process and implemented actions to address those areas needing improvement. Among the strengths identified was the continued participation of all governance committees and subcommittees in reviewing and revising their individual goals, membership, and procedures. All recent modifications forwarded and approved by the campus through the college participatory governance process were included in an updated College Governance Handbook in spring 2012.⁴⁶ A number of CGC actions were taken to address the challenges of establishing a common understanding of the college decision-making process and the dynamic nature of the governance structure based on the principles of participatory governance, roles and responsibilities of campus constituents, and the campus-wide responsibilities of committee chairs and committee members. Additionally, the college is currently evaluating the alignment of its governance committee structure with its recently revised college integrated planning process. *for example the inclusion of strategic goals for each agenda item on meeting agendas. (BH Comment- This last statement fits better in the next "resolution" section below with the other examples)*

Introduction

During the 2010 ACCJC site visit, the team noted that "[t]he college appears to be in the nascent stage of providing evidence to substantiate that the planning process leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness,⁴⁷" and that "...[i]t is difficult to integrate plans because planning is subdivided among different functional groups.⁴⁸" The team recommended that the College "...regularly evaluate its governance and decision-making structures to assure their effectiveness.⁵⁰"

Resolution

⁴⁶ College Governance Handbook

⁴⁷ 2010 Accreditation Team Evaluation Report, p. 8

⁴⁸ 2010 Accreditation Team Evaluation Report, p. 20

The CGC identified its major goal for 2012-2013 as the implementation of effective campus-wide communication strategies using common terminology.⁶¹ CGC members led an interactive presentation at the President's Convocation in early spring 2013 on "The 3P's of College Governance": principles, process, and practice of College Governance. The purpose of this activity was to address the identified challenges of awareness of roles and limits of responsibilities of members of all constituencies and to highlight existing processes and the practice of following those processes.^{62,63}

In addition, specific activities led by CGC members took place in spring 2013 to further campus-wide awareness of the college governance principles, processes, and practice, and to train governance committee members on effective practices. The activities included: a) update and revision of the glossary of terms in the College Governance Handbook,^{64,65} (delete, it has been replaced by CGC minutes) and b) reflective interactive workshops for training governance committee/subcommittee Chairs and Co-chairs as trainers of their committee members in effective participatory governance.⁶⁶ Participants in the workshops engaged in mapping their committee/subcommittee functions in elements of college governance,⁶⁷ including review of the duties of governance committee chairs and mapping role and responsibility pertaining to:

- Academic and Professional Matters, per Title 5 and SDCCD District Board Policy, and other participatory governance matters
- Development of college processes, operational procedures, and implementation
- ACCJC accreditation standards
- Reporting relationship to other governance committees

To enhance campus-wide awareness and understanding of college governance and decision-making, the CGC forwarded to the campus constituents a recommendation to institutionalize the participation of all constituencies in activities during the President's Spring Convocation.^{68,69,70} Additional discussion regarding a day dedicated for a college-wide convocation was held at the April 9, 2013 CEC meeting.⁷¹

An example of ongoing college efforts to align refine its governance structure with its integrated planning process is the inclusion of the College strategic goals for each agenda item on the governance committee meeting agendas (*BH comment- the last statement was moved from the Executive summary above*). Another example of its efforts to refine its governance structure and to potentially reduce the number of its standing committees is the recent recommendation of the CGC for "The formation of a campus-wide Program Review task force or work group to include the new SLO Facilitator with the new responsibilities to periodically meet in order to merge and better interface the program review processes of all areas and Divisions on our campus".^{74,75} The CGC recommendation was approved by the CEC (CEC minutes 04/09/13) and it was recently discussed and supported by the PIEC. (PIEC minutes 04/12/13) Chairs and Co-Chairs of the three Program Review Committees and the SLO facilitator are currently exploring how best to integrate college-wide Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment processes.

⁶⁰ CGC minutes 2/13/2013

⁶¹ CGC minutes 12/13/2012

⁶² Spring 2013 Convocation Program

⁶³ Spring 2013 Convocation Presentation: "The 3P's of College Governance"

⁶⁴ CGC minutes 2/12/2013

⁶⁵ Spring 2013 CGC Work Group Notes

- 66 CGC minutes 2/12/2013
- 67 CGC April 2013 Governance Workshop worksheets
- 68 CGC minutes 11/29/2012
- 69 Academic Senate minutes 2/5/2013
- 70 ~~CEC minutes 4/9/2013 (delete same as 71)~~
- 71 CEC minutes 4/9/2013
- 74 CGC minutes 11/29/2012
- 75 Academic Senate minutes 2/5/2013

Analysis

The college decision-making process is guided by principles and a governance model that is regularly updated and published.⁷⁶ The governance model is established to implement the Miramar College mission and goals to further the educational goals of students. The college governance structure was designed to be dynamic and flexible to accommodate changing student and campus needs, as well as changing policies, laws and responsibilities defined at the District and State levels. The model facilitates decision-making and compliance with California Education Code and its Title 5 regulations and the San Diego Community College Board of Trustees Policy 2510 regarding “collegial consultation” with the Academic Senate about the eleven Academic and Professional Matters and “effective participation” of all college constituencies. The established model depends on the participatory commitment and communication of students, faculty, classified and administrative staff through their officially recognized constituent groups.

The college governance model currently has fifteen standing committees and thirteen subcommittees designed for transparent campus wide participation to serve non-overlapping campus needs. Per the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) collective bargaining agreement (CBA) all campus contract faculty members are obligated to participate in college and/or District governance. The participatory governance model at San Diego Miramar College ensures campus-wide participation and transparency of decision making:

1. Membership of all governance committees and subcommittees include representatives of all campus constituents: students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators.
2. All members are charged with consulting, polling, informing and representing their constituencies.
3. All committee and subcommittees meetings are open and public, pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act. For that purpose:
 - a. Agenda items and any other writings are published, disseminated to the membership and to the public (during normal working hours) no less than 72 working clock hours in advance of any regularly scheduled meeting.

(BH Comment- Keep the original that matches our Governance Handbook verbatim)

“All agenda items and any other writings will be published, disseminated to the membership and posted in an area accessible to the public (during normal working hours) no less than 72 clock hours in advance of any regularly scheduled meeting.”

Also, here is a section regarding the agenda posting procedural Requirements

http://ceres.ca.gov/planning/pub_notice/part1.html

“Agendas for meetings and hearings before commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies must be posted in a location that is freely accessible to members of the public 72 hours prior to a regular meeting. The agenda must contain a brief general description of each item to be discussed and the time and location of the meeting (§54954.2). For the purposes of complying with the 72 hour posting requirement, weekend hours count as part of the notice period. However, the notice must be posted in

a location where it can be read by the public at any time during the 72-hours prior to the hearing (78 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen 327 (1995))”

- b. No action is taken on matters that are not on the posted agenda unless the provisions for late breaking or continued items or "emergency situations" are met.

The College Executive Committee is the campus final decision-making body. On the “Academic and Professional Matters”, the right to vote is given only to the Academic Senate President and the College President with the Associated Student Council and Classified Senate representatives providing input. On non-“Academic and Professional All-Campus” matters, each of the four constituent groups has an equal input. The College Executive Committee will make every effort to reach full consensus on non-“Academic and Professional All-Campus” matters, but if this cannot be achieved then the College President will decide the issue.⁷⁷

College initiatives since fall 2010 include the identification of College governance strengths such as college-wide participation in serving on governance committees and subcommittees and

⁷⁶ College Governance Handbook

⁷⁷ College Governance Handbook

2004 Recommendation 4: Integrated Planning

The College uses its strategic plan to drive the development and full integration of the educational master plan with the technology, facilities, and human resources plans and related institutional processes. The human resources plan should be developed with special attention to providing sufficient administrative and staff members for projected institutional growth. (III.A.6, III.B.1, III.B.2, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b)

Executive Summary

Since 2004 San Diego Miramar College has gradually and continuously enhanced its integrated planning processes by updating its Strategic Plan; developing an Educational Master Plan and three Division Plans (Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services); and updating and/or authoring new Operational Plans. As requested by the Accrediting Commission, the College revised its Human Resources Plan in spring 2012 with the assistance of the District Office of Human Resources in order to address the College's faculty, classified staff, and administrative staffing needs. This plan projected the College's growth to the year 2025, matching the College's projected increase to 25,000 students with expanded College facilities.

In addition, the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC) evaluated its planning processes and placed emphasis on six areas to further improve integration of planning with resource allocation and address gaps identified by an institutional effectiveness gap analysis and survey conducted during March 2012. To enhance dissemination of institutional effectiveness information to the College community, including Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) and service outcomes, a college-wide retreat was conducted on August 13, 2012 to discuss the results of an annual institutional effectiveness report. Utilizing group activities, reflective discussions of College outcomes were facilitated at the College convocation and at individual school and department meetings. During these discussions emphasis was placed on helping College constituencies link annual planning activities to long term strategic goals, prioritize new Program Review recommendations, and assess the impact of the prior year's allocation of resources on institutional effectiveness. A second college-wide retreat was held on March 22, 2013¹⁴³ which provided an opportunity to assess **the performance** outcomes of the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan, as well as determine progress with the College's institutional effectiveness¹⁴⁴ since August 2012. Also, the Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee (BRDS) established new procedures that institutionalize minimum funding levels each year and help identify appropriate resources to address critical College planning priorities.

Introduction

San Diego Miramar College has had an established planning process in place since 2007 that incorporates Program Review, planning, and resource allocation processes.¹⁴⁵ The College's various written plans, however, were not integrated or aligned with the Strategic and Educational Master Plans. The 2010 evaluation team therefore recommended that the College focus on the integration of its planning processes. In response, the College realigned its planning focus using

¹⁴³ College Retreat Program 3/22/2013

¹⁴⁴ 2013 Institutional Effectiveness Survey results

¹⁴⁵ 2007-2008 CWMP Outline - 2008-2009

Effectiveness Report.¹⁹⁶ These data are also used to inform updates to, maintain the consistency of, and manage operational plans, such as the Facilities Plan and the tentative College budget. Starting in 2012-2013, Division Plans included a summary of prior year planning activity accomplishments, a report of division achievement metrics, and learning outcome measures. The updated Division Plans for instruction, student services, and administrative services are due on March 15 of each year.

San Diego Miramar College's enhanced integrated planning process consists of:

- Program and Service Review which occurs on an annual basis and is the primary mechanism for identifying goals and objectives at the program and department level that align with the College strategic goals. These program and department level goals and objectives are updated or assessed and analyzed during the following years' Program and Service Review cycles.
- The College Annual Planning Cycle which provides a timeline for annual planning and assessment. This cycle is driven by the annual program and service review process for instructional programs, student services programs, and administrative services. The program and service review process identifies program and service area goals and objectives; evaluates and analyzes progress towards meeting goals and objectives, and specifies future steps and necessary resources.
- The Integrated Planning Cycle which provides a framework for long range planning for the College. The Strategic Plan Goals and Strategies ("Strategic Plan") drives the development and full integration of the Educational Master Plan with the Technology Plan, the Facilities Plan, and the Human Resources Plan and related institutional processes, including the College Annual Planning Cycle.
- A Strategic Plan developed and based primarily on the College mission, budget and resources review, an environmental scan, and an assessment mechanism comprised of feedback gathered over the period of time since the previous review and update. The current plan includes five goals, and each goal has several strategy statements that specify directions to follow to achieve the goal. The Strategic Plan is reviewed on a three year cycle and updated on a six year cycle.
- An Educational Master Plan, serving as the framework linking the Strategic Plan to the implementation plans in the three College divisions. The Educational Master Plan is comprised of planning themes which drive development of division plans for each of the College divisions: Instructional Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services. The Educational Master Plan is a 3-year plan that is reviewed and updated annually.
- Division Plans, which include a broad description of the division and its programs or services, goals, planning assumptions, staffing and facilities needs. The division plans are 3-year plans that are reviewed and updated annually.

environmental/external scan information, budget and resource information, and the College mission.

Assessment: A central component of integrated planning at San Diego Miramar College is the use of annual program review and SLOAC data to identify instructional needs and/or gaps in services and develop specific activities or interventions that align with the College mission, strategic goals and objectives. Division plans also utilize analysis of achievement indicators to assess progress each year. Beginning in 2011-2012, measurement of prior year department and program planning activity achievements and strategic goal attainment has, in part, informed the development of an annual progress report assessing institutional effectiveness.²⁰⁸

Departments and programs use prior year data provided by the District Office of Institutional Research and Planning, SLOAC data provided by the SLOAC Facilitator, and information provided by Career and Technical Education advisory committees or other external partners to inform the identification of future goals and objectives intended to improve student learning, College services and overall program success.

Achievement of strategic plan goals and objectives strategies is measured, in part, through accomplishment of planned activities including the college-wide strategic plan defined objectives and actions (Add Evidence XX 2010-2013 SP Accomplished Objectives) In addition, Department and program planning activities may represent projects conducted in a single year, or carried forward multiple years and modified as needed.

Assessment and analysis of achievement and outcome measures is conducted annually both as an indication of progress toward local department planned goals and objectives, and the division's progress in meeting the College's strategic goals and objectives.²⁰⁹ The College also developed a prototype of a scorecard in March 2013 to evaluate quantitative outcomes produced from of the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan.²¹⁰

The Instructional and Student Services Division plans also include an analysis of achievement indicators related to instructional programs offered by San Diego Miramar College. These common measures are used to assess trends related to enrollment, completion, and operational efficiency. In addition, data are used as a baseline for instructional and student services planning purposes and to inform the budget development process.

The Instructional and Student Services Divisions utilize a number of achievement indicators. These include annual Program Review Reports prepared by program faculty and staff, the College Fact Book, and Scorecard²¹¹ prepared by the District Office of Institutional Research and Planning. These indicators assist in the evaluation of division activities and inform future planning. They, along with SLOs and service unit outcomes, gauge the effectiveness of each division in meeting the needs of student learning and goal attainment. An assessment and analysis of program review data is conducted each year using five year trended data. Each indicator is linked to one or more Strategic Plan goals and therefore helps departments and programs assess their contribution towards achieving those goals. The process relies heavily

²⁰⁸ 2011-2012 Instructional Program Review / SLOAC Form

^{XX} 2010-2013 Strategic Plan Accomplished Objectives

upon the achievement and SLO data included in the annual Program Review Reports which are discussed at the department, program, division and College levels.

Dialogue & Self-Reflection: Discussions regarding student learning and achievement outcomes take place regularly each semester. These are guided by the Program Review Reports, including the report sections pertaining to planning, budgeting and resource allocation²¹². These reflective discussions of student learning and outcomes are continued during department meetings, as well as campus committee meetings that guide development of operational plans. Additionally, since fall 2008, dialogue about the college-wide planning has taken place at the President's Convocations^{213;214;215;216;217} and college-wide retreats.^{218;219}

Assessments of institutional effectiveness are now shared at multiple venues. In fall 2012 the College held an annual college-wide retreat focusing on an initial draft institutional effectiveness report that apprised the College of progress in achievement of strategic goal outcomes, student achievement, and outcome trends.²²⁰ College constituents utilized this opportunity to conduct sense-making of college-wide data and determine new directions and priorities for annual plans and resource allocation. This information was then taken to the fall 2012 College convocation and shared more broadly with College faculty and staff.

Another college-wide retreat was held in spring 2013 to re-affirm the planning priorities²²¹ identified ~~at~~ after the fall 2012 retreat, and to review additional student achievement and outcome data.²²² In addition, outcomes of the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan were evaluated, discussed using a newly developed prototype of an outcomes scorecard²²³ and the accomplishment of prioritized Strategic Plan objectives and their defined planned actions.^{XX 2010-2013 SP Accomplished Objectives} The College's integrated planning processes were discussed and assessed by reviewing the results of the 2013 institutional effectiveness survey.²²⁴ A discussion of institutional student learning outcomes was also facilitated by faculty, leading to a deeper understanding of the relationship between course, program and institutional outcomes by retreat participants. A survey assessment of the spring 2013 college retreat indicated that respondents felt that the activity was well organized and provided the opportunity for reflective discussion of planning outcomes, student achievement, and institutional effectiveness.²²⁵ This view was expressed by a majority of retreat participants, representing a broad cross section of the college community.

²¹² 2011-2012 MBEPS School meetings agendas

²¹³ Fall 2008 Convocation program

²¹⁴ Fall 2009 Convocation program

²¹⁵ Fall 2010 Convocation program

²¹⁶ Fall 2011 Convocation program

²¹⁷ Fall 2012 Convocation program

²¹⁸ Fall 2012 College-wide retreat agenda

²¹⁹ Spring 2012 College-wide retreat agenda

²²⁰ Fall 2012 College Retreat Agenda

²²¹ 2012-2014 College Planning Priorities

²²² 2013 San Diego Miramar College Fact Book

²²³ 2007-2013 Strategic Plan Scorecard

^{XX} 2010-2013 Strategic Plan Accomplished Objectives

Review & Revision of the Planning Process: San Diego Miramar College now participates in a regular and systematic review of its institutional planning and budgeting processes, including an annual assessment of committee accomplishments^{226;227;228;229;230} and budget workshops^{231;232;233;234} that help the College community understand budget development and resource allocation strategies.^{235;236} In keeping with the College's commitment to continual improvement, the College planning cycle and timeline, first developed in spring 2008, have been reviewed and updated annually by the PIEC while the Strategic Plan has been reviewed three times, with the latest update authored in spring 2013. Final outcomes from 2007-2013 Strategic Plan were evaluated in March 2013 through the use of a prototype of an outcome scorecard²³⁷, and the update on the accomplishment of prioritized Strategic Plan objectives and their defined planned actions^(XX 2010-2013 SP Accomplished Objectives)

Some of the findings of this evaluation process have contributed to revisions to the College's strategic goals, strategies and creation of new key performance measurable outcomes indicators in the 2014-2020 Strategic Plan, along with specific action plans.

As summarized earlier, in spring 2012 the PIEC conducted a survey of planning and institutional effectiveness utilizing questions drawn from the Accrediting Commission (ACCJC/WASC) training manual for accreditation visiting site team members. These questions were distributed to all committee members to rate the College's planning processes compared to ACCJC standards. Survey results were grouped into major themes and discussed at the PIEC. A list of process improvements was then developed for implementation during the remainder of spring and fall 2012. The survey was administered again in March 2013²³⁸, with results showing that the majority of respondents agreed that all seven primary institutional effectiveness topics were being appropriately addressed. Three of these topics were rated at agree or strongly agree by 70% or more of the respondents. Eleven focus areas showed improvement over the previous year while six focus areas were identified for additional emphasis during the 2013-2014 planning cycle. This survey of institutional effectiveness practices will continue to be utilized each spring to reassess the College's integrated planning, budgeting, resource allocation and assessment processes.

Additional Plans

- As part of the built-in integrated planning process, the College will continue to refine and improve its planning processes through formal annual reviews of its integrated planning cycle and program review/SLOAC processes

²²⁶ Committee accomplishments

²²⁷ 2009-2012 PIEC Accomplishments

²²⁸ 2011-2012 BRDS Accomplishments

²²⁹ 2011-2012 RSC Accomplishments

²³⁰ 2011-2012 CEC Accomplishments

²³¹ BRDS agenda 9/2/11 - Budget Forum

²³² BRDS agenda 9/16/11 - Budget Forum

²³³ BRDS agenda 2/3/12 - Budget Forum

²³⁴ BRDS agenda 4/27/12 - Budget Forum

²³⁵ 2011-2012 Budget Update - PowerPoint Presentation

²³⁶ Budget Update - PowerPoint Presentation - 2/3/2012

provided by the SLOAC Facilitator, and information provided by Career and Technical Education advisory committees or other external partners to inform the identification of future goals and objectives intended to improve student learning, College services and overall program success.

Achievement of strategic plan goals and objectives strategies is measured, in part, through accomplishment of planned activities including the college-wide strategic plan defined objectives and actions. ~~The campus community is given flexibility in determining progress toward completing activities, as assessments may be designed using quantitative and/or qualitative methods, as appropriate.~~ In addition, Department and program planning activities may represent projects conducted in a single year, or carried forward multiple years and modified as needed. Assessment and analysis of achievement and outcome measures is conducted annually both as an indication of progress toward local department planned goals and objectives, and the division's progress in meeting the College's strategic goals and objectives. The College also developed a prototype of a scorecard in March 2013 to evaluate quantitative outcomes produced from of the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan.

The Instructional and Student Services Division plans also include an analysis of achievement indicators related to instructional programs offered by San Diego Miramar College. These common measures are used to assess trends related to enrollment, completion, and operational efficiency. In addition, data are used as a baseline for instructional and student services planning purposes and to inform the budget development process.

The effort to measure progress toward the achievement of the College's strategic goals has also collaboratively initiated by the PIEC and the College Governance Committee (CGC) (PIEC minutes 12/01/10) resulted in a college-wide effort to map major participatory governance committee functions and agenda items to specific strategic goals and strategies. (2012 – Mapping Committee Accomplishments to Strategic Plan Goals) The completed participatory committee functional mapping is currently among the key elements informing the CGC current review of the college participatory governance structure and processes, (CGC minutes 10/30/12) ~~Over time, these processes are expected~~ to provide the College with additional mechanisms for tracking progress toward achieving its strategic goals as they relate to the participatory governance structure and processes (i.e., Strategic Goal 5).

During spring 2012 the PIEC conducted a survey of planning and institutional effectiveness utilizing questions drawn from the Accrediting Commission (ACCJC/WASC) training manual for accreditation visiting site team members.²⁵¹ These questions were distributed to all committee members to rate the College's planning processes compared to ACCJC standards. Survey results²⁵² were grouped into major themes and discussed at the PIEC. A list of process improvements was then developed for implementation during the remainder of spring 2011 and fall 2012 from the gap analysis. This survey of institutional effectiveness was conducted again in March 2013²⁵³, revealing eleven areas of improvement by comparison to the 2012 survey results, while identifying six areas that were referred for further consideration in the 2013-2014 planning cycle. ~~This survey will be utilized each spring to reassess the College's integrated planning, budgeting, resource allocation and assessment processes and facilitate introduction of additional improvements~~

²⁵³ 2013 Institutional Effectiveness Survey Results

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

II.A.1.c.

1. Fully implement SLOAC process and tracking system.

Since 2006 the College has continuously funded a contract faculty member to serve as SLOAC Facilitator²⁵⁴ as a 50% reassigned time assignment per semester, aiding faculty in the implementation the SLOAC process. The SLOAC Facilitator meets individually with departments, programs, and service areas to assist as they progress through the SLOAC cycle. The SLOAC Facilitator also regularly briefs the Academic Senate regarding progress in SLOAC and serves as a key member of the Instructional Program Review/SLOAC Subcommittee, which is a participatory governance committee responsible for coordinating the instructional program review and SLOAC processes on campus. Along with the SLOAC Facilitator, the College has continually provided information technology and clerical support to facilitate SLOAC data entry and tracking requirements. In addition, the college's Planning and Research Analyst supports the SLOAC process by conducting recurring and ad-hoc research and by serving on the Program Review/SLOAC Subcommittee.

In fall 2009¹⁰, the College implemented the use of SLOJet accountability management software,²⁵⁵ which was developed from open source software following wide faculty participation and active discussion throughout the college. SLOJet facilitates the tracking of all components of the SLOAC process, including SLO identification; faculty participation; assessment cycle results; and strategies to improve student learning. All faculty members have access to SLOJet to conduct data entry for their course SLOs. In addition, department chairs have a dual administrative/faculty peer role, in that they track the participation of other departmental faculty as well as facilitate department-wide dialogue about SLOs, SLO assessment, and strategies to improve student learning. Consequently, department chairs have additional access to SLOJet pages related to overall course-level SLO analysis²⁵⁶ and improvement strategies.²⁵⁷ SLOAC tracking and summary information is also included in the annual program review reports prepared by each instructional program.

As referenced in the October 15, 2012 College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation,²⁵⁸ San Diego Miramar College has reached proficiency with regard to the Accrediting Commission's rubric on implementation of student learning outcomes (SLOs). Student learning and service unit outcomes have been created for all active and offered courses, instructional programs, student services programs, administrative services and at the institutional level. As of fall 2012, 100% of active and offered courses had defined student learning outcomes, while 97% had ongoing assessment. 27 instructional programs offering 147 degrees and certificates had defined outcomes and assessments, while 15 student services programs were

²⁵⁴ SLOAC Facilitator position description

²⁵⁵ SLOJet System data entry form – Figure 1

²⁵⁶ SLOJet System analysis – Figure 2

²⁵⁷ SLOJet System improvements summary – Figure 3

²⁵⁸ 2012 College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation

actively assessing program and unit outcomes. Five institutional outcomes have been mapped through programs to specific course level outcomes, which are assessed each semester

II.B.2.c.

1. The College will continue the work on progress and ensure that all major initiatives, including SLOs, program review, and institutional effectiveness reach and/or maintain the sustainability level outlined in the accreditation rubrics.

A central component of integrated planning at San Diego Miramar College is the use of annual program review and SLOAC data to identify instructional needs and/or gaps in services and develop specific activities or interventions that align with the College mission, strategic goals and objectives. Division plans^{259,260,261} also utilize analysis of achievement indicators to assess progress each year. Beginning in 2011-2012, measurement of prior year department and program planning activity achievements and strategic goal attainment has, in part, informed the development of an annual progress report assessing institutional effectiveness.²⁶²

Departments and programs use prior year data²⁶³ provided by the District Office of Institutional Research and Planning, SLOAC data provided by the SLOAC Facilitator, and information provided by Career and Technical Education advisory committees or other external partners to inform the identification of future goals and objectives intended to improve student learning, College services and overall program success.

Achievement of strategic plan goals and objectives strategies is measured, in part, through accomplishment of planned activities including the college-wide strategic plan defined objectives and actions. ~~The campus community is given flexibility in determining progress toward completing activities, as assessments may be designed using quantitative and/or qualitative methods, as appropriate.~~ In addition, Department and program planning activities may represent projects conducted in a single year, or carried forward multiple years and modified as needed. Assessment and analysis of achievement and outcome measures is conducted annually both as an indication of progress toward local department planned goals and objectives, and the division's progress in meeting the College's strategic goals and objectives. The College also developed a prototype of a scorecard in March 2013 to evaluate quantitative outcomes produced from of the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan.

Instructional and Student Services Division plans also include an analysis of achievement indicators related to programs offered by San Diego Miramar College. These common measures are used to assess trends related to enrollment, completion, and operational efficiency. In addition, data are used as a baseline for instructional and student services planning purposes and to inform the budget development process. The Instructional and Student Services Divisions utilize a number of achievement indicators, including annual Program Review Reports²⁶⁴ prepared by program faculty and staff, the College Fact Book,²⁶⁵ and Scorecard²⁶⁶ prepared by

²⁵⁹ Three Year Instructional Division Plan (2011-2014)

²⁶⁰ Three Year Student Services Division Plan (2011-2014)

²⁶¹ Three Year Administrative Services Plan (2011-2014)

the District Office of Institutional Research and Planning. These indicators assist in the evaluation of division activities and inform future planning. They, along with SLOs and service unit outcomes, gauge the effectiveness of each division in meeting the needs of student learning and goal attainment. An assessment and analysis of program review data is conducted each year using five year trended data. Each indicator is linked to one or more Strategic Plan goals and therefore helps departments and programs assess their contribution towards achieving those goals.

Assessments of institutional effectiveness are now shared at multiple venues. In fall 2012 the College held an annual college-wide retreat²⁶⁷ focusing on an initial draft institutional effectiveness report that apprised the College of progress in achievement of strategic goal outcomes, student achievement, and outcome trends. College constituents utilized this opportunity to conduct sense-making of college-wide data and determine new directions and priorities for annual plans and resource allocation.

Another college-wide retreat was held in spring 2013 to re-affirm the planning priorities²⁶⁸ identified ~~at~~ after the fall 2012 retreat, and to review additional student achievement and outcome data.²⁶⁹ In addition, outcomes of the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan were evaluated, discussed using a newly developed prototype of an outcomes scorecard,²⁷⁰ and the accomplishment of prioritized Strategic Plan objectives and their defined planned actions.^{XX 2010-2013 SP Accomplished Objectives} The College's integrated planning processes were discussed and assessed by reviewing the results of the 2013 institutional effectiveness survey.²⁷¹ A discussion of institutional student learning outcomes was also facilitated by faculty, leading to a deeper understanding of the relationship between course, program and institutional outcomes by retreat participants. A survey assessment of the spring 2013 college retreat indicated that respondents felt that the activity was well organized and provided the opportunity for reflective discussion of planning outcomes, student achievement, and institutional effectiveness.²⁷² This view was expressed by a majority of retreat participants, representing a broad cross section of the college community.

II.B.3.e

1. The addition of online English as a Second Language (ESOL) testing will be investigated in conjunction with the College's sister campuses once the budget situation improves.

ESOL instructors from all three colleges have discussed the possibility of creating a methodology to test ESOL students online. As of Fall 2012, there is consensus that significant practical problems exist to prevent this project from reaching completion, such as the current estimated implementation cost. Instructors also voiced concern regarding the value of developing online testing for ESOL students, potential problems with such a system, such as cheating, and potential benefits to be gained from such an investment, such as efficiency in

²⁶⁶ 2011-2012 Miramar College Scorecard

²⁶⁷ Fall 2012 College Retreat agenda

²⁶⁸ 2012-2014 College Planning Priorities

²⁶⁹ 2013 San Diego Miramar College Fact Book

²⁷⁰ 2007-2013 Strategic Plan Scorecard

²⁷¹ 2013 Institutional Effectiveness Survey results

²⁷² Spring 2013 College Retreat Evaluation

Additionally, in response to a growing facilities capacity across the District, at the October 18, 2012 Board meeting two new positions approved. These positions were:

- Two 1.0 FTE 12-month HVAC Mechanic positions
- One 1.0 FTE 12-month Alarm Maintenance Technician position

These three classified employees represent District positions that serve all buildings at all campuses.

III.B.2.a.

1. The College will work with the district department to evaluate staffing needs to support the new facilities.

During spring 2012, San Diego Miramar College, in collaboration with the District Office of Human Resources, began working on an updated Human Resources Plan²⁸⁴ focusing on an up-to-date staffing plan which addresses issues of staff attrition, enrollment growth, and the addition of new facilities at the college. A key step in the development of the District's budget is to ensure that financial commitments are matched against supporting resources. Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) and Growth are categorized as continuing new resources, while the District's Lottery, Non-Resident Tuition, and Interest revenues are the primary sources of one-time-only new funds. Based on the District's Resource Allocation Formula (RAF), the new continuing resources defined above are applied 85% to the employee units and 15% to other purposes. For one-time resources, the split is 80% to employee units and 20% to other purposes.

The district is required to grow its credit full-time faculty to meet the state's Full-Time Faculty Obligation Number (FON). As this cost is directly related to growth, the district calculates growth funds for the number of regular full-time faculty required for state compliance. The cost for each position is charged to the 85% units' share of RAF funds. The units' 85% of Growth funds cannot be used for new management positions. Instead, management positions are funded from the other 15% share of RAF funds. For classified staff positions, the RAF formula allows for a maximum number of new positions based on a growth rate percentage. The number of Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) and Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) is multiplied by a vacancy rate cost and deducted from the unit's share of Growth funds.

During July 2012, meetings were conducted with District Office of Human Resources participation that reviewed and further analyzed staffing needs at San Diego Miramar College. In addition, an analysis of classified staffing patterns was presented at the SDCCD Governing Board meetings^{285, 286} on March 29, 2012 and May 24, 2012^{19???}. This report assessed gaps in existing classified staffing due to budget reductions and reviewed the ethnic and cultural diversity of the College's employees compared to the surrounding community. These data were

²⁸⁴ 2012-2013 San Diego Miramar College Human Resources Plan

²⁸⁵ SDCCD Board minutes 3/29/2012

²⁸⁶ SDCCD Board minutes 5/24/2012

III.D.2.e.

1. The College will continue to investigate new funding sources.

The discussion of alternate funding sources has been guided by the strategies adopted in the midterm revision of the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan. Strategy 4.4 directing the college to “Establish a campus process to evaluate and respond to partnership proposals from business, industry and education.”²⁹⁰ Among the specific actions identified by the college was “complete a survey of existing and potential alternate sources of funding and develop criteria to guide consideration for future development of financial resources.”²⁹¹ In Spring 2012, discussions aimed at the development of a college-wide transparent process that would be aligned with the college’s participatory governance process were initiated at the Budget and resource Development Subcommittee and at the PIEC. ~~(BRDS 5/11/12 meeting minutes and PIEC 5/11/12 meeting minutes)~~ ^(Add reference YY BRDS 5/11/12 meeting minutes, ZZ PIEC 5/11/12 meeting minutes) Guidelines for Contract, Grants and Partnerships are under development ^(YY PIEC minutes 3/8/13, zzz Draft- Contract policy) CEC discussions affirmed that the college will continue to follow it’s the existing process until an alternative is fully developed. ^(XXX CEC minutes 2/5/2012)

During summer 2012, San Diego Miramar College’s Deans’ Council identified a list of funding priorities,²⁹² obtained from 2011-2012 program review reports. This list of funding priorities was shared with San Diego Community College District’s Instructional Services & Planning Department to help guide identification of state, federal and private grants that match San Diego Miramar College’s strategic goals and objectives. Additionally, the College reviewed and updated a procedure for grant review and submission²⁹³ during fall 2012 which facilitated identification and vetting of new funding sources, including potential grants, contracts, and partnerships.

²⁹⁰ 2007-2013 San Diego Miramar College Strategic Plan

²⁹¹ 2007-2013 San Diego Miramar College Strategic Plan

^{YY} BRDS 5/11/12 meeting minutes

²⁹³ Funding Source Approval Procedure

^{zz} PIEC 5/11/12 meeting minutes).

^{yy} PIEC minutes 3/8/13,

^{zzz} Draft- Contract policy

^{xxx} CEC minutes 2/5/2012

²⁹² Summer 2012 Funding Priority List

²⁹³ Funding Source Approval Procedure

Standard IV: Governance

IV.A.1.

1. Review the College Governance Handbook and structure to continue to make the governance process more effective and efficient. Priorities in this review should include streamlining the mechanism for moving recommendations through the committee structure to the constituent groups and the CEC.

All the college participatory governance committees continuously review the goals, membership, and procedures of individual committees to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the governance process. For example the updated 2012 College Governance Handbook includes campus-approved revisions to thirteen of the fifteen participatory governance committees and one of the sixteen participatory governance subcommittees. All these revisions occurred between spring 2010 and fall 2012.

To streamline moving governance committee recommendations to the constituent groups and to the CEC, the CGC developed a routing form in spring 2011. The routing form was presented to the campus community at the fall 2011 Convocation.²⁹⁴ A training process for Committee chairs and constituency leaders in the use of this new form was developed by the CGC in spring 2012, and its utilization started in fall 2012. In spring 2013, the CGC held governance training workshops to train committee and subcommittee Chairs and Co-chairs, as trainers of committee members, to further campus-wide awareness of the college governance principles, processes, and practice, and effective practices. An interactive mapping of reporting relationships of committees was among the workshops activities.^(ref CGC workshops materials)

IV.A.2.a. & IV.A.5.

1. CGC should continue to work on streamlining the shared governance model to reduce the number of standing committees and should present recommendations to the campus constituent groups during the upcoming academic year, 2010-11.

In Fall 2010, a coordinated effort between the PIEC and the CGC took place through a joint committee meeting²⁹⁵ which highlighted the importance of evaluating the college governance committee structure, pending the development of an integrated planning process beyond the annual cycle. Dialogue about the revision of the college governance committee structure was then initiated in spring 2013 by the CGC, to align the College's committee structure with the now fully developed integrated planning process and assessment cycle to simultaneously address the possibility of replacing two independent Program /Service committees and one subcommittee into one campus-wide Program/Service Review governance structure and college-wide learning and service outcome matters. During In spring 2013, CGC also forwarded a recommendation to the College for "The formation of a campus-wide Program Review task force or work group to include the new SLO Facilitator with the new responsibilities to periodically meet in order to align and better interface the program review processes in all Divisions of the College."^{296;297}

²⁹⁷ Academic Senate minutes 2/5/2013

The CGC recommendation was approved by the CEC ^(CEC minutes 04/09/13) was it was recently discussed by the PIEC. ^(PIEC minutes 04/12/13) Chairs and Co-Chairs of the three Program Review Committees and the SLO facilitator are currently exploring how best to integrate college-wide Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment processes. The CGC will evaluate any justified need for further changes and/or reduction of committee number pending completion of its ongoing solicitation of input from all governance committees and its analysis. ~~A CGC recommendation regarding a reduction in the number of standing committees has not been drafted.~~

²⁹⁴ Routing form - Committee member reporting relationship to constituency groups

²⁹⁵ PIEC minutes 12/10/2010

²⁹⁶ CGC minutes 11/29/2012

²⁹⁷ Academic Senate minutes 2/5/2013

Appendix 1: Writing Team Membership

2010 Recommendation 1 – Culture of Evidence

George Beitey
Joseph Hankinson
Lawrence Hahn

2010 Recommendation 2 – Participatory Governance Structure

Paulette Hopkins
Dan Gutowski
Daphne Figueroa
Buran Haidar

2010 Recommendation 3 – Employee Evaluation

Brett Bell Joyce
Allen Joan
Thompson

2010 Recommendation 4 – Administrative Turnover

Susan Schwarz
Sam Shoostary
Daphne Figueroa
Michael Sheppard

2010 District Recommendation 1 – President Selection and Evaluation

Greg Newhouse
Terrie Hubbard
Peter Elias

2004 Recommendation 3 – Library Materials

Lynne Ornelas
Temmy Najimy
Mary Hart

2004 Recommendation 4 – Integrated Planning

Jerry Buckley
Katinea Todd
Buran Haidar

2004 District Recommendation 4 – Delineate District Functions

Lou Ascione
Elaine Vega
Mark Manasse

Program Review/SLO – Subcommittee

Chair Eligibility – Co-Chairs: Any faculty member and an instructional administrator as designated by the College President

Chair Election – Recommendation, faculty co-chair elected by committee

Chair Term – Two Years

Committee Membership

Administrators (3)	Classified Staff (3)	Faculty (5)
Instructional Division Representative (1)	Instructional Division Representative (1)	Arts/sciences faculty (1)
Student Services Division Representative (1)	Student Services Division Representative (1)	CTE faculty (1)
Administrative Services Division Representative (1)	Administrative Services Division Representative (1)	Student Services faculty (1)
		SLOAC Facilitator (1)
		Articulation Officer (1)

Committee Goals:

1. Facilitate program review process and the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) and Administrative Services Outcome (ASO) Assessment Cycle for all college programs.
2. Provide support and serve as a resource to faculty, staff, and administrators in completing all program review and SLO/ASO processes and reports.
3. Review all program review self-study reports on a recurring basis and provide feedback and recommendations.
4. Update forms and recommend changes to processes, timelines, and outputs for program review and SLO/ASO processes, as needed to comply with accreditation standards and the college’s integrated planning process.

Committee Procedures and Calendar:

1. Faculty/Staff/Administrators complete program review and SLO/ASO reports as per the college’s annual planning cycle
2. The committee meets at least once per month during the academic year to conduct regular business
3. The committee reports to the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee.

Parent Committee(s):

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Link to Agendas and Minutes: TBD

Outcomes and Assessment – Subcommittee

Chair Eligibility – Any member

Chair Election – Elected by committee

Chair Term – Two Years

Committee Membership

Administrators (3)	Classified Staff (1)	Faculty (3)
Instructional Division Representative (1)	Administrative Services Division Representative (1)	Instructional faculty (1)
Student Services Division Representative (1)		Student Services faculty (1)
Administrative Services Division Representative (1)		SLOAC Facilitator (1)

Committee Goals:

1. Facilitate Student Learning Outcome (SLO) and Administrative Services Outcome (ASO) Assessment Cycle for the college at the course, program, General Education, and Institutional levels.
2. Provide support and serve as a resource to faculty, staff, and administrators in completing all SLO/ASO processes and reports.
3. Update forms and recommend changes to processes and timelines for SLO/ASO processes, as needed to comply with accreditation standards and the college’s integrated planning process.

Committee Procedures and Calendar:

1. Faculty/Staff/Administrators complete SLO/ASO reports as per the college’s annual planning cycle
2. The committee meets at least once per month during the academic year to conduct regular business
3. The committee reports to the Program Review/SLO Subcommittee.

Parent Committee(s):

Program Review/SLO Subcommittee

Link to Agendas and Minutes: TBD