

San Diego Miramar College
Research Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

March 9, 2009, 3:00 – 4:00
President's Conference Room

Present: Joyce Allen; Elizabeth Armstrong; Amy Fraher; Cathy Hasson; Daniel Miramontez; Duane Short; Sandi Trevisan; Sadayoshi Okumoto

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.

2) Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved by consensus with no changes.

3) Old Business

a) 2009-10 research agenda development

D. Short presented a draft 2009-10 research agenda that he, C. Hasson, and D. Miramontez jointly developed over the past month. D. Short indicated that this document included research needs identified by the Program Review committee and the Institutional Effectiveness committee as well as research needs in support of each of Miramar's strategic goals and objectives. C. Hasson summarized how the information in the different columns relates to each other and highlighted the utility of the document for identifying research needs, relating those needs to the mission and goals of the college, and sharing that information both internally and externally (e.g., accreditation).

D. Short proposed that between now and the next committee meeting, the committee would attempt to identify other recurring major research needs and add those to the draft research agenda. A. Fraher volunteered to contact the VTEA coordinator and S. Trevisan volunteered to contact the Marketing and Outreach Committee for this purpose. D. Short agreed to ask A. Jacobson to contact the Student Services Committee and to determine other committees that should be solicited for research needs.

The committee agreed to review and discuss the draft 2009-10 research agenda at the April meeting and approve the final agenda at the May meeting. The approved agenda would then be forwarded to the Institutional Effectiveness committee.

D. Short also presented a separate draft document that would list the research identified on the draft 2009-10 research agenda by individual study and requestor and asked if this would be a useful tool. S. Trevisan stated that this document

would be useful to quickly identify what research was being conducted for which purposes and might also spark additional requests or uses for research on campus. The committee approved of creating this document in conjunction with the full research agenda document.

b) Research committee procedures document

D. Short presented a draft document describing the process for receiving and prioritizing research requests for inclusion on the annual research agenda. After discussion, the committee agreed that two different processes should be used: The first process would be to identify recurring college research needs related to major college planning, goals, and initiatives. Those needs would be listed on the research agenda (discussed in item a above) and updated on an annual basis. The second process would be used to receive and process individual “ad hoc” research requests. These would not have a specific due date, and instead would be received and considered by the committee on an ongoing basis. Requests for the same “ad hoc” research to be conducted on a periodic basis could be added to the annual research agenda.

The committee also reviewed the draft document and agreed on several non-substantive changes. A. Fraher suggested that the form for “ad hoc” research requests could be designed as a web-based form that would automatically populate the entered information into a spreadsheet. Some items on the form could be selected from pull-down menus or buttons, such as links to college programs and initiatives; links to the college strategic goals; links to federal and state goals; or external accreditation requirements. D. Short agreed to look into the possibility of creating an online form. A. Fraher recommended that it be tested first with the committee before placing “live” online.

The committee also discussed the need for feedback on how the research was actually being used by the requester. Committee members felt that this would be a useful way to assess how research was being used on campus to improve programs and make campus decisions. A. Fraher suggested an online form or website could be used to solicit feedback on this.

D. Short agreed to make the recommended changes to the committee procedures document.

4) New Business

a) Election of committee chair for 2009-10 and 2010-11 academic years

D. Short reminded the committee that he is serving as temporary chair for this academic year only and that he would like to hold a formal committee chair election during the April meeting.

5) Standing Reports

a) Campus / district researcher – no report

b) District Research Council representatives – no report

c) Institutional Effectiveness Steering Committee representative

D. Short reported that next year's college priorities had been drafted and may have minor wording revisions recommended by Academic Senate. He also reported that the Environmental Scan developed by the Research Committee last semester was being incorporated into the College-Wide Master Plan.

6) Roundtable – no items

7) Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 pm.