

San Diego Miramar College  
Research Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

April 11, 3:00 – 4:00  
President's Conference Room

Present: Randy Barnes; Peter Fong; Parvine Ghaffari; Naomi Grisham; Daniel Miramontez; Susan Schwarz; Duane Short; Sandi Trevisan

**1) Call to order**

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

**2) Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved by unanimous vote with two additions.

**3) Old Business**

a) Development of 2011-12 College Wide Research Agenda: second reading

D. Short explained that Miramar's strategic plan document is in the process of being updated. The strategic plan includes a set of strategic goals that are referenced in the Research Agenda. Because the strategic goals are being updated, it might be advisable to wait until the update is complete before finalizing the Research Agenda. D. Miramontez provided additional information in regards to meeting dates and the timeframe to update both the strategic plan and the Research Agenda. After discussion, the committee agreed to wait for approval of the Research Agenda until the next committee meeting. D. Miramontez agreed to update the Research Agenda with the changes made at the last committee meeting and the new strategic goals and to provide the updated draft to the committee before the next meeting.

b) Research components for ACCJC evaluation response

P. Ghaffari reported that the team drafting the ACCJC evaluation response decided there was not enough time to implement the research survey directed to campus decision-makers that she had proposed at the last meeting, although it appears that some of the questions may not be fully addressed without it. She provided a draft of the survey to the committee and asked whether the committee would like to implement something like it. The committee discussed the pros and cons of conducting the survey, the kinds of questions on it, the timeline for response, how the results would be used, and how the information might be incorporated into the campus planning process. The committee voted to have D. Miramontez work on the survey over the summer and bring back an updated

version to the committee in the fall. D. Short agreed to incorporate the fact that the college is doing such a survey in the ACCJC accreditation response report.

c) Survey draft – covered under item (b) above.

#### **4) New Business**

a) Committee procedures

P. Ghaffari asked about the lead time for distributing documents for review at the committee meeting. D. Short stated documents for review are generally distributed with the meeting agenda several days before the meeting. Lengthy documents or those requiring extended discussion are usually given first and second readings at sequential committee meetings. D. Short agreed to send out documents for review as early as possible.

b) Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval process

D. Miramontez reported that the committee has received two requests for research using college staff or students as subjects. However, the committee does not have a process in place for processing such requests. City and Mesa do have such processes in place (IRB processes). D. Miramontez and R. Barnes suggested using City's process as a model for developing a similar process at Miramar. The committee discussed the specific requests. D. Miramontez provided an overview of City's IRB process and stated that any process we put in place will need to be approved by the District Student Services Department.

S. Trevisan explained that currently research requests of this kind are processed through the VPI's office. The committee agreed that the two current requests may move forward through the VPI's office using this current process.

P. Fong suggested that the District is the appropriate level for processing external research requests and not the college. He pointed out that district personnel have more expertise in this area and that the college is already very busy with doing our own internal research in order to meet state and accreditation mandates. R. Barnes stated that local control over research on campus is also important and that the college should be involved in these decisions. After discussion, the committee decided to move forward with developing an IRB process at Miramar. P. Ghaffari suggested some changes to be made to City's IRB document before adopting it for Miramar. D. Short agreed to modify the document before the next committee meeting to incorporate those changes and any others suggested by committee members.

#### **5) Standing Reports**

a) Campus / district researcher

D. Miramontez summarized the research projects he is currently engaged in. He also reported that he has begun serving on the Program Review/SLOAC committee and the Institutional Effectiveness committee.

b) District Research Council representatives – no report

c) Institutional Effectiveness Steering Committee representative

P. Ghaffari reported that she often has a scheduling conflict preventing her attendance at IE meetings. R. Barnes stated that the meetings have been moved to try and accommodate members' schedules.

6) Roundtable – no items.

**7) Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 pm.