

San Diego Miramar College
Research Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes
May 9, 2011, 3:00-4:00 p.m.

Present: Randy Barnes; Parvine Ghaffari; Naomi Grisham; Joseph Hankinson; Terrie Hubbard; Daniel Miramontez; Susan Schwarz; Duane Short; Katinea Todd.

1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Parvine Ghaffari, who thanked D. Short for chairing the meetings until this time.

2. Approval of Minutes.

P. Ghaffari indicated that Paragraph 4.b. of the draft Minutes of April 11 was unclear as to whether or not the committee voted to process the two current research requests through the VPI's office. The ensuing discussion confirmed that the decision was made by general consensus and not by a vote. It was moved, seconded and carried to amend the draft Minutes to so indicate.

3. Approval of Agenda.

D. Miramontez requested that the IRB approval process be moved to the top of the May 9 agenda, and the revised agenda was approved by general consensus.

4. Institutional Research Board (IRB) approval process.

D. Short provided the committee with an updated draft of the IRB document first reviewed in April. The committee reviewed and discussed the document. Several suggestions were made. D. Short agreed to incorporate the suggestions into the document.

5. Standing Reports.

a. Campus/District Researcher.

- D. Miramontez distributed a scorecard put together at District which is an outcome report for the Chancellor and Board, and contains information on demographics, enrollments, student outcomes and student satisfaction. It can be reviewed more closely in the Fall, but in the meantime, D. Miramontez will provide the link on the website.
- The Transfer report is out and can be sent off.
- D. Miramontez presented a list of all projects that he worked on last year, including student outcomes, accountability, basic skills, special populations, productivity and budget, marketing & outreach, data sharing, enrollment management and institutional planning, with hours completed or in progress. Part of the charge of

the committee is to help prioritize his assignments, so he wanted to make the committee aware of what projects he has worked on and how much time they required. It will also help in building a culture of evidence. His workload is expected to increase in Fall 2011.

b. District Research Council (DRC).

D. Short attended the most recent DRC meeting and summarized the highlights not already covered by D. Miramontez.

- Cultural climate survey, administered in fall 2010, will be shared next week with the college presidents and the Board and then with the campuses.
- Noncredit to credit transition report that might be of interest for the admissions side of the house and enrollment management. Interestingly, more students come here from Continuing Education than from counseling in the local high schools.
- The next meeting for DRC will be October 2.

c. Institutional Effectiveness Steering Committee (IESC).

R. Barnes reported that the revised Strategic Plan has basically been approved with minor modifications. The IESC is still clarifying the process for assessment of the Strategic Plan.

6. Unfinished Business

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

P. Ghaffari explained that since the Strategic Plan is still a work in progress, the second reading of the research agenda has been postponed to Fall 2011 to ensure the research agenda responds to the revised document.

b. Research components in the final report of the ACCJC evaluation response.

D. Short said that the second draft of the accreditation response was sent to campus and some suggestions from the research office were incorporated into the draft, along with a few grammatical changes. There are two sections which specifically pertain to research, but research components are peppered all the way through, but it's basically unchanged from the first draft. It looks good and will probably be disseminated within the next day or two.

c. Review and approval of changes to the City IRB guidelines.

D. Miramontez said that the Mesa College research committee has a subcommittee as an IRB, and the City College research committee functions as an IRB. Our research committee should decide whether it wants to serve as an IRB or have an IRB subcommittee. If we have an IRB it would have to go thru shared governance.

City College has problems with IRB, having to do with employees in doctoral programs, who must be treated as outside investigators. At DRC, a district-wide policy was mentioned that researchers who are faculty or staff and want to conduct research cannot do so at the colleges where they work because it's a conflict of interest to conduct research at their own institutions, and would be a breach of the employees' confidentiality agreement. Discussion followed and there were several dissenting comments. D. Miramontez will take those back to DRC.

It was moved, seconded and carried to adopt the IRB guidelines of City College with amendments. P. Ghaffari will submit the appropriate request form to CGC for recommending the establishment of an IRB committee, and the research committee will be the temporary IRB until the new IRB committee is established.

d. External research requests.

i. Patricia Flower's dissertation research request.

It was moved, seconded and carried to approve Flowers' research request.

D. Miramontez suggested an amendment under the recruitment section as the correct way to approve the list for IRB. Flowers is interested in surveying 82 faculty members and wants to recruit 20 faculty members for qualitative research interviews. The way it was established in regard to recruitment practices through IRB is that the researcher would be treated as an external individual, so this committee would approve it but the recruitment part of it would have to go through Lynn Neault's office for reasons of confidentiality. For example, if there was an outside agency who wanted to use our facility and they wanted to recruit people here we wouldn't just automatically give them peoples' emails and phone numbers, etc. DRC said the process, for both surveys and research, was to contact L. Neault's office and for a fee that office would contact those individuals.

Discussion followed, and it was pointed out that because of her flyer people will voluntarily come to her, and also that faculty email addresses and phone numbers are available in the catalog and on the college website. Students' contact information that isn't publically accessible won't be given, but students can voluntarily respond to flyers, postings, etc.

It was moved to amend the recruitment section to specify that L. Neault's office will handle contacting of faculty for surveys and for the recruitment. The motion failed for lack of second.

ii. Request from UCSD.

This is the second research request from UCSD. It was moved, seconded and carried to process the request through the current process, the VPI's office, if UCSD wants the research done this summer, but if UCSD is not under a time

constraint, it will be postponed to Fall 2011. D. Miramontez said that it's very sensitive when minors are concerned and should therefore be taken up with IRB in itself, based on what happened at City College, which received a very similar proposal and declined it. It was moved, seconded and carried to amend the motion to postpone action on the request until Fall 2011, and not put it through the VPI's office. D. Short reminded the committee that procedurally, any dissent should be made before voting.

7. Roundtable. None.

8. Meeting dates for Fall 2011.

P. Ghaffari suggested changing the committee's monthly meeting day for Fall 2011, but discussion indicated that that would create conflicts with other standing meetings. Therefore, meeting dates for Fall 2011 will continue to be held on the second Monday of each month, but the time will be changed to 3:00-4:30 (from 3:00-4:00).

9. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:16 p.m.