



Institutional Research and Planning Committee

February 15, 2007

District Office South (Annex) Conference Room

Meeting Notes

Present: B. Schmiede (for C. Hill), C. Chiriboga, J. Colson, J. Ford,
B. Hertel, J. Marron, P. Wright

Absent: C. Hill, Vice President Academic Affairs, Grossmont College
position Vacant)

Recorder: L. Davidson

Introduction

Bob Hertel and Pam Wright distributed the Institutional Research and Planning Committee binder to committee members. Included in the binder were the committee membership and charge, Mission Statements, Ed Code section 66010, California Community College System Strategic Plan, GCCCD Strategic Plans, Strategic Plan Comparison Grid, Sample Strategic Plans, Sample Planning Charts, SMART Goals, and Meeting Schedule.

Strategic Plan Review

P. Wright suggested members review our district plans and read the handout in the front of the binder which explains the who, what, and why Strategic Plans are done. She stated our existing strategic plan is missing important components from the mission of the California Community Colleges such as access, quality teaching, and education equity. P. Wright discussed the Strategic Plan Comparison Grid, which compares the existing District, Grossmont, and Cuyamaca plans to the California Community College System Strategies. She asked members how do we align our plans. Sample plans from other colleges are included in the binder. She noted the Los Rios plan is good example. She discussed the importance in setting SMART goals.

J. Ford stated the committee purpose as presented is different from what was done in the past. She expected the committee to work on setting research priorities.

J. Colson asked about how this will tie into the colleges.

J. Marron suggested the committee charge be revised to include strategic planning.

C. Chiriboga described how the Advisory Research Committee worked in the past. She found the Grossmont, Cuyamaca, and District project report a valuable document that gave a districtwide overview. The committee reviewed the faculty requests from one college, and considered gathering the information for the other college as well.

J. Colson stated WASC indicates institutional research is done at colleges and districts. B. Hertel explained that the Institutional Research staff does all research within our district.

P. Wright explained the past committee membership did not match our current membership.

B. Hertel talked about his staff working on developing a project Gantt chart, and posting additional information on the department Webpage.

B. Hertel agreed to check into the process for updating the committee charge in the District Governance Structure. Bob will submit the change to list strategic planning as suggested.

Resource Advisory Workgroup

Time constraints did not allow discussion on this agenda item.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

The next meeting will be March 16, 2007, 2:00 p.m. at the Heritage of the Americas Museum, Cuyamaca College.

:ld



GROSSMONT-CUYAMACA
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Institutional Research and Planning Committee

*March 16, 2007, 2:00 p.m.
Heritage of the Americas Museum*

Meeting Notes

Present: C. Hill, C. Chiriboga, B. Hertel, J. Marron, T. Pitt, P. Wright

Absent: J. Colson, J. Ford

Recorder: L. Davidson

Additions to the Agenda

T. Pitt requested the addition of plus minus grades to the agenda. She approved a survey request B. Smith and P. Blanco will soon submit on plus minus grading for Planning and Research Services.

Committee Charge Draft

B. Hertel distributed a revised draft of the committee structure reflecting DSP&BC suggestions. Members agreed to add a student representative.

C. Hill asked if there is a clear agenda and how much work is there to do. She requested one student representative from each college be appointed to the committee.

T. Pitt asked if we meet on all research.

P. Wright stated we are a district without a strategic plan. She also stated the Districtwide Strategic Plan needs regular updating with monthly meetings. She explained the process to submit Research Requests, and explained once the Vice President approves, all requests are completed.

C. Chiriboga requested a document showing the research agenda in order to share the research project information between colleges.

The committee members discussed having a Classified Senate representative for each college. It was determined the Classified Senate representative is not college specific, and one districtwide representative would be fine. The committee will ask the senates to identify one Classified Senate, and two student representatives.

Strategic Plan Review

P. Wright distributed the committee timeline, and stated this is a sample to look at and is open to revision. It gives us a perspective to where we are. The following issues were discussed:

C. Hill asked if committee issues would go to the Academic Senates that do not meet during the summer months. She stated the timeline should not drive the result.

J. Marron stated his experience at other institutions indicates process takes one year, and this time line may be too short. He stated the site visits will be in June and July.

P. Wright stated the timeline for the State was similar and included research. The writing took place in a few months.

C. Chiriboga stated we are the development work group in the development phase, and will present our work afterwards in shared governance. She suggested a process where the planning tasks are completed first with shared governance input, and the writing tasks will follow. We will recommend areas of focus based on the state and colleges plans. P. Wright will be the leader on this.

C. Hill suggested the plan develops, and then the committee will evaluate it.

The members agreed we are in the development phase, and the committee will ask the colleges to set the parameters based on their college plans as appropriate to develop the district plan. Planning and Research Services will write the District Strategic Plan, and the final draft will go back to the colleges for review. Members agreed the district and college plans support each other without one driving the other.

P. Wright shared information in the binders previously distributed and stated the committee will look at the state plan, Grossmont and Cuyamaca College plans, and strategic plans for other multi-college districts in California.

T. Pitt stated the grid is a great tool that we can all look at together. She suggested P. Wright develop the recommended framework and areas of focus for the April meeting. Members will take the draft framework and areas of focus out to the colleges for feedback in May. This gives the summer for writing. The committee will review after summer.

C. Hill stated it would be difficult to get approval from Academic Senates in this timeframe. The first discussion may be time consuming with many questions. Members agreed P. Wright, who normally attends the Academic Senate meetings, would be available to answer questions.

Members agreed they would facilitate the plan's presentation. The District Strategic Plan will help facilitate the college views. The district plan will be an encompassing districtwide plan based on the state strategic plan, and the Grossmont and Cuyamaca College strategic plans.

B. Hertel stated he has seen plans that are too big which no one reads and others too small to follow.

Resource Advisory Work Group

This item was not discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

The next meeting will be April 20, 2007, 2:00 p.m. at the District Office South (Annex) Conference Room.

:ld



GROSSMONT-CUYAMACA
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Institutional Research and Planning Committee

April 20, 2007, 2:00 p.m.

District Office South (Annex) Conference Room

Meeting Notes

Present: C. Chiriboga; J. Colson; J. Marron; T. Pitt; P. Wright

Absent: J. Ford; C. Hill; B. Hertel

Recorder: L. Davidson

Additions to the Agenda

J. Colson requested the addition of New Members to the agenda. J. Colson read a letter from T. McNeil, and J. Fenningham addressed to J. Colson, and J. Marron requesting the addition of the two Deans of Counseling to the Institutional Research and Planning Committee. The Deans are the matriculation coordinators at each college and request membership for the following reasons:

- College matriculation programs currently fund 50% of one Research Analyst position. Membership would allow the Dean of Counseling at each college to have a voice on the priority given to research projects.
- Membership would allow the Dean of Counseling to monitor matriculation funds more closely, ensure funds are spent according to regulations, and allow accurate reporting of research activities.
- Membership would allow the Dean of Counseling at each college to plan, and review research that ultimately results in approvals for various math, English, and ESL assessment research and testing.

The letter was given to B. Hertel. Members agreed to invite the Dean of Counseling at each college to meetings defined in the Committee Charge under other resource people as needed. B. Hertel will invite Teresa McNeil and Jim Fenningham to the next meeting.

Strategic Plan Review

P. Wright presented the draft Districtwide Strategic Areas of Focus, and Areas of Focus Grid. She described how similar items are listed together. Members discussed how the proposed areas of focus fit into previous plans. Diversity is now threaded within all areas. The Goal Areas column was added to more clearly define the Area of Focus. This draft is subject to change. The Areas of Focus items came from the

State, District Office, Cuyamaca College, Grossmont College, and Los Rios plans. The last area, Develop Alignment within the District, is from a prior suggestion to focus on alignment.

Members discussed the district function under the area Enhanced Teaching and Learning Effectiveness is to support the colleges in developing student learning outcomes.

C. Chiriboga stated she is hearing the state is slapping districts for the first time for not being further along. She explained accreditation standards have been around since 2002. The colleges are at different points in the process, which is academic senate driven.

Members discussed the best language to use and offered the following suggestions:

- terms such as unity, align curriculum, align noncredit, and include are better than alignment
- collaborative, promote, and foster are better than ensure
- provide the opportunity to explore rather than expand,
- encourage collaboration
- support development opportunities
- student learning outcomes should be specifically stated
- effective teaching supports student success

P. Wright explained the need to define clear action goals to assist in the next steps, which are to write the detailed action goals, state what will be accomplished, and how the accomplishments will be evaluated. She stated this is possible when a clear purpose is defined at the beginning.

T. Pitt suggested the development of a spreadsheet that begins with the mission statement, and then weaves in the colleges planning.

C. Chiriboga and P. Wright will look again at the draft and suggested changes.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

The next meeting will be May 18, 2007, 2:00 p.m. at the District Office South Conference Room.

:ld