PRESIDENT'S CABINET RETREAT
Friday, November 9, 2012
9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Point Loma Nazarene University
MINUTES
Assessing our Planning Processes

The Retreat began at 9:18 a.m.

PRESENT: Jill Baker; S. Beth Cain; Kris Clark; Bill Craft; Saeid Eidgahy; Jan Ellis; Dave Evans; Jonathan Fohrman; Margie Fritch; Ashanti Hands; Bri Hays; Lina Heil; Inna Kanevsky; Angela Liewen; Pam Luster; Laurie Mackenzie; Andrew MacNeill; Marichu Magana; Tim McGrath; Caterina Palestini (Senior Secretary/Recorder); Charlotta Robertson; Monica Romero; Chris Sullivan; Susan Topham; Chuck Wandall; Kathleen Wells; Denise Whisenhunt; Charles Zappia.

Time	Topic	Name
~~9:00 a.m.~~ **9:18 a.m.**	**Welcome & Introductions** Pam Luster welcomed the group. The Retreat began with a small celebration and thank you for the hard work to support the passage of Proposition 30. Luster indicated the task today is to determine how one assesses its assessments. Some activities are already taking place, such as program review. Luster outlined the topics on the Agenda. Time will be set aside for general questions at the end of the Retreat.	**Pam Luster**
~~9:15~~ **Approx. 9:25**	**Getting to Institutional Effectiveness** Luster asked the following two questions: 1. What do we mean by institutional effectiveness and what have we done in terms of the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee? 2. What we do to "Mesa-nize" our work? The Accrediting commission asks us how we know our institution is being effective at what we do. The notes from a recent Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIE) meeting were distributed. Luster introduced Jonathan Fohrman to address the topic. The goal is to determine what institutional effectiveness "looks like" for Mesa; a working definition. Fohrman explained that the PIE committee has been in existence for over a year. When it was formed, the focus was on integrated planning, the elements of institutional effectiveness and the ACCJC rubric. The big picture is how resource allocation ties into it. These areas are to inform resource allocation. He noted a statement was developed at a PIE meeting. The statement was reviewed and discussed and Fohrman asked for feedback.	**Pam Luster**

	Discussion followed and it was noted one part that is not included is how we discuss the the results of these activities. The last bullet focuses on our assessment process, which is the focus of the discussion at the retreat. Mesa does its annual planning in the spring but time should be set aside, as with the retreat, to review goals. Program review is a well established process with well defined ways to assess. Additional feedback was given. Luster noted there is a lot of important information included in the statement and suggested adding language to reflect "effective communication" to show how we achieve the standards. Luster asked if this IE statement would be adopted. It was suggested that although it is dense statement and perhaps could be communicated via an executive narrative. Tim McGrath noted this statement drives our goal and what is communicated to the campus is our mission statement, goals, etc. This statement is more from a planning perspective. Lina Heil suggested developing a Power Point based on the first paragraph. She volunteered to develop this Power Point with Fohrman. The statement was adopted as presented with the potential for pulling a shorter statement from it when it is communicated to the campus. (A short break ensued when members of the Point Loma Nazarene University gave a brief presentation.) Luster thanked Fohrman for his work and leadership on this statement. Accreditation standards were discussed next. A handout on Standard 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness was distributed. Luster explained this is a source document and the primary focus is on item B6 on p 14, what we use to assess IE and how effective is it. Another area of focus is B7 on page 15, how the institution assesses its evaluation mechanism.	
9:45	**Program Review Process Assessment** Jill Baker presented on program review process assessment. She distributed a handout that summarized the work accomplished in the summer in terms of assessment and how it rolls forward with the current cycle. She reviewed three key slides from the Program Review Lead Writer Training that describe the process flow of automation and outline the steps in the process leading to the due date of November 26th. These slides are posted on the Program Review Website.	**Jill Baker/ PRC**

Up until November 26th, it is a collaborative process. After submission, the next steps include electronic approvals by the chair/supervisor and then the dean/manager. The Program Review Committee liaisons complete the Liaison Final Feedback form and their comments are included in Committee's final report reviewed by President's Cabinet.

Once approved, the program reviews are distributed to the resource allocating bodies. Baker noted in the past it was not as clear how the program review documents were used and how they were distributed. Now, the path to the resource allocation committees, strategic planning, and PIE are clear. The allocation process occurs simultaneously among these bodies.

The next slide focused on the information contained in the program review documents and how it informs such areas as strategic planning (internal scan, goals/objectives), other planning (Educational Master Plan/IT Strategic Plan), and resource allocation (Faculty/Classified/ equipment/facilities).

Baker explained the automation process is in a transition at this time with paper-based program reviews from last year and automated program review updates this year. Additional data is available this year. She outlined the parts of the program review and how it reports back to the three planning/allocation areas. Baker noted with automation, these separate areas will be aggregated for each program/service area. Trends with strengths/challenges will emerge. This information may be provided to the next level reviewers as primary data from the areas. The information on these slides was created for the purpose of communicating the program review flowchart to the campus.

The third slide outlined the next steps regarding the resource requests for 2012-2013. The flowchart illustrates the path to the Budget and Resource Allocation Committee (BARC) then to the next levels, including the President, for final decision. If not funded, these resource requests can roll forward.

Laurie Mackenzie noted questions about program review were discussed at a recent Chairs meeting. Baker indicated that the Program Review website has been revised and all program review information is posted according to lead writer/liaison/manager and supervisor.

Saeid Eidgahy noted the information contained in these slides is beneficial in that it is simple and straightforward. He will refer to it within his school level. Luster added this process is now on paper and the next manifestation involves the plan for allocation. She emphasized the importance of consistency with presenting this

information in various forums, noting that it is illuminating and brings alive the whole institutional planning process.

Angela Liewen inquired about the prioritized lists to be sent to the BARC. Baker noted the requests may go to BARC (the slides were developed in August as decisions were made about the flow). Luster clarified that the requests go as informational items to BARC. BARC packages it for distribution to each area for allocation purposes. Also, BARC will recommend in addition to the decisions made by the individual allocating bodies. BARC would package the items as appropriate. Mackenzie added that there was discussion at a Senate meeting about the role of BARC and its responsibility to take into consideration, for example, a request for faculty, to ensure that is being supported by a request for facilities. BARC would coordinate those areas. Luster added that BARC will use rubrics to coordinate multiple silos.

Luster added many resources are available through Props S and N. Many existing requests are being built into the new buildings and down the road as yearly assessments are made to replace items, this process will be helpful.

Bill Craft inquired about rolling information forward and how it fits into the priority. Baker explained that the lead writers were given the choice to roll forward to the next year for reconsideration, "prioritization".

Andrew MacNeill inquired about how curriculum fits in with resource requests. McGrath explained when curriculum is submitted for approval, though it may be a great idea, the resources may not be available (i.e. facilities or equipment). Deans/managers would request the resources before the curriculum can move forward. Fohrman added that specific questions are asked as curriculum moves forward to address these concerns.

Luster provided clarification regarding questions on how program review plays a part in IE. She asked for feedback as to the role of program review as a comprehensive assessment and how we are measuring the "things" we need to measure. Fohrman noted the information submitted in the Accreditation Midterm Report emphasizes that program review is at the heart of planning at Mesa.

She thanked Baker and members of the Program Review Committee as well as Bri Hays for their work. She noted this is a huge shift in terms of the assessment piece and rolling it out in time for this academic year. Baker added the Program Review Committee listened to the feedback and is currently focusing on plans for assessment.

10:00 10:13	**Review of 2011-2012 Integrated Planning Process/BARC Proposal**	Donald Abbott/PIEC
	McGrath began the presentation with a story about growing up in Big Bear and the long car rides. Crossing the dam meant at least another hour before arriving at their destination yet he recalled asking his parents: Are we there yet? Similar to the integral planning process, we ask a similar question: How are we doing? The first cycle has not yet been completed but we are moving in the right direction. McGrath noted last year, the allocation processes were integrated and the 2nd year of a two-year faculty prioritization process was used though due to the current budget state, the list was not reprioritized and no new faculty were hired. He noted a formal prioritization process is not in place for Classified staff. A list would be compiled and would be reviewed through the managers and Executive staff. McGrath reported that the Classified Senate has developed a prioritization process, similar to that for faculty, and it will be used this year for the first time. McGrath added that the prioritization process for equipment and supplies has been through Deans' Council and PIE but going forward through BARC. He noted the Academic and Classified Senates would review the requests using rubrics and then bring these needs forward for allocation. McLeod noted that $50,000 was allocated last year. This year, those allocations will be assessed. McGrath invited all deans who received an allocation(s) last year to discuss what was allocated and how it will be assessed. It was noted that two groups were not considered for allocation for the following reasons: Student Services due to the newly build Student Services building and the resources that are allocated with new buildings. They will be part of the allocation process next year. The other group is the School of Humanities. They realized others had greater need for resources for this cycle. They will be part of the allocation process next year. The following deans described the allocation(s) received and how it will be assessed: Dave Evans/School of Physical Education, Health Education and Athletics: His School received a baseball pitcher machine that will be used to enhance hitting and a "shoot away" that makes it possible to feed multiple basketballs to the players to assist with shooting the ball. Bill Craft/School of Learning Resources: His School received two tripods that will be used to maintain audio visual support for events. There was another request for an outside book drop but after it was approved, it was not funded and later reevaluated as a low priority.	

Bill Craft/Acting Vice President of Administrative Services: Administrative Services was approved for two positions to be reclassified in the Student Accounting office.

Charles Zappia/School of Social/Behavioral Sciences and Multicultural Studies: His School received three SPSS software licenses in order to offer a one-unit Statistics lab course required by SDSU. This software serves as a bridge for when additional facilities are offered in the future and they can request full software packages.

Baker/School of Business and Technology: Her School received Perkins funding in three areas (GIS, Multimedia and CISC). This funding allowed them to replace old servers that enable them to run the systems used in these classes. They also received funding for sewing lab equipment and a color calibration machine. They will assess this equipment – if the instructional outcomes improve with the new equipment.

Eidgahy/School of Mathematics and Natural Sciences: Hi s School received equipment to support the Chemistry Department in order to maintain the program. The Accelerated College Program (ACP) received faculty laptops to maintain the program.

Fritch/School of Health Sciences and Public Service: Her School did not receive any year-end funding. With an excess of funding in Perkins, she had savings for equipment. Other programs funded by Perkins during the year were eligible for remaining funds and the Dental Assisting program received three dental heads. The remaining funding was allocated to Baker's School as noted above. Luster noted this approach is an example of a high level of integration using a prioritized list. It is a good example of transparency.

Fohrman/School of Arts and Languages: His School received lighting equipment and an industrial iron for the Drama program as well as digital art lab software that places the programs up to standard.

McGrath explained these allocations were the outcome of discussions at PIE and at Deans' Council which brought forward the priorities. Presentations were made to the deans, information was ranked and then recommendations were made to the campus.

Mackenzie added as part of closing the loop, the chairs were involved and discussions took place among students and faculty as to the needs and the process to meet those needs. Baker noted there was a high level of collegiality during the process. For example, the method used by Fritch to administer Perkins funding is such that

information is distributed and then she works with individuals to meet the needs. Fritch added that it is more about the collegiality of the faculty involved with Perkins funding and their approval for funding to be held back as emergencies arise and prices fluctuate so they can continue to meet campus needs. Monica Romero also noted that this concept crosses over to student services that are unable to run their programs without this funding.

McGrath asked: Where are we now? BARC is in the process of approving requests. Luster added information is being populated. The campus is moving ahead and requests will be submitted through the program review process. As those requests move through the allocation process, recommendations will eventually be made to the President's Cabinet. At this time, discussion focused on the equipment received and the next step is to focus on incorporating the assessment of this equipment/resources into program review to determine the outcome of these allocations.

McGrath asked: Are we on the road to bringing this process into the campus culture as the allocation process to be used? Several participants at the Retreat expressed their agreement.

Eidgahy noted this is a credible process with a specific rubric and moving forward, this rubric will continue to be important and bring integrity to the process.

Wells noted from a program review standpoint, information about the allocation process reached all lead writers/deans, chairs and others involved with program review. She suggested communicating this process to the rest of the process to ensure the allocation process is clear to the entire campus.

Fritch emphasized the automation of program review allows everyone to have a voice if they choose. Discussions take place during the process rather than at the end. In the past, there was an issue with lack of voice but with automation, it played a key role with giving everyone a voice.

McGrath added that the President's Cabinet plays a key role and as a group we have assessed the allocation process and agree with it. The next steps involve reporting this information to our respective groups.

Luster added she launched a new activity called "Breakfast with the President" as part of communicating with the campus. It has been emphasized during these discussions that the campus would like a monthly communication from the leadership on campus.

10:15 10:40	**TaskStream Taskforce**	Update
	Madeleine Hinkes, Chair of the TaskStream Taskforce was unable to attend the Retreat. McGrath reported on her behalf. The goal of the Task Force is to assess TaskStream. This group will find out methods used by other campuses as well as determining how the current tool, TaskStream, is being used or can be modified to fit out needs. The Task Force is a subcommittee of PIE formed it as a subcommittee of PIE and will report their findings to that group. The Task Force members represent various areas of the campus.	
10:45-11:03	**Break** (after the break, a video about Homecoming was shown.)	
11:00 11:11	**ILO Assessment/Mapping – Initial Outcomes** Luster asked: How are we doing with the assessment of our Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)? What are the six ILOs? The six ILOs are: Critical Thinking, Communication, Self-awareness and Interpersonal Skills, Personal Actions and Civic Responsibility, Global Awareness, and Technological Awareness. Fohrman facilitated the discussion. He explained the Learning Assessment Task force (LATF) is a newly formed committee. The purpose and goals were reviewed. He noted with Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), the campus has experienced a year of intense activity. The next steps involve assessing and reviewing the rubric from ACCJC. TaskStream, through mapping, allows us to report on these activities. The LATF has been reviewing the rubric to enhance current campus activities as well as foster a broader dialogue across the campus. The LATF has also made progress generating reports from TaskStream for assessment. Having generated such reports for her School, Baker was able to provide assistance by generating an analysis through TaskStream. Fohrman asked: How we can best make use of this analysis? In the initial cycle, the idea was to sample General Education (GE) courses and how they map to ILOs. Baker noted she is a consultant to the LATF and explained how the report was generated. A spreadsheet was created containing all SLO assessments by program. Mapping from program to institutional level was discussed through this analysis. This report is an initial assessment using the mapping function. Suggestions were made for the "best" way to make use of this information. An "Assessment Day" and/or workshops may be scheduled during Flex Days. Participants would represent various cross sections of the campus. Luster noted the need to communicate the tools available to us to do these assessments as well as determine whether goals are being met. There has been discussion about scheduling a Flex activity as an opportunity for several departments to engage in assessment. The	**Jonathan Fohrman/ Learning Assessment Task force (LATF)**

activity would focus on drilling down to determine the next steps and understanding how courses map to ILOs. She noted that Ed Helscher has been working with faculty and staff but additional assistance is needed. Luster asked for feedback about scheduling an assessment activity during the upcoming Flex Days in January and should we do an activity for departments.

Chris Sullivan suggested how the campus can best be served through this "check-in". Mackenzie suggested educating faculty, students, and staff as to how assessment links to something at a higher level. Mapping means something different to everyone. It is more than linking it is an understanding that Mesa is bigger than its assessments. She used an example of how Facilities assesses itself and how it is tied to ILOs. There are various ways to assess including dialogue, videos, and other methods. She noted that ideas may be shared with the TaskStream Taskforce. Currently, the use of TaskStream for program review is simplified but that does not appear to be the case with the SLO side.

McGrath suggested a map be drawn to link resource allocation ILOs. An example of an ILO "in the community" would be the dance event he attended the previous night and how that event relates at the campus level.

Kathleen Wells noted the key word is communication – we are not in a silo. There are different ways to communicate and it may be through a Flex workshop. She suggested inviting the campus and participants could discuss these links and arrive at one understanding that the campus can agree upon. If people know it, they feel comfortable with it, they buy into it.

Margie Fritch noted dialogue she has been engaged in concerning the SLO portion of TaskStream, noting suggestions to make it more user-friendly. The other important piece is the student success taskforce guidelines for which we are held accountable. She suggested the SLO side of TaskStream be set up with questions like the program review side.

Eidgahy added Mesa has operated successfully on some levels, especially individually/small groups and this was achieved with the activity in August. The difficulty is at the institutional level. He inquired about the types of consensus surveys that may be administered and suggested building several rounds of activities to achieve campus-wide consensus.

Zappia expressed concern about the ILOs. They wrote course and program SLOs to parallel ILOs. For example, if an ILO is "critical thinking", measure the course outcome and have an assessment for that. Then, take all course outcomes and assess them as part of a

program. He inquired if that would result in a combination of programs that map up to the ILOs. He noted this is already being done through TaskStream. Zappia added the other part is more rewarding to look at it in a narrative sense and accreditors ask to see both the data and dialogue.

MacNeill noted the value of the activity in August, adding that he attended a department meeting recently where the topic of discussion was how their assessment meets the ILOs. They brought in tools for assessment and dialogue.

Baker noted an assessment day was scheduled in her School which resulted in her faculty having ownership of this assessment. It was granular in a way – they wanted to now "tweak" their SLOs etc. as a result of discussion.

MacNeill added his faculty agreed on the changes and standardized their assignments.

Fohrman noted a new institutional effectiveness mechanism is being used across the campus and part of it calls for institutional level assessments. There are TaskStream reports for review and discussion. The Accrediting Commission emphasizes the dialogue aspect of it.

Inna Kanevsky noted her concerns from a research standpoint. She suggested standardized assessments. Zappia expressed agreement within Kanevsky's discipline but noted that assessments vary by disciplines.

Mackenzie emphasized that accreditation should not drive academic creativity. She expressed concern with an accreditation requirement to standardize testing or assessment.

Luster noted one of the suggestions from LATF is relative to the variation in how TaskStream data has been populated and there is a need to arrive at some type of standardization of data. Dialogue plays an important role in this process as the individuals in each area decide what is entered into the system. She added that the Accreditation Commission has not indicated there is a move towards "standardization".

Baker noted in her School, they looked at the outcome and how they assessed it.   They also looked at ways to improve and, for example, they noted whether or not they met their goals after assessing the same SLO.

Chuck Wandall inquired about the ILO and SLO process – whether the College began with the ILOs and built SLOs from there.   Also,

he asked for clarification concerning, for example, the Math SLO. He wondered if he "signed up" for this general SLO to come from this class or if it should be more specific. Fohrman clarified the process for arriving at SLOs from ILOs. Zappia added there may be confusion between an SLOs and student learning objectives. It appeared that Wandall's question was more about an objective rather than an SLO. Fohrman noted his agreement, adding that this distinction has caused confusion among larger groups. Fohrman added SLOs were the "new phenomenon" while the objectives were already on the syllabus. Sullivan emphasized this confusion comes directly from the end-user – the students.

Fohrman emphasized that decision-making includes dialogue and is aligned to support student learning. There has been a great deal of important dialogue at the program level and the next step involves linking that dialogue at the institutional level. He suggested one method would be through mapping. Another method is to look at the process side (the results of student assessments). This will help achieve a "global" perspective on SLOs. This would also lead to wide-spread institutional dialogue about institutional assessment. These ideas will be discussed further at a future LATF meeting. Fohrman added a response to Kanevsky's concern. In terms of assessment reports that are available, when looking across a large group, faculty may want to look at consistency, consistent mapping, etc. Review the extent at which we are currently assessing to arrive at a global assessment.

Fohrman added with "standardization" there needs to be individualization with how assessment is done within the areas. The rubric emphasizes this as well as the expectation that the College be responsive to SLOs and authentic assessment – degrees – refer to GE assessment and the fact that the College should do more in this area. Different models have been reviewed and he suggested investigating ILOs and General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs). There are different methods that can be used. Some colleges developed an exit survey for graduates (direct and indirect assessment). These colleges reported good response rates. Mesa could use the same method for its capstone courses. Some colleges did a sampling of GE courses or in some cases, all of their GELOs/ILOs. All these examples involve common rubrics. Fohrman added the results were analyzed in various ways. At Mesa, we have assessed through mapping up and the next steps are to review the results of this mapping. Also, at LATF they are reviewing examples of how other peer institutions are doing it. LATF is studying the implementation of a direct assessment in the spring. This may yield new forms of assessment.

Mackenzie suggested creating a campus-wide showcase. Currently, there is no method where classroom activities and services offered

come together and show how they contribute to student learning. Also, this showcase will emphasize how Mesa is interconnected – it's students, faculty, staff, services, athletic events, etc. This showcase will be a visual of the dialogue and activities that have been taking place. She added that, for example, an example of showcasing the ILO of civic responsibility could be the blood drives. We could use video formats to illustrate such activities that occur. This would allow individuals to identify themselves with Mesa and celebrate what we do on an individual level that contributes to the institution; what makes Mesa "Mesa".

Ashanti Hands noted her agreement with this concept. This activity would show the campus' progress through the student's experience of what we do. We could identify the outcomes at each level from the grounds keeping to other services offered. Everyone would know how important their role is to the bigger picture. She noted it is easy to forget the receiver, the impact on the student.

Mackenzie added some groups such as faculty may not know what is involved on a daily basis in the work life of a Facilities staff member. Videos to convey this information could be developed. Mackenzie suggested the development of a story board containing interviews and other related information, etc., and would showcase every aspect of the campus contributing to Mesa. If we focus on one area such as faculty, classified, or students then we lose the interconnectedness.

Kanevsky recalled a scavenger hunt that was organized when she was first hired. The goal was to collect various important pieces of information at offices throughout the campus. This would be a great activity for other new faculty who do not yet know a lot about Mesa. Mackenzie suggested awarding Flex credit for such an activity.

Wandall suggested creating consistency with technology and the ability to send alerts when information is uploaded online.

Wells summarized the need for assessment and for advertising our assessments to the campus. This advertisement would not be solely for educational purposes but also in the spirit of inclusivity.

Fohrman noted the focus of today's discussion was on the processes in place and then the establishment of processes as we move forward. This feedback is useful for the next steps.

Luster noted LATF is a newly formed and organic group. She encouraged anyone with an idea to ensure that it is communicated with the group for follow up discussion. Fohrman indicated he will distribute the LATF goals and priorities document. Others are welcome to attend a meeting to discuss an item of interest.

	Luster indicated LATF is exploring improved means of electronic communication of information. The goal is for discussions, videos, etc. to be readily available. They are looking for more ways to celebrate student learning. Luster summarized the discussion began with an IE statement. There are three primary areas for review to ensure we are on the right track. Topics discussed were program review, integrated resource planning, a mini update from the TaskStream Task force and ILOs. She emphasized discussion about communication. The group emphasized dialogue, sharing what we are doing with others and determining whether or not we are measuring the right things or is something missing from the equation. The group appeared to be in agreement with Luster's statement that program review and resource planning lead to IE.	
~~11:30~~ 12:13	**Establishing the Cycle of IE Assessment** Bulleted items that are part of the cycle were listed on poster paper and Luster referred to them during discussion. Beginning with TaskStream, program review, integrated resource planning and BARC, information moves along toward assessment and we have data to assess – that's the plus. The minus is communication and the indirect methods of communication. Wells noted we are always evolving and Luster added the process is circular. Luster placed a "+" between the poster paper describing program review and integrated resource planning. Luster placed a "+/-" between integrated resource planning and TaskStream Task force as well as a "+/-" between TaskStream Task force and Learning Assessment to indicate the need to determine if it is working. Luster asked: Have we assessed our institutional planning processes? It was agreed that we have done so. Luster asked: How often should we do it? Mackenzie suggested a mini and a major assessment, adding that results from the groups could be part of the mini assessment. Fritch compared the process to a "check up" versus a "physical". Whisenhunt added we should continue to check the temperature and be consistent, adding we should have a major assessment and then a check in. Fohrman noted we should ensure program review continues to be assessed annually and then think of other pieces such as the rubrics for allocation, and determine how those can be assessed. He suggested we build in assessment tools. The results of all those assessments should come together as a whole.	**Pam Luster**

	Luster asked: Might the cycle look different in the developmental stage than down the road? She suggested further discussion during the spring retreat as these activities are progressing. We may be able to have an annual mini assessment with a major assessment every two years. This would yield ongoing assessments. Luster noted content of discussion in the spring may be the same but a year from now, this group should revisit the entire planning process again. This cycle would be ongoing, annually. If it is determined next year that we are successful with this process, we could move to a biannual process. Luster emphasized the importance of honoring the process and agenda set forth today. She added this has been a remarkable level of work and at a deep level behind each area. She polled the group's agreement with the success of discussion at the retreat and all appeared to be in agreement that it was successful. Luster congratulated the group for the amount of work accomplished during the retreat.	
~~12:15~~ **12:30**	**Lunch** (dine at the Point Loma Nazarene University cafeteria).	

The Retreat concluded at 12:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Caterina Palestini, Senior Secretary
Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research