

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes for 14 February 2012

PRESENT: Donald Abbott (Co-Chair), Jill Baker, Bill Craft, Jonathan Fohrman, Brianna Hays, Madeleine Hinkes, Angela Liewen Romeo, Laurie Mackenzie, Tim McGrath (Co-Chair), Kari Parker, Ron Perez, Monica Romero; Michael Roth

ABSENT: Richard Chagnon (excused), Jan Ellis (excused)

GUESTS: Pam Luster

I. CALL TO ORDER made by McGrath at 3:37 PM

A. M/S (Mackenzie / Hinkes) to approve minutes of meeting of 6 December 2011 with no changes; approved.

B. Announcements: New student rep, Michael Roth, introduced to committee.

C. Changes to Agenda: Classified Senate update added to discussion of Allocation Recommendation Process.

II. REVIEW OF PIEC RETREAT (Hays, McGrath)

A. Hays presented update of Objectives/Priorities Crosswalk based upon discussion at retreat (attached—changes recommended at retreat in red; new contribution from Fohrman in green). Sense of the committee to accept changes as indicated; new recommendation to be considered at the next meeting.

Luster recommended that a working group (Luster, Hays, Baker) meet to revise and identify new KPIs (sense of committee to accept). Mackenzie suggested that minutes of PIEC (as well as other planning committees) could be used in accreditation process to demonstrate what planning ideas are being considered on campus. Discussion followed on use of non-data information in accreditation process.

B. McGrath submitted a proposed Calendar for Integrated Planning for Spring 2012 (attached). McGrath reminded the committee that the process this year will use last year's Program Plans (from Program Review Process) and will, therefore, be a hybrid of old and new practices. Abbott suggested that PIEC members remind their constituents and colleagues that integrated planning (especially the Allocation Recommendation Process) is in the midst of development and that we will incorporate lessons learned from this year. M/S (Mackenzie / Hinkes) to adopt calendar; approved.

III. ACCREDITATION (Fohrman)

A. Fohrman reported on the meeting of [name of group] on [date], attended by five Mesa representatives (Baker, Fohrman, Liewen Romeo, Mackenzie, and Chris Sullivan). He reported that Barbara Beano addressed the group and indicated that in the future accreditation will be even more data-driven. Assessment of the use of SLOs is under way, and new guidelines will be promulgated in March.

B. The core members of the campus Accreditation Committee will meet this week to begin planning for dealing with new accreditation standards. The committee is still looking for additional members.

IV. STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS (Baker)

Deferred owing to lack of time.

IV. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (Romero)

Deferred owing to lack of time.

V. ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATION PROCESS (Abbott)

A. Classified Senate report: Romero reported that the Allocation Recommendation Process proposal had been presented to the Classified Senate and will be considered at the next meeting. She indicated that there were questions, but no significant opposition to the proposal at this point.

B. Academic Senate report: Hinkes reported that the Allocation Recommendation Process proposal had been presented to the Academic Senate and will be considered at the next meeting. She indicated that while there was no significant opposition to the proposal, several questions were raised. In particular, a senator asked if there would be feedback from the silo committees. Abbott responded that there would indeed be such feedback, based upon the published rubrics and standards now being developed by the various silo committees. Also, the issue of a fiscal set-aside for maintenance of IT and other big-ticket equipment was raised. Abbott reminded the committee that the proposal includes long-term planning schedules (in the EMP, ITP, and FMP) that will need to be developed. Luster emphasized that this long-term fiscal planning (in order to anticipate aging equipment and alleviate the need for departments to request such maintenance) was crucial to overall good planning and budgeting.

C. Committee of Chairs report: Mackenzie reported that the Allocation Recommendation Process proposal had been presented to the chairs and will be considered at a future meeting. She indicated that there were questions, but no significant opposition to the proposal at this point.

D. Baker submitted a proposed Equipment Resource Allocation Prioritization rubric that had been prepared by a sub-committee made up of Baker, Craft, and McGrath (attached). Owing to time-constraints, the proposal will be considered at the next meeting.

VI. ADJOURNED by McGrath at 5:01 PM.

Submitted by D. Abbott

Approved: _____