SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee
Minutes for 24 April 2012 Meeting

College Mission:
To inspire and enable student success in an environment that is strengthened by diversity, is responsive to our communities, and fosters scholarship, leadership and responsibility.

PIE Committee Objectives:
- Coordinate the critical planning constructs of the college (such as mission, vision, values; annual objectives and priorities; and long-term goals) and ensure their integration into the planning and operations of the entire college.
- Work in tandem with the Program Review Committee to assure that planning at the unit level is aligned with planning at the college-wide level.
- Foster the college's planning processes, informed by internal and external data.
- Foster the integration of the resource allocation recommendation processes at the college level.
- Carry out on-going assessment of the effectiveness of the alignment and integration of the college's planning activities; recommend and implement improvements.
- Facilitate the development of the college's educational master plan.
- Provide oversight for the College's compliance with WASC-ACCJC Accreditation Standards and the Commission's recommendations regarding the integration of the college's planning efforts;
- Serve as the steering committee for the preparation of reports for the Commission including annual reports, mid-term report, and the self study.

Present: Donald Abbott (co-chair), Jill Baker, Rich Chagnon, Bill Craft, Jan Ellis, Jonathan Fohrman, Bri Hays, Madeleine Hinkes, Angela Liewen, Pamela Luster, Laurie Mackenzie, Tim McGrath (co-chair), Kari Parker, Ron Perez, and Monica Romero
Guests: Marichu Magana, Chris Sullivan, and Kathleen Wells
Absent: Michael Roth

I. Call to Order made by T. McGrath at 3:35 PM
   A. Motion to approve minutes from April 10 meeting (D. Abbott); Second (J. Baker); Approved.
   B. Announcements: T. McGrath and M. Hinkes reported on the statewide Chief Instructional Officer (CIO)/Academic Senate joint conference, which took place April 18 - 20. T. McGrath shared that an ACCJC representative was present at the conference and received feedback from conference attendees on the accreditation reporting process. ACCJC will a series of public hearings on the current standards.
   C. Committee Membership: T. McGrath mentioned that the PIE Committee had previously discussed two-year terms for committee members and asked members if anyone would not be able to serve in the 2012-2013 academic year. No members indicated they would be unable to serve in 2012-2013. T. McGrath suggested that terms be staggered and new members begin attending meetings the year prior to serving in order to foster continuity in the committee. D. Abbott encouraged faculty to consider serving as the academic co-chair of the PIE Committee and reminded members that co-chairs must serve on the committee for at least one year to be eligible for co-chair.
   D. T. McGrath noted that all PIE Committee agendas will be placed on the accreditation web page. D. Abbott indicated that he would compile all PIE Committee agendas and accompanying documentation for the web site.

II. Accreditation
   A. J. Fohrman shared that the Accreditation Committee has been working to establish some procedures for collecting data for the accreditation gap analysis and mid-term report and introduced three members of the accreditation committee: Chris Sullivan, Marichu Magana, and Kathy Wells.
   B. J. Fohrman handed out the accreditation gap analysis documentation prepared by the Accreditation Committee J. Fohrman commented that Accreditation Committee members did not include recommendations in the gap analysis document but intended for the PIE Committee to discuss the information and make recommendations.
   C. J. Fohrman explained his work on Standard I and Recommendation 1 from the January 2011 ACCJC letter. He noted that the College has made significant progress in Standard I areas, especially related to integrated planning, resource allocation processes, and measureable objectives. J. Fohrman shared that while the College has done a good job of integrating student achievement data into its planning processes, there is some room to expand the use of student learning outcome (SLO) data into its planning processes. D. Abbott noted that this year's resource allocation process served as a temporary, hybrid model, and that the following year would include the fully integrated process. J. Fohrman noted that resource allocation rubrics will be in place for the 2012-2013 academic year, which would clarify the College's resource allocation processes for the campus community. J. Fohrman noted that the College's mission statement was due for an update in 2012. T. McGrath noted that the mission statement would be one of the PIE Committee's charges in 2012-2013 but

that the current mission statement was already reviewed and approved by the former Academic Affairs Committee. J. Fohrman indicated that the College's educational master plan was due for an update. T. McGrath indicated the educational master plan timeline shifted due to leadership changes and transitions. D. Abbott suggested that the educational master plan be deferred to 2012-2013. T. McGrath recommended that the current educational master plan dates be extended rather than deferring the educational master plan. J. Fohrman again noted the need to improve integration of SLOs at all levels and recommended appointing a campus body to oversee institutional or associate degree learning outcomes. T. McGrath noted that J. Fohrman had taken the lead on high level learning outcome assessment. Committee members discussed the possibility of an SLO coordinator, mapping of student learning outcomes, and assessment of institutional learning outcomes. L. Mackenzie stated that the institutional learning outcome assessment process should be discussed with faculty and expressed a need more support with SLOs. D. Abbott noted that the PIE Committee has evaluated the hybrid planning and resource allocation process but needed to begin regular reviews of the process to ensure continuous quality improvement.

D. C. Sullivan described his work on the gap analysis for Standard IIA. C. Sullivan shared that the College's curriculum review process is a solid one but that the College needed a more dynamic software package to support the SLO assessment process. T. McGrath shared that SLOs should be included in curriculum documentation. P. Luster noted that the College must include SLOs in curriculum documentation and course syllabi per accreditation requirements. T. McGrath mentioned that curriculum is aligned across the district, but SLOs are identified at the college level, leaving room for discussion. C. Sullivan mentioned that the current curriculum review process is well documented but that he was unable to find information on the PIE Committee's review of the planning process and on the College's web site. D. Abbott noted that he was collecting documents and would prepare the information for the web site. J. Baker shared that the PIE Committee documentation could be found on the College's web site under Strategic Planning.

E. M. Magana described her work on the gap analysis for Standard IIB. She noted that she had no recommendations for IIB areas but said that the change in how the College reviews and funds programs needed to be more clear. M. Magana indicated that the College's new Title III/Title V eligibility designation would provide more opportunities for program funding. She also shared that the College has contracted with a vendor to place many student services online for fall 2012.

F. J. Fohrman noted that the Accreditation Committee member who completed the gap analysis for Standard III was not present but that writer believed the College needed more stable funding for technology. B. Craft expressed a concern regarding the gap analysis and the importance of ensuring information in the gap analysis is accurate. J. Fohrman noted that the gap analysis was a first draft and intended for discussion.

G. K. Wells explained her work on the gap analysis for Standard III. She noted that the Accreditation Committee members were rather new to accreditation and were still learning the process. T. McGrath indicated that accreditation is a three-year process and that the PIE Committee role is to interact with the campus to close gaps and that the next step will be the mid-term accreditation report. J. Baker mentioned that in the past accreditation cycle, it was helpful to get deans and other stakeholders together in one session to speak with accreditation report writers. M. Hinkes recommended that the Mesa accreditation writers meet with the other SDCCD colleges to get district office responses to accreditation-related questions.

H. J. Fohrman indicated that the gap analysis was a work in progress and that the Accreditation Committee had not yet been able to examine Standard IV. D. Abbott commended the Accreditation Committee, noting that the group effectively identified gaps and potential gaps for the PIE Committee to examine. L. Mackenzie and J. Baker also commended the Accreditation Committee for their work on the gap analysis. J. Fohrman said the Accreditation Committee may work on the gap analysis for Standard IV as a group. P. Luster offered to assist with the Standard IV gap analysis. PIE Committee members discussed the timeline for the mid-term report. K. Wells recommended that the Accreditation Committee continue as a standing committee. J. Fohrman noted that the accreditation standards are not widely understood in the campus community and that their needs to be a broader understanding across campus. T. McGrath said the PIE Committee would continue the discussion of the gap analysis at its next meeting to provide direction to the Accreditation Committee.

III. Future Issues

A. J. Baker recommended shifting the Program Review timeline from an 18-month cycle to a 12-month cycle, with program reviews due in December in order to meet the deadlines for resource allocation and budget development in spring. J. Baker noted that the change would take place in the 2012-2013 academic year. P. Luster indicated that the program reviews due in fall 2012 would be an update to the program review documents submitted in spring 2012. M. Romero noted that the change must still be reviewed and approved by the Program Review Committee. T. McGrath expressed support for the change to a 12-month cycle. D. Abbott also expressed support for the change but suggested that the Program Review Committee emphasize that the 2012-2013 program reviews would be updates to the spring 2012 documents. B. Craft expressed a need to email the campus community explaining the shorter Program Review cycle.

B. P. Luster provided an executive summary of the President's Cabinet Retreat minutes and asked the PIE Committee to take action on key recommendations pertaining to college-wide goals, the Integrated Resource Planning Model, a subcommittee on assessment and evaluation, a possible college-wide assessment day, and the updated strategic plan, which will be prepared by the President's Office.

C. T. McGrath asked for the Committee to continue discussion at its May 8 meeting.

IV. Adjourned by T. McGrath at 5:10 P.M.

Submitted by B. Hays
Approved: _____