

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes for 26 February 2013
DRAFT

PRESENT: Donald Abbott (Co-Chair), Robert Arca, *Julie Barnes, Richard Chagnon, Bill Craft, Jan Ellis, Jonathan Fohrman, *Dan Gutowski, Ashanti Hands, Madeleine Hinkes, *Terry Kohlenberg, Angela Liewen, *Pamela Luster, Laurie Mackenzie, Tim McGrath (Co-Chair), Kari Parker, Monica Romero (*indicates non-voting member/consultant)

ABSENT: *Jill Baker, *Brianna Hays (both excused)

GUEST: Kathleen Wells

I. CALL TO ORDER made by McGrath at 3:34 PM

A. Changes to Agenda: postpone "Establish Planning Deadlines" from III. Strategic Planning Process.

B. M/S (Mackenzie / Fohrman) to approve minutes of meetings of 12 February 2013; approved with one abstention.

C. TaskStream Task Force Update: [need input].

D. McGrath reported that Miramar had received full accreditation from WASC and that San Francisco Community College was awaiting announcement of their standing. He asked PIEC members to look at the ACCJC website (www.accjc.org) over the next two weeks to familiarize themselves with the many recent changes to WASC accreditation requirements. He emphasized that stringent accountability measures (such as student success rates) are in the new requirements and that Baker was visiting WASC and will report back to the campus in March.

II. ACCREDITATION (McGrath / Fohrman)

A. McGrath reviewed the schedule of deadlines for the mid-term report. He emphasized that the report is due 15 October 2013, and that working back from that date, several interim deadlines must be met: the report will be vetted at the upcoming PCab retreat; it will be finalized with evidence and editing over the summer; and will go before the SDCCD Board in September. PIEC must review all of our responses to the recommendations by our 9 April meeting so that PCab can review it over two meetings before the end of the semester.

McGrath reviewed the Accreditation Review Process (attached) and pointed out the difference between ACCJC recommendations and our own self-determined recommendations, stressing that the former were far more critical.

B. Fohrman reviewed the draft response to Standard 1 recommendations; there were only minor clarifications and suggestions. Fohrman asked the committee members to read the response in greater detail before the next PIEC meeting and bring suggestions for improvement at that time. Several members of the committee commended Fohrman and his working group on the thoroughness of the draft response.

III. STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS (Luster)

Luster reported that she, Baker, Zappia, and Hays had met to discuss how to move forward with the Educational Master Plan development now that the person who had contracted to act as consultant for our the project had backed out at the last minute. She indicated that they decided to move ahead without a consultant and that—while we may bring in people to assist in program and service area interviews—it would essentially be an in-house process. After conducting interviews this semester and processing data over the summer, they will bring the EMP draft to the PIEC and the campus for review in the fall.

IV. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (Hands)

Hands reported that the PRC would submit its final annual report to PCab on 5 March.

V. LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT TASK FORCE (Fohrman)

Fohrman reported that the task force will hold a retreat this Friday (1 March) to look at ways that learning assessment can contribute to sustained, continuous quality improvement goals.

VI. BUDGET AND ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATION COMMITTEE (Abbott)

A. Abbott indicated that he and McGrath would develop a BARC deadline schedule for submission to PIEC.

B. Romero submitted the materials related to the Classified Staff Hiring Prioritization list, including a description of the committee, the rubric used during the process, and the recommendations of the committee (attached). She indicated that the process worked well, but that the committee felt that this first time around was a learning experience, and that they will make recommendations for improvements to the process.

VII. FUTURE ISSUES

McGrath pointed out that the PIEC has only four meetings left this academic year. Mackenzie reminded the group that the development of various timelines to tie the many committee and institutional deadlines together would be very helpful. The committee agreed and suggested that this might be a project for a sub-committee over the summer.

VIII. ADJOURNED by Abbott at 4:58 PM.

Submitted by D. Abbott

Approved: _____