

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes for 28 August 2012
DRAFT

PRESENT: Donald Abbott (Co-Chair), Jill Baker, Richard Chagnon, Bill Craft, Jan Ellis, Jonathan Fohrman*, Ashanti Hands, Brianna Hays*, Madeleine Hinkes, Angela Liewen, Pamela Luster*, Terry Lohlenberg*, Laurie Mackenzie, Tim McGrath (Co-Chair), Kari Parker, Monica Romero, Denise Whisenhunt* (* indicates non-voting member/consultant)

ABSENT: none

GUESTS: none

I. CALL TO ORDER made by McGrath at 3:32 PM

A. McGrath introduced new members of the committee: Hands (Academic Rep), Kohlenberg (Consultant, Academic Senate President-elect), Whisenhunt (Consultant, VPSS), Rosas (Student Rep). Abbott pointed out that the term of office for the Academic Co-chair of the PIEC was two years and that he was currently beginning his second year in that office; he asked members of the committee to consider serving the next term. Liewen asked that the committee consider allowing a Classified Rep to serve as co-chair—the committee agreed to take up the issue in the near future.

B. Announcements: McGrath distributed binders to members of the committee that included proposed agendas for PIEC meetings through the academic year. Abbott emphasized that the agendas were tentative and subject to modification; he encouraged members to continue to submit ideas for issues for the committee to consider.

McGrath reviewed the calendar for the PIEC and PCab for the coming year. (PCab will meet on 1st and 3rd Tuesdays; PIEC on 2nd and 4th Tuesdays.) He pointed out that the calendars and meeting issues were tied to some extent to upcoming accreditation issues. Those issues are listed on the agendas, referencing a list of concerns drawn up by Fohrman (in his capacity as Chair of the Accreditation Subcommittee) over the summer (attached).

C. M/S (Mackenzie / Craft) to approve minutes of meeting of 8 May 2012; approved.

D. Changes to Agenda: none

E. McGrath initiated a general discussion of the responsibilities of the PIEC (with an emphasis on the institutional effectiveness aspect of our responsibilities). He reminded the committee that we had a global responsibility for planning (a “30,000 foot” view) for the campus. This makes the PIEC a steering committee with the responsibility for guiding other groups on campus. Abbott reviewed the alignment (with Mission, Vision, Values; long-term goals, and annual priorities) and integration (across the campus) oversight responsibilities. A general ‘brainstorming’ session (led by Fohrman) followed. Some of the ideas expressed by committee members included:

- PIEC is responsible for a 'big 3' of concerns: Planning, Program Review (integration, not the process itself, which falls to the PRCommittee), and Student Learning. The PIEC also has oversight responsibility for Continuous Quality Improvement.
- PIEC has assumed responsibility for reviewing and proposing changes to the Mission, Vision, Values of the campus, and for assuring campus fulfillment of MVV.
- Teaching and learning are the main goals of the campus and the reason we exist; PIEC is responsible for ensuring documentation of the fulfillment of those goals.
- PIEC must develop and recommend metrics (and timelines) for institutional effectiveness.
- PIEC must articulate those functions for which it has direct responsibility and which functions for which it has oversight responsibility.

The brainstorming session ended with a general discussion of the meaning of institutional effectiveness; the consensus of the committee was that these issues needed further discussion and that we must develop a lexicon of institutional effectiveness.

II. ACCREDITATION (Fohrman)

A. Fohrman reminded the committee that last spring it recommended continuing with the current MVV for another year unchanged, but raised the question of whether this recommendation need to go to the District Board. Luster replied that she would determine the answer and report back. The PIEC must, in any event, review the MVV during this academic year.

B. Fohrman provided an update on the accreditation mid-term report. The draft of the report will be completed this semester, with Chris Sullivan as editor) and will go through the participatory process in the spring.

III. STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS (Luster)

Luster reported that she will present a written proposal to the PIEC for the process of writing the Educational Master Plan. She indicated that it might be possible to bring in an outside consultant to assist with the project, and that much of the research data has already been completed (thereby making the hiring of a consultant more affordable). She also described the elements of research and projections that will be included in the five-year EMP.

IV. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (Baker)

Baker reported that the many members of the PRC worked over the summer to automate Program Review, and that they had incorporated 10 requests made by PR participants last year. She reminded the committee that this year's process will be an update only (to bring the PR Process into a calendar schedule in which PR is completed in the fall, and the Allocation Recommendation Process is completed the following spring). Program Plans will be due December 1.

V. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (Hays)

Hays provided an update on the SLO Report due to WASC October 15. She reported that she, Hinkes, and Mackenzie met over the summer to draw up responses to seven queries from the ACCJC to be included in the report.

VI. ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATION PROCESS (Abbott)

Abbott indicated that he would submit a proposal for an allocation recommendation oversight committee (a Budget and Allocation Recommendation Committee, BARC) at the 11 September PIEC meeting.

VII. FUTURE ISSUES

Abbott reviewed the future issues on the agenda. Committee members asked that two items be added to future issues: further discussion of institutional effectiveness and consideration of reforming the research committee.

VIII. ADJOURNED by Abbott at 4:47 PM.

Submitted by D. Abbott

Approved: _____