

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes for 11 September 2012
DRAFT

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

ABSENT: Jan Ellis (excused), Terry Kohlenberg* (excused)

GUESTS: Saeid Eidgahy, Margie Fritch, Andrew MacNeill, Charles Zappia

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

A. Changes to Agenda: The SLO report from the Deans moved to the top of the agenda ('Call to Order' suspended for the Deans' report).

II. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (Campus Deans)

A. Each of the Deans submitted a written report (attached) and made a brief oral summary of the SLO process completed over the last academic year. (These reports also include conclusions from Department Chair SLO reports.) Some of the issues and conclusions reported by the Deans include:

- There continues to be some confusion over student objectives vs. student outcomes.
- Many rich and diverse dialogues were prompted by the entire SLO process; these included many adjunct instructors who are often left out of such discussions.
- The development of SLOs is an iterative process requiring ongoing development.
- One important benefit of school SLO meetings was that they allowed faculty to align courses and sequential courses.
- SLO meetings encouraged the sharing of best practices among faculty.
- There is continued concern regarding data entry into TaskStream (many found the software cumbersome and data entry a tedious process).
- Overall, departments and schools found that students were reaching targeted SLO goals.
- Some faculty—while acknowledging that student outcomes are important—found the SLO process as mandated to be a distraction from the professional development crucial to improving teaching.
- More dialogue is needed among faculty and support service personnel to achieve better integration of needs and services.

B. After the Deans departed, the PIEC briefly summarized what they perceived as the principal conclusions to be drawn from the Deans' presentations:

- The process helps to focus campus efforts on teaching methodologies.
- There is general consensus that the campus is moving forward on SLOs.
- The campus is having a dynamic discussion (both positive and negative) on the entire process of SLOs, which can only improve our service to students.
- Adjuncts have been integrated into the process in a very positive way.

I. CALL TO ORDER (resumed)

B. Abbott welcomed new student representative Roberto Rosas.

C. Abbott clarified the issue of tenure on the PIEC, explaining that non-administrative members (who serve at the pleasure of the President) serve 2-year terms with the option of a second term. He reminded the members that we will need a new co-chair at the start of the next academic year.

III. ACCREDITATION (McGrath)

McGrath provided an update on the SLO Report. He indicated that Department Chairs are reviewing the report this week, and he reviewed the timeline of submission of the report to the District Board and to the State of California.

IV. STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS (Luster)

Luster indicated that she would submit a proposal for completion of the Educational Master Plan at the 25 September PIEC meeting.

V. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (Baker)

Baker submitted a rubric for facilities resource allocation requests (attached). After discussion, the sense of the committee was to forward the rubric to the Facilities Committee for review. It will then come back to the PIEC for reconsideration.

VI. ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATION PROCESS (Abbott)

Abbott submitted a proposal for an allocation recommendation oversight committee (a Budget and Allocation Recommendation Committee, BARC), attached. The PIEC will consider the proposal at the 25 September meeting.

VII. FUTURE ISSUES

The committee took up the question of reviving the Research Committee (which had been absorbed into the Strategic Planning Committee and thence into the PIEC). Baker argued that a small group—perhaps a subcommittee of PIEC—should be established to consider research opportunities and standards (one of the functions of the original Research Committee). After discussion, the sense of the committee was that a Research Advisory Group (suggested by Luster) would be a useful tool in fulfilling the 2004 Accreditation advisory that the campus “build a climate of evidence.” We have begun

that process, but an Advisory Committee could focus on continuing that effort. PIEC will take up the issue at a future meeting.

VIII. ADJOURNED by Abbott at 5:00 PM.

Submitted by D. Abbott

Approved: _____