

PIE Council Minutes
October 19, 2012
1:30pm
Welty Board Room

Members Present: John Davis, Beverly Joyce, Erin Kempker, Carla Lowery, Cathy Young, Mark Bean, Jasmine Becton, Sirena Parker, Rusty King, Nora Miller, Marty Hatton (Chair)

Members Absent: Twila Alpe, Menuka Ban, Nora Corrigan, Brandy Larmon, Cassie Derden, Dionne Fortenberry, Dave Haffly, Larry Jones, Jim Borsig, Alexei Huguley, Martha Jo Mims, Shelly Moss, Perry Sansing

1. Approval of minutes from September 21, 2012. A motion to accept the minutes as amended was made by John Davis and duly seconded by Cathy Young. Council carried the motion.
2. Institutional Effectiveness Flowchart – Dr. Marty Hatton
 - Very accurately depicts what we are doing or not with our assessment processes
 - Document reads that these assessment processes feed back into our strategic planning by way of the vision mission and guiding principals
 - Flowchart shows that the processes fall out and never go back again
 - Those assessment processes do not influence the long range strategic planning
 - The way it was designed it was set up for failure
 - Leave it to show we recognize our process was not working - and that we are going to move to something else
 - Proposal of 2nd chart – Bringing forward for context
 - a. if approved it impacts how we do processes on this campus
 - b. impacts some of the committees on campus
 - c. two key committees that it impacts
 - i. Assessment committee
 - ii. Gen Ed Curriculum Committee
 - iii. both voted unanimously to accept the 2nd chart
 - d. Assessment committee effectively goes away and rolled into PIE council
 - e. Assessment committee may become a subcommittee under PIE
 - f. A lot of details to be worked out
 - g. Everything we do has to go back to student learning according to SACS
 - h. There should be crosstalk between both assessment processes in one body – good reason for it to go through PIE
 - i. Very clear mechanism for this to move down from the vision mission guiding principles through President’s Cabinet through PIE Council moves down from the colleges
 - j. Assessments would not be able to go back to PIE without a letter or document from the Dean saying it has been reviewed, show the discussions the group has had, and how it is impacting their overall planning
 - k. The work of the Assessment subcommittee changes
 - l. How are continuous improvements occurring?

- m. Need training on the front end
- n. Work of the committees is to make sure the process is working
- o. Need to know what best practices are
- p. AASCU has been validated – think we need to adopt those
- q. Gen Ed curriculum needs a body to report to – might make sense for them to report to PIE
- r. Policy statements will have to be changed
- s. Assessment committee – completely reworded
- t. Academic councils and committees are under review – are they truly necessary or could those functions be rolled down to the college level – then go through then deans council, academic council as FYI – unless red flag
- u. Deans Council has this – needs to vote, Academic Council needs to vote, Cabinet will need to vote
- v. John Davis made a motion to accept the 2nd chart the motion was duly seconded by Carla Lowery. Council carried the motion.

3. Peer institutions – Carla Lowery

- What criteria do we need to look at?
- Different peers used for different instances
- 2 separate list public versus private institutions
- Pell eligible students
- Institution size 2000-5000
- Residential versus non- residential students
- Percent of transfer students
- Mission
- Non - white
- Will need to be adjusted as our goals change
- Look at how it will be used internally for planning and work out from that
- We have some base line issues that have to be dealt with first
- If thoughts come to mind – email Carla
- Will come up with a set of peer institutions that we propose