Introduction

The meeting was briefly brought to order. Feedback from the Space Planning Committee was almost immediately commenced.

Space Planning Committee Feedback

According to the Space Planning committee, the most important theme for them (the one that most affected the committee) was theme #4: Institutional Alignment. Before the Institutional Proposal is submitted, they are hoping that the actions regarding this theme will be more flushed out and rationalized so that they will eventually be actualized during the Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Reviews.

The concern of this committee stems from their uncertainty regarding their work toward creating recursive processes to ensure future stability with regard to space planning at the University. The committee is not very sure whether their progress will be effectively recorded and used for proactive planning in the University’s future. The committee is hoping to create an academic plan that will be used to develop a master facilities plan so that consistent standards for space planning will be in place. Unfortunately, there has not been acceptance of this plan yet, mostly to do with the steep price tag associated with it.

Because of this, the Committee is concerned that financial obligations necessary for this project might lead to inaction. They determined that what is needed is a champion for action. The Space Planning Committee would therefore like to have some external consultation in the form of either a liaison who will act as a buffer between the many different constituencies concerned with the effective use of space on-campus, or more preferably a “facilities manager” whose main job and area of expertise would be to proactively set into place measures and standards for space related projects. The presence of a former facilities manager was discussed, and comparisons were made between the need for a facilities manager and the need for an institutional researcher, both of which were determined essential to grow the capacity of the University and have it meet its goals of educational effectiveness.

It was determined that a facilities manager would be highly beneficial since he or she would be able to handle the prioritization and implementation of projects, something that takes a considerable amount of time and cannot necessarily be done well by simply extending resources already currently available on-campus. Therefore, it was the opinion of the WASC Reaccreditation Steering Committee that an outcome would be added to the institutional proposal regarding the requirement of a “facilities manager” and that the problems being faced by the Space Planning Committee would be discussed in more depth in order to create a context of urgency befitting the current situation.
Curriculum Committee Feedback

The Curriculum Committee Feedback, although brief due to time constraints, was also very illuminating. This presentation brought up some very interesting questions regarding the capacity of the University in dividing the responsibilities mentioned in the institutional proposal to the appropriate committees. The following questions were raised: “How is curriculum to be affected?”, “Who is going to be responsible?”, “What are we going to do about assessment?”, “What responsibilities are going to be dispersed and to whom?” The curriculum committee found that at times their work was duplicated elsewhere in the University.

The recommendation was made to review the charge of the Curriculum Committee and to determine where and how in the plan for reaccreditation there will be a means to implement program review and learning assessment. The suggestion was made that in addition to providing faculty development there may be a need to create new committees to oversee these items, or draw upon existing committees, such as Curriculum and the Academic Chairs, and have them focus on these matters.

Conclusion

The chair of the committee commended both presentations and was very pleased with the criticisms that were raised. She assured both presenters that these issues would be addressed, both for the creation of the institutional proposal and during the Capacity and Preparatory Review.