

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE**  
**PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes for 14 May 2013**

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

ABSENT: Robert Arca, Ashanti Hands (both excused)

GUEST: Charles Zappia

I. CALL TO ORDER made by Abbott at 3:38 PM

A. M/S (Mackenzie / Ellis) to approve minutes of meeting of 23 April 2013; approved.

B. Fohrman thanked Abbott for his work over the last two years as the first Academic Co-Chair of the PIEC. He indicated that Abbott had worked tirelessly on planning issues and had made significant contributions to several key planning processes now in place.

C. The committee resumed its discussion of the possibility of having a classified member of the campus serve as Co-Chair of PIEC. Abbott suggested that the committee adopt a “permissive” stance on the issue that would allow such service, depending upon the wishes of the Classified and Academic members of the committee at the time of the election of Co-Chair. Sense of the committee to wait until fall, when the Participatory Governance Taskforce will meet, to send forward such a recommendation for consideration.

D. Mackenzie announced that a draft campus communication flow chart had been presented at the most recent Chairs meeting. She asked for ideas about which bodies should review the document, and indicated that she would forward the document to PIEC members. Luster indicated that the process would be reviewed over the summer as part of planning for the upcoming academic year, and emphasized that this was a “functional” document rather than a governance one.

E. McGrath announced that this would be the last meeting for three of our members: Craft, Mackenzie, and Parker. He thanked them for their service over the last two years and complemented them on the contributions they had made to the work of the PIEC.

II. ACCREDITATION (McGrath)

McGrath reported that the draft Mid-term Report was accepted at the last PCab meeting. Data supporting the report will be gathered over the summer to finalize the report.

III. EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN (Zappia)

A. Zappia emphasized the importance of the Master Plan by pointing out that the forthcoming document will constitute the most comprehensive planning document on

campus over the next five years. He reported that Hays, Baker, and a graduate student intern (from SDSU) are engaged in gathering information for the report—this task will continue over the summer. The Educational Master Plan Taskforce will solicit critical ideas from faculty, classified staff, and students. He reported that Hanover Research has been contracted to provide data on such extra-campus issues as the local economy, job market, and future educational needs.

B. Zappia indicated the Taskforce expects to present a draft of the EMP to the campus for review during fall 2013 and to complete the EMP by the end of that semester.

#### IV. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (Baker)

Baker reported that the Program Review Committee is very happy with the PR process conducted over the last year—the PRC feels that the Program Plans as submitted are complete and ready for review over the summer.

#### V. LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT TASK FORCE (Liewen / Hinkes)

Liewen reported that the LATF held an end-of-year discussion to assess their work. The discussion was productive and cleared up some misconceptions about the role of assessment in the planning process. Hinkes indicated that Kris Clark will serve as the upcoming LATF campus coordinator.

#### VI. BUDGET AND ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATION COMMITTEE (Gutowski)

Gutowski reported that the BARC had reviewed unfunded requests in case additional funds become available at the end of the year. They also updated the allocation recommendation rubrics and timelines for next year.

#### VII. PIEC ANNUAL ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION (Abbott / McGrath)

A. McGrath reminded the committee that last meeting we discussed the accomplishments of the PIEC over the year, and that this discussion will focus on those things we would like to change or improve for next year. Much of the discussion focused on ways to improve communication among various planning groups and the campus at large. Significant points raised during the discussion included:

- Hinkes suggested that a high priority for next year should be to get the word out to campus about how the planning process works (especially the role of PIEC). Luster informed the committee that she is planning to hold workshops during convocation on just this task. Chagnon suggested that booths might be set up at convocation staffed by members of various planning committees.
- Barnes suggested that we produce and widely distribute around campus a linked flow chart showing planning group relationships and planning flow.
- McGrath pointed out that the PIEC has put numerous planning process in place over the last two years, so it should not be surprising that many folks on campus are not yet familiar with them. He suggested that our task over the next year or two should be to communicate with the campus on how those processes work.
- The committee agreed that a good addition to increased campus knowledge of planning would be the establishment of FLEX workshops on Program Review (since PR

is the 'heart' of planning at Mesa, and touches all other aspects of planning and allocation).

- Gutowski asked if e-mail was the best way to get the word out on important issues, especially the results of the allocation recommendation process.

B. McGrath moved the discussion toward a broader assessment by reminding the committee that "getting stuff" (successful allocation requests) is not the end of the process, but actually the middle. He pointed out that allocations must lead to further assessment to determine if resources are being allocated effectively—that is, do they lead to improvements in learning?

- Luster suggested that there is a need to make the processes of PCab recommendations and Presidential approval more formal. She indicated that she will provide increased narrative for her final decisions that will help inform the campus as a whole about allocations.

## VII. FUTURE ISSUES

Several issues (see agenda) are on the table for work over the summer and during the upcoming academic year.

## VIII. ADJOURNED by Abbott at 4:55 PM.

Submitted by D. Abbott  
Approved: 8/27/13