

# SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

## Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee | Minutes

03.10.26 | LRC 435 | 3:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.

### **Membership**

<b>Co-Chairs:</b>	Holly Jagielinski (HS&PS); Hai Hoang (IE)
<b>Administration:</b>	Victoria Millers (SS); Ryan Shumaker (I)
<b>Classified Professionals:</b>	Courtney Lee (SS); Ayana Woods (CS); <b><i>Vacant (I); Vacant (AS)</i></b>
<b>Faculty:</b>	Mary Gwin (AS); Blythe Barton (ES); Lisa Shapiro (B&T); Michelle Rodriguez (SBSMS); Derek White (SS-Counseling); Ian Duckles (Chair of Chairs); Lisa Burget (LRC); <b><i>Vacant (A&amp;L); Vacant (M&amp;NS), Vacant (H)</i></b>
<b>Student Representative:</b>	<b><i>Vacant</i></b>
<b>Consultants (Non-Voting):</b>	Ashanti Hands (President); Larry Maxey (SS); Lorenze Legaspi (Administrative Services); Isabel O'Connor (I); Alex Berry (CTE); Leland Simpliciano (AANAPISI & HSI); Michelle Rodriguez (ESC); Tara Hardee Teodoro (I)

### **Attendees:**

Hai Hoang, Holly Jagielinski, Mary Gwin, Lisa Burget, Ryan Shumaker, Ian Duckles, Lorenze Legaspi, Larry Maxey, Ayana Woods, Lisa Shapiro, Blythe Barton, Isabel O'Connor, Tara Hardee Teodoro, Ashanti Hands, Victoria Miller

#### **A. Call to Order**

1. Holly Jagielinski called meeting to order at 3:33pm

#### **B. Approval of February 24, 2026, Minutes**

1. Motioned: Ian Duckles - Seconded: Lisa Shapiro
2. Outcome: Minutes were approved
3. Abstained: Ayana Woods and Lisa Burget

#### **C. Continuing Business**

1. Committee Report Outs
  - a. SET (Maxey): SET focuses on pursuing the BSI designation, supporting HSI initiatives, and contributing to campus-wide efforts like Black Student Success Transfer Week.
  - b. BARC (Legaspi): Defer until later in the meeting.
  - c. Classified Hiring (Maxey): The committee is meeting, setting timelines, scoring rubrics (target completion date: March 19), and scheduling PIEC presentations, with results going to PCAB April 21 and a second reading May 5.

- d. Faculty Hiring (O'Connor / Gwin): The group met to rank the requests and submitted the results to PIE today. We also held a follow-up meeting to develop suggestions for the next steps.
- e. Environmental Sustainability (Rodriguez): Not in attendance;
  - 1. Isabel – I've been working with Michelle and the district to finalize the LEAF designator process. They've established a process that should work well, and the fall list is already prepared.
- f. Diversity, Action, Inclusion, and Equity (Miller): Blythe- The group is working to align their mission moving forward, with Prope Jorge leading the effort and planning in-person retreats each semester. Additionally, CDAIE T-shirts will be distributed during Cultural Unity Week in April through random acts of kindness with AS.
- g. [HSI](#) and AANAPISI (Simpliciano):
  - 1. Minority Serving Institution Grant Update: HSI and AANAPISI funding may not be restored under FY 2026, with possible redirection to SIP; group was advised to prepare a summer grant writing team.
  - 2. Upcoming AANAPISI events include a Mar 23 convening and the APAHE Conference (Apr 12–14), with five proposals accepted.
  - 3. For HSI, updates were shared from the AHSIE conference; the ALMA Committee was reinstated with new co-chairs, and work continues on the HSI STEM spenddown plan.
  - 4. Isabel: Funds have been appropriated but not allocated. Two California bills proposing state-supported HSI and AANAPISI programs are being discussed due to uncertainty around federal funding.
- h. Outcomes Assessment (Rabinovich/Hoang): The group is reviewing ACCJC standards and rubrics, identifying strengths and gaps, preparing for the Midterm report, and discussing methods for disaggregating learning outcomes.
- i. [Program Review](#) (Hoang): The feedback survey closed, and the committee is reviewing the program review model for improvements in clarity, alignment, and simplification. A Miramar College representative shared their process to inform potential improvements. Bruce Naschak was elected Instructional Faculty Co-Chair, and the Student Services Classified Co-Chair position remains open.
- j. Accreditation – Annual Report, Fiscal Report (Hoang): Based on PIEC's previous decision, the annual report will include the 1% and 2% goals and will be submitted this year following last year's process. Future discussions will focus on aligning goal setting earlier in the year. The VPA typically submits the fiscal report; the new Acting VPA will be contacted to ensure it is submitted on time.
  - 1. Lorenze: Have we received the login for the reports?
  - 2. Hai: I received the login for the annual, but I can send you the info for the fiscal report.

## 2. ACCJC 7-year Structure [vote]

*Holly: We are revisiting the ACCJC 7-Year Structure shared at the last meeting and inviting any final edits. If none are provided, we will move forward with a vote to send it to PCAB.*

### a. Isabel: Can you tell us who is on the ASC?

1. Holly: We do not yet have that structure in place, and it is expected to be implemented in Year 3.
2. Ashanti: That makes sense, as we are currently focusing on the Midterm Report first.
3. Hai: In Spring 2027, PIE will establish the ASC for the remainder of the cycle, including clarifying the charge and membership.
4. Isabel: I'm reviewing Part 3 on Institutional Support, emphasizing the need for work to be sustained, properly resourced, and transparent rather than ad hoc. Can you clarify this some more?
  - a. Hai: The idea is to ensure proactive planning for accreditation work over the 7-year cycle, since it impacts the entire institution. This includes defining roles, aligning workload, and planning resources in advance to maintain ACCJC compliance and avoid ad hoc or last-minute efforts.

*Holly: Vote from PIEC to send to PCAB to adopt*

- a. Motion: Ayana Woods - Seconded: Lisa Burget
- b. Outcome: Consensus approved
- c. Next Steps: Sending to PCAB for the next report.

## 3. SPAA [TBD]

*Hai: Reached out to Brian and scheduled a meeting to talk about potential integration or SPAA. Brian has been meeting with the board, and we will report back with updates after the meeting.*

*Holly: Meeting is on March 17<sup>th</sup>.*

## D. New Business

### 1. FHP Presentation

- i. Mary: 40 proposals were reviewed and ranked after multiple meetings and robust discussions. A follow-up meeting was held on February 27th to discuss next steps and considerations, including clarifying the number of positions or funding available before ranking.
  1. Ian: What is the highest score you can get?
  2. Mary: The highest possible score is 80. The group discussed reweighting the rubric by keeping four main categories at 25 points each and making

sustainability a bonus category worth an additional 5 points instead of a required scoring area. The group discussed suggestions for improving the rubric, including adjusting how it is weighted while keeping the existing questions the same.

3. Ryan: The idea was to treat sustainability as a bonus rather than a core scoring category, since many requests (e.g., faculty positions) are necessary but not inherently sustainability focused.
- ii. Mary: The group discussed keeping the word limit while allowing data tables or data entries that would not count toward the word count, so respondents can include supporting data alongside the narrative.
  1. Isabel: The 300-word cap was set last year, but some responses exceeded it. We also discussed the need for more consistent and reliable data to better support faculty position requests.
- iii. Mary: The committee discussed adding a checkbox in Program Review to identify whether positions are funded by the general fund or categorical sources, noting that categorical positions require additional institutional justification. They also agreed that pre-ranking discussions about program need would be helpful, since strong writing in applications may not always reflect the greatest institutional need. We agreed that positions required for programmatic accreditation should be automatically prioritized, rather than going through the regular ranking process.
  1. Lisa S: What steps do you use to determine program needs?
    - i. Mary: It's hard because we have very good writers in some departments and have a need; but in other departments the need is greater, but they don't necessarily write the best request.
  2. Lisa S: Earlier requests focused more on data rather than narrative. Instead of relying on bonus points, proposals could be weighted using factors like campus priorities and hard data, such as student-to-faculty ratios and demonstrated demand when faculty numbers are low compared to student need. This would shift decisions toward objective data and institutional priorities.
    - i. Isabel: Not necessarily, because faculty shortages shouldn't be measured only by total faculty versus students. Instead, it should compare contract faculty to students and adjunct faculty to students, since lost contract positions are often backfilled with adjuncts.
  3. Lisa S: It would be helpful to develop clearer weightings for the different factors involved.
  4. Mary: Another situation is when new faculty create a program request, but they might lack experience creating the requests. They may not know what data to present, so even though the program has a strong need, the request may not effectively demonstrate that need.

5. Lisa S: We need a way to prioritize these factors by assigning categories the appropriate weight.
6. Mary: It also needs to be flexible, so the weightings can change if priorities shift.
7. Isabel: The committee once relied heavily on data like retirements and ratios but attempts to create different rubrics for various faculty roles became chaotic. Moving away from data also caused problems because strong narratives could overshadow real need. The experience showed that data is important for evaluating requests and that a single, consistent rubric works best.
8. Blythe: The question is how to capture and incorporate needs like MSI programming or work-based learning, whether through data or indicators like full classes and waitlists.
  - a. Isabel: Different criteria can be used to demonstrate needs, such as showing work-based learning through program-run work experience courses. We tried to create a solution that met everyone's needs, but it ended up satisfying no one.
9. Hai: There is a need for both better use of data and recognition of different types of requests. Since much of the data already exists on dashboards, the solution may be better training to help people understand what data is available and what the committee is looking for. Providing examples of strong requests could also help people clearly demonstrate need and align with priorities.
  - a. Mary: The committee could require a few specific data points from the dashboards, like the FTEF-to-FTES ratio, to make requests more uniform, though they have not agreed on which metrics to use.
  - b. Lisa S: Requests could be pre-populated with relevant data indicators for each program. The indicators may differ for classroom and non-classroom roles, but the weighting of data and narrative would remain consistent.
  - c. Isabel: Counseling has already done significant work identifying useful data, so it could serve as a model.
    - i. Blythe: Statewide curricular changes tied to transfer pathways often drive need, but creative programs like dance may not show the same transfer or job rates, which can affect how their needs are evaluated.
10. Ashanti: I appreciate the discussion. In my final review, I consider factors like faculty ratios, retirements, accreditation needs, and mandates. Including these data points earlier could help align the committee's evaluations with final decisions.

## 2. [BARC Presentation](#)

## *Lorenze: Shared BARC Presentation*

- i. Process
  1. Rubric Approved at PCAB
  2. Trainings were held in Fall 2025
  3. Prioritization Process PCAB
    - a. First Read
    - b. Second Read/Recommendation
    - c. Funding determination – President Hands
- ii. Initial Reactions
  1. Highlight in future process BARC is intended for innovative requests
  2. Rubric will be reviewed for next process
  3. Potential for quotes to be included
  4. Ongoing costs review
  5. Trainings work!
- iii. See attached Presentation for rankings
- iv. Next Steps
  1. PCAB
    - a. 1<sup>st</sup> reading 3/3/26
    - b. 2<sup>nd</sup> reading/recommendation 3/17/26
  2. Applicant Notifications
  3. Rubric evaluation and change recommendations

### *Questions:*

- v. Blythe: Did the follow-up conversations lead to improvements in the feedback process?
  1. Lorenze: The follow-up conversations mainly provided clarification, with many questions already covered in training. Next steps include reviewing the rubric and proposing any changes to the President's Cabinet before the next cycle.
- vi. Mary: Are the things that are approved going to be purchased this year? Do the unused funds roll over instead of returning to the district, and if there is any remaining amount will be added to next year's \$250,000 allocation.
  1. Lorenze: The goal is to purchase most items this year using the \$250,000 set aside through IELM, but if projects require site improvements or larger requests, some may be purchased at the start of next year. No, that hasn't been the case because there typically hasn't been leftover funding; we usually spend it all by going down the list. Last year, some items weren't purchased in time, so the committee moved the ranking earlier—from April to March—to allow purchases to happen sooner.

### 3. Roadmap update

*Hai: A recent workshop with the consultant reviewed the objectives, measures, and implementation of the plan. A draft was received last Friday, and the team is now refining the measures to ensure they make sense for institutional research and are sustainable to track regularly. Once the list of measures is clearer and simplified, it will be shared with key groups for feedback. The plan is to present Roadmap 2.0 to PCAB for a first reading in April and a second reading in May.*

- i. Isabel: Instructional support is needed to improve student success, including achieving transfer-level math and English in the first year and reducing units and time to complete certificates.
  - a. Hai: That would be a priority, right?
  - b. Isabel: Yes. The measures should also include the effectiveness of instructional support and how it contributes to student success, not just services like basic needs or student plans.
- ii. Hai: The draft strategic plan was developed, but it now needs refinement with input from people across the institution who have key expertise.
  - a. Tara: The equity plan 2528 includes tutoring as a key strategy for improving transfer-level math and English, which aligns well with this plan.
  - b. Isabel: Alignment with existing plans is important, so the strategy builds current efforts and fills gaps rather than creating something new.
- iii. Holly: Hai, can you define service utilization that is listed as a measure?
  - a. Hai: When we received the draft, it was listed; IR is also wondering how we would define it.
  - b. Ashanti: It would be the measure of how many people are using the services which can indicate whether access has increased.
- iv. Holly: Where is the data coming from and what data is it.
  - a. Ryan: Counseling service use can be measured in multiple ways—such as check-ins, SARS calendars, and online counseling—using different metrics to capture overall utilization.
  - b. Hai: We’re struggling with how to measure service utilization because it can mean different things across areas and could lead to too many metrics. The proposal is to focus on outcome-level measures at the college level, rather than detailed operational measures for each priority, leaving those specifics to divisions or departments.
- v. Ryan: Our program review maps unit outcomes up to core priorities, with each unit telling its story. Local measures still support shared priorities, as long as priorities are clearly structured to align the right outcomes.
- vi. Hai: Focusing too much on measures could lead to 20–30 metrics for a single goal, which is excessive.

- vii. Isabel: I'm still thinking through schedule efficiency. Schedule coordination makes sense, especially for adult learners, but I'm not sure efficiency measures like FTES/FTEF clearly connect to completion, since some low-efficiency classes may still be necessary, such as capstones.
  - a. Hai: This is the time to refine the workgroup's input by involving key stakeholders with institutional knowledge to ensure it makes sense.
- viii. Ryan: The Mesa 2030 goal—built on equity and excellence and supported by key pillars—guides outcomes and measures. Since priorities are already embedded in these goals, they may be redundant; focusing on outcomes and measures tied to the goals may be more effective, allowing each unit to operationalize them in its own way.
  - a. Isabel: Shouldn't some priorities remain strategic to maintain focus and prevent efforts and resources from being spread too thin?
- ix. Ryan: If everything maps to the overarching equity and excellence goals and the five key goals, different approaches can still stay aligned. However, the process can feel circular—linking priorities, goals, outcomes, and measures back to priorities again.
- x. Hai: We may be discussing this at different levels. Some colleges focus only on goals, outcomes, and measures—leaving priorities to divisions. In this approach, the college sets the goal, and each division decides how to achieve it, as long as they contribute to the shared outcomes.
  - a. Ryan: Goals and outcomes should reflect institutional priorities—meaning those priorities should already be built into the meta goals and goals, so everything aligns.
  - b. Holly: Priorities may work better as a foundational layer that supports goals, outcomes, and measures—rather than being treated as equal elements. Reframing them this way could reduce confusion and make the structure clearer and less visually overwhelming.
  - c. Ashanti: I support focusing on goals, outcomes, and measures, with priorities defined locally. The main challenge is tracking progress and accountability across units. The first three columns are key; the rest are examples, and the book may help guide this.
- xi. Holly: We have five pillars, but priorities like adult learners and BSI are where the real focus shows up.
- xii. Ashanti: There are different ways to approach this, and it needs more discussion. Focus areas like Latin adult learners and BSI help tell the broader story, while priorities in the other column seem more like operational actions for departments—so they may be separate concepts for now.
  - a. Holly: Would you recommend taking the last two columns off the slides (Priorities and Measures) and using them more internally.
  - b. Ashanti: That is my thought, yes.

- xiii. Lisa S: Tracking is key, and program review already does this well by aligning goals, outcomes, and measures. For priorities, committees could define their own (aligned to campus goals) and track them using a shared or standardized template.
  - a. Ashanti: A dynamic plan should align with program review, so it doesn't feel redundant. Encouraging all areas—committees, departments, and initiatives—to connect their work to overarching goals helps keep everyone aligned.
- xiv. Holly: We should hold an annual meeting of committee chairs to align their work with campus goals and priorities for the year.
- xv. Hai: Program review currently generates too many disconnected unit-level goals. A better approach may be to start with college goals and have departments align their work to them, improving focus, alignment, and long-term impact.

4. Book provided by Ashanti:

- i. We spend a lot of time planning but not as much on execution. Reflects on first roadmap as strong in design but less effective in implementation.
- ii. It is important to tell a data-informed story over time.
- iii. I suggest focusing on one or two “wildly important goals,” with departments identifying one goal to align. I want to make notes of the value of understanding and using lead measures to support progress. I think that small, actionable steps can help build momentum.
- iv. We need to use a clear scoreboard to track progress and outcomes.
- v. I suggest having a regular cadence of accountability focused on goal progress. We need clear implementation plans alongside future planning.

#### E. Announcements

- 1. Confirmation: cancellation of March 24 due to Chancellor's Forum
- 2. Next meeting: **April 14** (ACCJC Outcomes Transparency; SPAA)

#### F. Resources

- 1. [PIEC website](#)
- 2. [PIEC Meeting Schedule '25-'26.docx](#)

#### G. Approval of Minutes

- 1. 4.14.26 Approval of 3.10.26 Minutes
- 2. Motioned: Ian Duckles    Seconded: Ayana Woods
- 3. Outcome: Consensus Approved Minutes

**Minutes Submitted by: Brenna Bonikowske**

