

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee | Minutes

02.10.2026 | LRC 435 | 3:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.

Membership

Co-Chairs:	Holly Jagielinski (HS&PS); Hai Hoang (IE)
Administration:	Victoria Millers (SS); Ryan Shumaker (I)
Classified Professionals:	Courtney Lee (SS); Ayana Woods (CS); <i>Vacant (I); Vacant (AS)</i>
Faculty:	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); <i>Vacant (A&L); Vacant (M&NS), Vacant (H)</i>
Student Representative:	<i>Vacant</i>
Consultants (Non-Voting):	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

Holly Jagielinski (HS&PS); Hai Hoang (IE); Victoria Millers (SS); Courtney Lee (SS); Ayana Woods (CS); Mary Gwin (AS); Blythe Barton (ES); Ian Duckles (Chair of Chairs); Lisa Burget (LRC); Ashanti Hands (President); Larry Maxey (SS); Lorenze Legaspi (Administrative Services); Isabel O'Connor (I); Tara Hardee Teodoro (I); Guest: Liza Rabinovich

A. Call to Order

1. This meeting was called to Order at **3:35 p.m.** by Holly Jagielinski

B. Welcome and Introduction

1. Welcome Brenna Bonikowske as Admin Tech of IE

C. Approval of [December 9th, 2025, Minutes](#)

1. Edits: Add Ian's name as co-presenter at Convocation; Spelling error of CDAIE
2. Motioned: Ian Duckles; Seconded: Victoria Millers
3. Abstained: Isabel, Blythe, Ayana
4. Outcome: Minutes were Approved

D. Continuing Business

1. **Committee Report Outs**

- a. **SET (Maxey):** Haven't met yet. The focus this semester is on BSI designation and ALMA. The task force is preparing to present at the Chancellor's Forum on BSI designation and will share more details soon. Plans are also underway to bring cohort support groups together for a collective gathering to strengthen collaboration and support.
- b. **BARC (Legaspi):** The first meeting is Thursday, 2/12, to norm the resource request process, review other colleges' budget committees, and align goals with the 10 plus 1 and new ACCJC practices.
- c. **Classified Hiring (Maxey):** The committee met last week and will move forward by reviewing the rubric and preparing for the work. With new members joining, training will be provided. Next week's meeting will focus on reviewing the forms and ensuring alignment.
- d. **Faculty Hiring (Gwin):** Met last Friday did the norming session and are currently scoring.
- e. **Environmental Sustainability (Rodriguez):** Absent
- f. **Diversity, Action, Inclusion (Miller):** Last week's meeting focused on reviewing past goals, setting future goals, and planning Cultural Unity Week.
- g. **HSI (Simpliciano):** APR was submitted on time, will be informed. MSI anticipated to restore HSI funding.
- h. **AANAPISI (Simpliciano):** APR was submitted but was notified that submission was not received. Sent the submission receipt. MSI anticipated to restore AANAPISI funding.
- i. **Outcomes Assessment (Liza/Hoang):** The committee has not met. A DOC orientation/semester update is scheduled for Feb 18. The Spring 2026 training schedule is being finalized, and the current cycle ends June 30, 2026.
- j. **Program Review (Hoang):** The committee met last Friday and will send out a feedback survey to reflect on the current PR model. They are exploring division-specific prompts, integrating Roadmap 2 into PR, and simplifying PR and RR. They also discussed budget/vacancy transparency, seeking rubric input from resource committees, collaborating with Nuventive for improvements, and electing PR Co-Chairs.
 - i. Blythe: When is the new cycle available?
 - ii. Liza: Timeline depends on the extent of changes—revisions would be submitted in spring, tested in summer, and ready by fall (possibly earlier depending on number of changes).
- k. **Accreditation (Hoang):** We are accredited and reaffirmed for the rest of the cycle. We have midterm due in 2028 and comprehensive review in 2031.

2. Convocation Breakout: Stronger Chair, Stronger Impact: Update and Next Steps [Jagielinski]

- a. Holly: Breakouts went well.
- b. Ian: Great turnout; Holly did a fantastic job, and it should be repeated.

- c. Holly: Great to repeat in the fall semester as committees are getting started. Suggested holding a beginning-of-year meeting with all chairs to align goals, clarify committee roles, and share a “State of the Union” so everyone starts on the same page and can inform their committees.

3. Committee highlights structure / committee function and expectations

[Discussion][Jagielinski/Hoang]

a. Key discussion points

- i. Holly: Approach this intentionally and use a rubric as a supportive check in tool, not policing.
- ii. Victoria: AS may be a better pilot than CDAIE. Assign PIE members to review websites independently and reach out directly to chairs.
- iii. Ian: A gentle, proactive audit will help avoid accreditation issues. Focus on committees not already reporting to PCAB.
- iv. Blythe: Create a simple checklist tied to governance updates and accreditation. Embed it in the governance handbook to support chairs.
- v. Isabel: Transparency is important, but chairs often lack time and support to manage updates.
- vi. Ashanti: Partner with Office of Communications to host website office hours. Clarify the “why,” verify the committee list, and align this effort with stated goals.
- vii. Hai: Synthesized the discussion by emphasizing the need to clarify expectations, provide chairs time and support, streamline duplicate reporting systems, prioritize current semester deliverables, and align the effort with ACCJC.

b. Key suggestions

- i. Develop a concise 5 to 6 item rubric:
 - 1. Updated membership
 - 2. Posted agendas and minutes
 - 3. Clear charge and scope
 - 4. Current goals and contact information
- ii. Frame the process as supportive, transparent, and accreditation aligned.
- iii. Pilot with one committee, possibly AS.
- iv. Focus initial outreach on committees not reporting to PCAB.
- v. Integrate checklist into governance handbook.
- vi. Offer structured support, including Communications office hours.
- vii. Streamline website and reporting processes where possible.

c. Next steps

- i. Holly drafts a simple rubric.
- ii. Holly connects with Victoria for input.
- iii. Bring rubric back to PIE to confirm pilot and scope.

- iv. Clarify expectations to chairs this spring and allow time for updates before a formal review cycle, potentially in fall.
- v. Revisit the governance handbook and clarify committee structures and explore support mechanisms for chairs.

4. ACCJC Timeline Review [Discussion] [Jagielinski/Hoang]

a. Purpose

- i. Hai: The draft 7-year ACCJC timeline is a 2025-2026 PIEC's deliverable intended to create clear, consistent, year-round accreditation work and prevent last-minute scrambling, especially after the 2024 ACCJC compliance letter.
- ii. This PIEC's goal is about sustainability, clarity of roles, and ongoing evidence collection.

b. Key discussion points

i. Timing and clarity of role:

- 1. Ian: Suggested adding "Monitor Standard" under *Standard/Section Lead* to clarify ongoing responsibility.
- 2. Isabel: Raised concern about identifying Standard Leads in Year 1, noting these are significant responsibilities that require clarity about: Role expectations, Scope of monitoring, Communication responsibilities beyond the ALO, Reassigned time and workload implications
- 3. Hai: Noted that in the last cycle, most Standard Leads were deans and VPs, with some faculty co-leads and one classified staff member.

ii. Focus of Year 1 and 2:

- 1. Ashanti: Recommended that Years 1 and 2 focus on campus-wide understanding of the 2024 standards, especially evidence expectations and disaggregated data requirements, before assigning formal lead roles.
- 2. Isabel: Agreed that identifying formal lead writers now may be premature and that structure can be reassessed closer to the report.
- 3. Holly: Revisited the original intent of the 7-year timeline as a detailed, sustainable roadmap to ensure accountability, continuity across personnel changes, and clear annual expectations. Asked whether the shift to focusing primarily on Years 1–2 changes that approved commitment.
- 4. Mary: Indicated the full 7-year structure should remain in place, with adjustments limited to short-term implementation details.
- 5. Isabel: Agreed that the overall plan remains intact and can evolve as the college learns more through the process.
- 6. Committee: Agreed to retain the 7-year framework while maintaining flexibility in early years and documenting revisions with dates for continuity.

7. Holly: Clarified whether “Identify and Train Standard Leads” should move to Years 3–4 based on the current suggestions
8. Isabel: Recommended Year 4.
9. Ashanti: Suggested planning could begin in Year 3 given the March 2028 midterm.

iii. ASC Structure

1. Hai: Asked whether ASC should be reestablished in Years 1–2.
2. Ashanti: Indicated this may be premature if tied to unidentified lead writers.
3. Blythe: Proposed a small ASC early on, centered on the ALO and lead writer, expanding later.
4. Lorenze: Supported a small core group initially to ensure continuity and avoid knowledge residing in one person.
5. Ashanti: Suggested ASC membership could evolve over time based on workload and phase of the cycle.

iv. Lessons from previous cycle

1. Isabel: The challenge last cycle was not lack of evidence but writing structure. One individual drafted the ISER while others submitted materials.
2. Isabel suggested a possible future model of standard-based writing teams with unified editing.

v. Institutional Support and Standard 2 concern

1. Liza: Expressed concern that Standard 2 requires disaggregated learning outcome systems that are not yet fully established. Waiting too long to operationalize expectations may create capacity challenges later.
2. Ashanti: Agreed conversations should begin now to surface gaps and guide system development.

vi. Key Suggestions

1. Hai: Synthesized that the immediate priority is awareness, identifying gaps, and engaging the broader campus.
2. Retain the full 7-year accreditation framework as originally committed.
3. Focus detailed implementation planning primarily on Years 1–2.
4. Delay formal identification and training of Standard Leads to approximately Years 3–4.
5. Do not formally reestablish a full ASC in Years 1–2. Maintain a small core group early. Expand as workload increases.
6. Prioritize campus-wide education on the 2024 standards in Years 1–2.
7. Add “Monitor Standard” language to clarify expectations.
8. Document revisions with dates to preserve continuity and historical record.
9. We will make the changes and vote at the next PIEC to bring it forward to PCAB

E. New Business

1. Roadmap 2 [Info/Discussion] [Hoang]

a. Context:

- i. Hai: Presented the “upside-down triangle” structure:
 1. Mission and vision at the top
 2. 10-year goal (Mesa 2030)
 3. 5-year strategic roadmap
 4. Day-to-day actions
 5. Two priorities have emerged with broad support. A draft of five goals with outcomes, objectives, and measures is ready for feedback. Final workshop is Feb 26, 2026, followed by PIE review and governance process.
- ii. Isabel: Asked whether the Roadmap 2.0 priorities are finalized.
- iii. Hai: Confirmed they are still open for input.

b. Key discussion points

- i. Process clarification
 1. Ashanti: Stated that final decisions at the Roadmap 2.0 workshop should be put to a vote. Clarified that the two elevated priorities are not the only priorities, but are being highlighted for focused campus-wide attention. All strategic objectives remain important.
 2. Ashanti: Clarified that the Mesa 2030 Committee should recommend priorities, present them, and then the broader body decides.

ii. Equity Lens and Target Populations

1. Isabel: Emphasized that support for adult learners should be approached through an equity lens, especially given the Latine adult learner grant. Suggested prioritizing those most impacted rather than using a blanket approach.
2. Hai: Noted that current adult learner focus is on the Latine population.
3. Ashanti: Connected the priorities to Mesa 2030’s emphasis on Latine and Black students, noting that highlighting these groups:
 - a. Addresses equity gaps
 - b. Supports accreditation goals
 - c. Demonstrates targeted action using disaggregated data
4. Isabel: Added that completion and student success measures should be disaggregated by groups such as Latina and Black/African American students.

iii. Measures, Monitoring, and Sustainability

1. Holly: Asked how and when measures will be assessed. Annual? Semester-based? One-time? What is the sustainable tracking plan?
2. Ashanti: Proposed:
 - a. Establishing baseline data in 2025–26

- b. Conducting regular semester or annual check-ins
 - c. Reviewing data through relevant governance groups
 - d. Using findings to guide adjustments, especially for Latin students
3. Holly and Isabel: Noted that this level of clarity in tracking provides purpose and direction.

iv. Alignment Within the Triangle Structure

1. Hai: Asked how elevated priorities (Adult Learners, BSI) should be presented to the college. Should they be mapped within the triangle?
2. Ian: Asked how the priorities align with existing outcomes and objectives.
3. Holly: Asked where the priorities map onto the previously created structure.
4. Tara: Suggested each major priority could function like its own triangle, connecting mission, long-term goals, objectives, and actions.
5. Ayana: Asked whether strategic objectives are being tailored specifically to these two priorities.
6. Ashanti: Clarified:
 - a. The priorities are integrated into existing objectives.
 - b. They are elevated, not separate.
 - c. They will be tracked within the current framework.

v. Focus

1. Ian: Expressed concern that focusing on these priorities may signal that other objectives are being ignored.
2. Ashanti: Clarified that:
 - a. All strategic work continues.
 - b. Previously, there were 26 objectives; now there are 14.
 - c. In the prior cycle, responsibilities and benchmarks were unclear.
 - d. Moving forward, each objective will have:
 - i. Benchmarks
 - ii. Assigned responsibility
 - iii. Clear data tracking
3. The elevated priorities will model intentional, measurable implementation.

vi. Accountability and Responsibility

1. Ashanti: Emphasized that at the end of Mesa 2030:
 - a. Benchmarks will be set.
 - b. Responsibilities will be assigned.
 - c. Progress updates will highlight successes, challenges, and equity-focused outcomes.
This addresses prior concerns about lack of ownership and narrative coherence.

2. Isabel: Reinforced that measures (e.g., pathways and partnerships) should be disaggregated to intentionally track equity impact.
3. Ashanti: Directed Tara and Larry to review current objectives to ensure all are accurately reflected and aligned.

c. Suggested next steps

- i. Discuss “priorities” at the next workshop (Feb 26)
- ii. Clarify mapping structure
 1. Clearly show how Adult Learner and BSI priorities integrate within the existing triangle framework.
 2. Avoid presenting them as separate silos.
- iii. Refine Measurement Plan
 1. Establish 2025–26 baseline data.
 2. Define review cycle (semester or annual).
 3. Confirm responsible groups for monitoring.
- iv. Ensure Equity-Based Disaggregation
 1. Embed disaggregated tracking (Latine, Black/African American students) into measures and reporting.
- v. Assign Responsibility and Benchmarks
 1. Identify accountable leads for each strategic objective.
 2. Set clear benchmarks to avoid prior cycle gaps.
- vi. Return to PIE
 1. Present a near-final draft for review.
 2. Continue through the governance process.

2. SPAA [Info/Discussion] [Hoang]

- a. Everyone has a letter with SPA unit details, guidelines, and timelines. Recommendations go to PCAB April 21 (first reading) and May 19 (second reading). More info can be emailed and discussed at the next meeting.

Announcements

1. [PIEC Meeting Schedule '25-'26.docx](#)
2. Next Meeting: 02.24.2026
3. Adjournment 5:03 pm by Hai Hoang

Resources

1. [PIEC website](#)
2. [Integrated Planning Calendar](#)

Approval of Minutes

1. [2.24.26](#) Approval of 2.10.26 Minutes

2. Motioned: Ian Duckles - Seconded: Mary Gwin
3. Outcome: Minutes were approved

Minutes submitted by Brenna Bonikowske