

# SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

## Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee | Minutes

02.24.26 | 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>Vacant (I); Vacant (AS)</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>Vacant (A&amp;L); Vacant (M&amp;NS), Vacant (H)</b>
<b>Student Representative:</b>	<b>Vacant</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, Blythe Barton, Larry Maxey, Lorenze Legaspi, Courtney Lee, Tara Hardee Teodoro, Mary Gwin, Leland Simpliciano, Isabel O'Connor, Ashanti Hands, Ian Duckles, Lisa Shapiro, Victoria Miller, Ryan Shumacher

### A. Call to Order

1. This meeting was called to Order at 3:36 p.m. by Holly Jagielski.

### B. Approval of [February 10, 2026 Minutes](#)

1. Motioned: Ian Duckles - Seconded: Mary Gwin
2. Abstained: None
3. Outcome: Minutes were Approved

### C. Continuing Business

#### 1. [Committee Website Rubric](#)

*Holly: Victoria and I drafted a simple website review rubric (about 2 minutes to complete). Please provide feedback. Do you like this format? Who should complete this? Should PIEC be involved in the completion process? We can convert it to a Google Form.*

- a. Vicky: We recommend that the chair completes the rubric, with follow-up check ins to ensure that it's complete. Alternatively, a PIEC member who is a part of the specific committee could also complete the rubric and notify the chair.
- b. Ashanti: Would the rubric be the first point of contact? We could start by informing committees about what PIEC is reviewing (specific website elements) and give them a couple of months to make updates/find barriers. If needed, we can follow up later with the checklist.
  - i. Victoria: It is a softer way of getting the committees to review the website.
  - ii. Ian: Aren't we already doing this with GOV101 and Convocation?
    - 1. Holly: We previously shared the GOV101 link, but it's unclear if it's being reviewed. About 30 people attended the convocation session, so others may not be aware. I recommend a fall session—before committees meet—to clarify PIEC's expectations for website maintenance. Victoria and I suggest focusing on governance committees, as that approach worked best during our reviews.
  - iii. Blythe: If they answer no to a question, we should provide the next steps for the committees to take.
    - 1. Holly: Great idea, including who they should contact to help with their barrier.
    - 2. Ian: We should include a space for them to share any barriers.
      - a. Holly: There is a section at the bottom for suggestions. We're aiming to simplify the process—for example, Hai suggested listing positions only (not names) on the website to avoid frequent updates due to role changes.
        - i. Hai: PIEC suggestions to them are not their suggestions to us?
          - 1. Holly: If the chair completes it, it can serve as a self-check tool without a suggestions section. If a PIEC member completes it for another committee, a suggestions section would be included.
- c. Holly: Who should complete the rubric?
  - i. Blythe: We should start with the chair.
  - ii. Holly: We will send it to chairs as an informational resource, along with the GOV101 link and contact information for support with any barriers. It will go out this semester and again at the start of fall. I'll add the barriers section and distribute it.

## 2. SPAA Discussion

*Hai: SPAA is officially recognized as a bargaining unit. How can we integrate SPAA meaningfully and practically?*

- a. Ian: Offer representation at PIEC and PCAB. If they would like additional representation, they can raise it within those committees.
  - i. Holly: Who would be the representative of these committees?

1. Ian: They may select their representative, who would report back to them. We may also want to reconsider SPAA's seat, since AFT does not have representation on PCAB/PIEC.
- ii. Hai: They don't have a Senate but do meet. Should Brian Mackus, as SPAA director, be our point of contact to discuss representation?
  1. Ian: Yes, they can decide on representation.
- b. Ian: If SPAA is considered a bargaining unit, and AFT has no seats on PIEC or PCAB, should SPAA be treated differently?
  - i. Holly: If they are only a bargaining unit, should we mirror the AFT representation model?
    1. Ian: I believe AFT has representation at DGC, but that is at the district level, not Mesa.
    2. Hai: AFT has a seat at DGC.
- c. Victoria: How are the other schools doing it?
  - i. Hai: One college has a Senate-like model, and another is a model where they integrate it into the current classified structure.
  - ii. Mary: There is a Miramar individual that represents SPAA at DGC. He represents Miramar/SPAA.
    1. Ian: But he would be representing SPAA not Miramar SPAA he would just be SPAA
      - a. Mary: Yes, you are correct. I do not think we need to send anyone if there is already a representative.
- d. Ian: I do not think there would be anything wrong with having another person here at PIEC.
- e. Lorenze: We need to determine whether supervisors want committee representation or feel underrepresented. City College has representation on its PCAB.
- f. Lisa: Can SPAA currently join committees?
  - i. Hai: Participation is open to all; SPAA has been treated as classified, and no committee is specifically requesting SPAA representation.
  - ii. Lisa: If SPAA can join committees, then there is no reason why they are not getting/giving input. There is already an opportunity for them to participate.
  - iii. Lorenze: Are they aware that they can be represented under the classified umbrella?
  - iv. Isabel: How does that work with Classified are they aware of this as well?
    1. Hai: Most of my employees are SPAA members but are recognized within the Classified structure. They're already included and may run for Classified Senate president, as in the Miramar model.
      - a. Ian: They are a part of the classified senate?
        - i. Hai: Yes they can, if they want too
- g. Ian: I believe they are already represented. If SPAA wanted to go to PCAB, they would be able to do so and bring up topics at the end.

- h. Hai: Should we invite them to PIEC and ask about what they think?
- i. Ashanti: A SPAA representative has been added to the district. The district is leaving it up to the colleges to decide on SPAA representation. City is the only one that has anything defined. Miramar and CE are discussing it further.
- j. Hai: What should we ask if we invite SPAA into a meeting?
  - i. Blythe: Do you feel represented? If not, where would you like to be?
  - ii. Ashanti: We need to inform them on if you would like to get involved you are able to go through classified.
  - iii. Hai: We can see if Ayana is able to have a discussion with SPAA to see how Classified Senate can incorporate that structure.
- k. Isabel: I like Ian's idea of them being involved in PIEC and PCAB
- l. Hai: When it comes to Key Document submission to ACCJC, for example, do we need to include a SPAA signature, or should we wait to discuss that?
  - i. Ashanti: We do not need to go to that level yet.
- m. Hai: Next steps would be to invite them to next meeting.
  - i. Isabel: Given its sensitivity, this conversation should take place outside of PIEC.
  - ii. Victoria: We should create a safe space for conversation on the side with SPAA and then just report back.
  - iii. Ryan: We should first educate SPAA members, as many may not realize they already have representation through the Classified Senate.
    - 1. Ashanti: I agree.
    - 2. Ryan: They may feel underrepresented. Informing them and gathering feedback will likely require a multi-step process that takes time. What is the deadline?
      - a. Ashanti: We made the timeline up; we have the semester to figure it out.
      - b. Ryan: An infographic could outline their current representation, available channels for engagement, and the potential addition of seats on PIEC and PCAB. Sit with it and in a month ask if this is sufficient or not.

### 3. ACCJC Timeline Review

*Hai: Please review the revised packet. I'd like to highlight updates to Part 1, Part 3, and Part 4. The cycle is based on the calendar year. We're in the remainder of the reaffirmation cycle, with the midterm report due in two years. I've included a proposed timeline and welcome your feedback.*

- a. Ryan: We need to have incremental reporting on expectations or goals such as a checklist.
  - i. Hai: See Part 5 for the year-by-year implementation plan outlining what must be completed each semester.
- b. Isabel: Can we see the format for the Midterm report.
  - i. Hai: Yes, I can get that for the future meeting.

- c. Hai: To confirm at the last meeting, we decided that instead of having a 7-year, ACCJC workgroup of the ASC we will only establish the ASC as needed for the ISER and maybe the Midterm. I have adjusted the timeline based on this information.
- d. Lisa: Are we assuming the Dean of IE will serve as the ALO, or will we appoint someone separately? If we appoint the ASC, I'd argue we should also appoint the ALO, as the role is a significant responsibility for one person.
  - i. Isabel: I thought we were going to spread the work—multiple writers for the full report, with one unified voice at the end.
  - ii. Ashanti: With Hai in this role, I can supervise to ensure we stay aligned. We'll be more intentional, share responsibility, and I'll work closely with one point person, as I'm ultimately accountable. The midterm report has four sections focused on improvement, student achievement, assessment, and planning ahead. Each includes specific questions that will guide who gathers information. If we start now, we can stay organized and show how we're sustaining our work. The ISER process is separate—this report is a priority.
    - 1. Hai: What you stated aligns with the fall and spring.
  - iii. Isabel: Can we get time to review and bring it back to the next meeting?
    - 1. Hai: Yes.
  - iv. Ian: For standard section lead, would that be during years 2 and 5?
    - 1. Hai: Yes
    - 2. Holly: Have a copy, please read it and be ready to come back to the next PIEC meeting and we will move forward.

## D. New Business

### 1. ACCJC Annual Report

*Hai: Shared PowerPoint on Annual Report for ACCJC; Annual Fiscal Report due in April; we do this every year; keep on track to prepare for the ISER; for the midterm they will ask us to reference back to annual report. Need a more intentional approach to ACCJC report. Have 2% annual increase on actuals for aspirational and 1% annual increase for the floor.*

- a. Ryan: Did we decide that 2% will move forward permanently, or just for that one meeting?
  - i. Hai: We decided it will move forward permanently.
- b. Ryan: So regardless of our actuals, our aspirational goal will be 2% above them?
  - i. Hai: That was the decision.
  - ii. Isabel: It stems from the fact that many of our goals this year have been aspirational rather than grounded in reality.
- c. Ryan: In 2024, we set certain goals, and by 2025 we were adjusting them based on current performance. For example, if we're achieving 8%, we set a goal of 10%—even if that's still far

from where we should be. The idea has been to increase by a small margin, like moving from 97% to 99%, regardless of whether the overall number is strong enough.

- i. Hai: The goal will increase each year. We'll set a standard default goal to report annually and use our discussions to review results and adjust.
- d. Ryan: Can we say we met the goal because the bar was set too low?
  - i. Hai: Yes, we could.
- e. Ashanti: We might agree to it for now, but not long term. Our issue is timing—we tend to have these conversations right before deadlines, which makes them less meaningful. If we plan earlier, especially alongside efforts like Roadmap 2, transfer initiatives, and our strategic plans, we can set more realistic, intentional goals and have more productive discussions.
- f. Holly: This could be a great focus for the fall and spring PCAB retreats—using them for intentional conversations about progress and next steps. My question for Hai is whether we'll have the necessary data to support that discussion.
  - i. Hai: In 2024, PIEC emphasized intentional goal setting—identifying gaps, noting where targets were met, and aligning with ACCJC goals and campus processes like Roadmap 2, PCAB retreats, and annual program reviews. We haven't yet mapped out the timing because in 2024 our focus was on getting back on track with accreditation.

*Hai: With the 1% floor and 2% aspirational growth rule, we need to reset the baseline and ask: if we had applied 2% annual growth over five years, where would we be? Goals reflect targets; actuals reflect performance. Too low of goals lowers ambition; too high of goals discourages engagement—so intentional goal setting is critical. As you review the data, focus on trends, structural vs. performance changes, equity impact, Roadmap alignment—and decide what we'll do next.*

- g. Lisa: If we set a flat 2% growth rate, how do we account for economic factors? Since external conditions affect our growth, a fixed rate may not be realistic.
- h. Ryan: The 2% rule was decided in 2025, but flat growth doesn't account for environmental factors like the economy, enrollment shifts, funding changes, or policy impacts. Those conditions tell a bigger story. We've made progress where we've been intentional and invested resources—like improving outcomes reporting—and new priorities (e.g., Black-Serving Institution, adult learners) will also shift results. Growth isn't happening in a vacuum. That's why we need earlier, meaningful conversations focused on where we are now and where we're going, rather than simply projecting a fixed increase from five years ago.
- i. Ian: The 1% and 2% rule came from repeatedly guessing at targets in meetings without a clear basis. Instead of arbitrarily picking numbers, this approach sets an automatic benchmark so we can focus on meaningful analysis. Rather than debating what "looks good," we can examine trends—like COVID declines and plateaus—and ask what actions will actually move the numbers. That's a more productive use of our time.

- j. Holly: When we made that decision, we acknowledged these were our numbers and our reports, and committed to using them more intentionally to improve over time. That’s why we’re having this conversation today.
- k. Ryan: We’re trying to determine whether our efforts are truly making a meaningful difference for students. Ultimately, what matters most is actual performance and improvement over time—not just whether we technically met a goal.
- l. Ian: The data shows we’re improving, but not as much as we’d like. The question is: what will it take to move from our current performance to our aspirational goal?
- m. Ryan: If we improved course success from 76% to 85%, that’s far beyond 1–2% growth. We should ask: what did we do to drive that improvement?
- n. Ashanti: We need to reverse engineer this into our practices, so the data has meaning and tells a clear story. Too often, we focus on lag data instead of the lead measures that actually drive improvement. By aligning this work with Roadmap 2 and MESA 2030, we can set clear KPIs, connect actions to outcomes, and regularly review progress—so we know not just that numbers changed, but why. If we time it well, especially through intentional spaces like PCAB retreats, we can integrate it into our ongoing work rather than treat it as a compliance task. The key is aligning actions with our strategy and giving the process real purpose.
  - i. Holly: If I’m understanding correctly, many of these metrics are key drivers within the new, metric-focused Roadmap.
    - 1. Hai: Yes
- o. Isabel: We have room to improve across all metrics, especially when disaggregated, but we can’t focus on everything at once. Since course success, certificates, degrees, and transfer are interconnected, we need to prioritize where we can make the greatest impact. That means selecting a few key areas—such as associate degree attainment—and aligning resources and attention there, rather than spreading ourselves too thin.
  - i. Ashanti: If it were up to me, we’d focus on just one or two priorities at a time instead of trying to do everything. The idea is to choose a single “wildly important goal” (at most two) and dedicate about 20% of our energy to moving it, while 80% goes to day-to-day operations. The key is focusing on execution—tracking lead measures, monitoring progress regularly, and leveraging what we’re already doing—rather than spreading ourselves thin. We did this with accreditation and succeeded. If we applied that same focused approach to something like certificates or transfer, improvement would be inevitable because it would truly be our priority.
    - 1. Lisa: What would be your first choice?
      - a. Ashanti: We can start anywhere, but BSI and adult learners already require focused effort. To make the biggest impact, we should choose one clear priority—perhaps targeting the largest equity gaps—and focus on the key levers for change. The key is simply deciding on a focus.

- p. Ian: Since the ACCJC report doesn't drive real discussion, we can default to the 1% and 2% targets and move on—so we can focus our time on the priorities that truly matter, like transfer or course success.
- q. Ryan: Metrics are not mutually exclusive. If we focus on one thing, the others will follow.
- r. Isabel: Higher course success should lead to more degrees and certificates—but only if our processes ensure eligible students are identified and awarded.
  - i. Ryan: I agree—if we intentionally choose one or two priorities as a group, that's what matters. It can evolve over time.
  - ii. Ashanti: The work will still get done, but I'd love for us to narrow our focus to just two priorities and concentrate on those—I think we'd see meaningful results.
- s. Lorenze: MESA 2030 should be our primary space for tracking and assessing metrics, while the other report remains a secondary compliance task.
- t. Hai: We can fold this into MESA 2030 by focusing on high-impact areas—especially for disproportionately impacted students—and using these metrics as college-wide KPIs tied to funding and outcomes.
  - i. Isabel: I agree, why duplicate the work.
- u. Ryan: We should disaggregate the data and focus on the largest equity gaps, where we can make the most meaningful impact—rather than trying to prioritize everything.
- v. Holly: If we choose two priorities, we should clearly communicate them campus-wide—like a themed focus—so everyone aligns and moves in the same direction.
  - i. Ryan: This is a proactive, positive choice about what matters most to us, and this group has representation.
- w. Isabel: Focusing would require a clear plan—defining desired outcomes, aligning resources, and connecting all efforts, so everything leads in the same direction.
  - i. Holly: As we launch the next Roadmap, clearly naming our priorities shows we've listened and set a shared direction—building unity and intentional focus across campus.
    - 1. Isabel: We shouldn't impose priorities without context. Ground them in data, allow conversation, and create space for shared buy-in before finalizing.
  - ii. Blythe: To build buy-in, everyone needs a clear role. When people see their piece of work, it creates ownership and accountability.
  - iii. Lorenze: We embed the priorities into program review and Roadmap 2, tie them to resources, and institutionalize reflection and accountability.
  - iv. Ryan: We could incentivize the priorities by allocating extra resources to aligned efforts.
    - 1. Lorenze: There are resources now, but how do we ensure they stay aligned with MESA 2030 and remain focused on those priorities?
  - v. Isabel: I agree—but since everyone can check every box, we need to be more intentional and careful in how we apply it.

Hai: *What should be our next steps?*

- x. Blythe: Where are we seeing the biggest gaps?
- y. Ian: Which metrics will give us the greatest return on investment?
  - i. Ryan: Let's disaggregate by race and ethnicity to pinpoint the biggest equity gaps and focus where the need is greatest.
  - ii. Hai: We're developing an equity report, though it may not fully show the gaps.
  - iii. Holly: Many students already qualify for certificates but don't receive them due to process gaps—not student shortcomings. That's a system issue we need to address. Financial aid funding as well.

## **2. Chancellors Forum:**

- a. Aligns with the 2<sup>nd</sup> PIEC meeting in March. Would we like to meet after the forum or cancel the meeting?
  - i. Consensus voted to cancel the PIEC meeting on 3/24/26

## **E. Announcements**

- 1. [PIEC Meeting Schedule '25-'26.docx](#)
- 2. Next Meeting: 03.10.26

## **F. Resources**

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

## **G. Approval of Minutes**

- 1. [3.10.26](#) - Approval of 2.24.26 Minutes
  - a. Motioned: Ian Duckles - Seconded: Lisa Shapiro
  - b. Outcome: Minutes were approved
  - c. Abstained: Ayana Woods

**Minutes Submitted by: Brenna Bonikowske**