

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee | Minutes

04.14.26 | 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); Vacant (I); Vacant (AS)
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); Vacant (A&L); Vacant (M&NS), Vacant (H)
Student Representative:	Vicki Gonzales
Consultants (Non-Voting):	Ashanti Hands (President); Larry Maxey (SS); Jacqueline Collins (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, Ian Duckles, Blythe Barton, Ayana Woods, Isabel O'Connor, Jacqueline Collins, Lisa Shapiro, Ashanti Hands, Tara Teodoro, Mary Gwin, Larry Maxey, Ryan Schumacher, Victoria Miller, Courtney Lee, Vicki Gonzales

A. Call to Order

1. This meeting was called to order by Holly Jagielinski at 3:33 p.m.
2. Welcome new members – Jacqueline Collins and Vicki Gonzales

B. Approval of [March 10th 2026 Minutes](#)

1. Motioned: Ian Duckles - Seconded: Ayana Woods
2. Outcome: Consensus Approved Minutes

C. Continuing Business

1. Committee Report Outs
 - a. [SET \(Maxey\) & Classified Hiring \(Maxey\)](#)

- a. Blythe: CLOs were standardized this year, while PLOs are determined by each unit, with varying approaches using either CLO data or broader assessments.
 - i. Isabel: Other colleges use technology to aggregate CLOs into PLOs alongside departmental discussion; this may be explored by COA.
 - b. Ian: In Social Sciences, Nuventive is used to roll up CLO data into PLOs, while other programs may use different methods. Documentation is automated, with analysis discussed in department meetings.
 - c. Blythe: With the shift to Nuventive, CLOs were clearly mapped to PLOs and ILOs, allowing easy access to aligned data, with flexibility for deeper analysis.
 - d. Ian: In Social Sciences, PLOs are mapped to ILOs and CLOs to PLOs, forming a structured alignment; other programs may vary.
 - e. Isabel: The 9.2% PLO rate may be low due to under documentation of CLO-to-PLO alignment, despite strong CLO performance.
 - i. Ian: Some faculty may not have completed PLO documentation in Nuventive due to pending steps.
 - ii. Blythe: The June 30 deadline has been shared, and departments are working to complete assessments, with expected increases in May and June.
- ii. Hai: PR- Updates include division-specific prompts and alignment with Roadmap 2, along with changes to timelines, budget, training, and governance. A proposal that is being considered would shift the comprehensive review to 2027–28, using 2026–27 for a regular, goal-aligned review.
 - 1. Ian: I have concerns about potential accreditation impacts and ensuring compliance with required timelines.
 - a. Hai: I share your concern about accreditation; further discussion will take place later in the meeting but since we are going to still have a regular program review, it will be fine from an ACCJC standpoint. In fact, it may be better because we have a very good reason -to be more intentional on planning for roadmap 2
 - 2. Holly: Will there be sufficient program review data for the 2028 ACCJC midterm report if the comprehensive review occurs in 2027–28?
 - a. Hai: Yes.
 - iii. Hai: ACCJC -
 - 1. Hai: A 7-year framework was discussed in March and presented to PCAB for first reading; action items are pending and will be brought to an upcoming PIE meeting.

2. Hai: Federal accreditation discussions are shifting from process-based compliance to outcome-based accountability, focusing on measurable results (student success, employment, and return on investment). Accreditation reforms are still under discussion, with final recommendations expected by November 1, 2026.
3. Ashanti: Current standards focus on having a defined process and following it. If timelines shift, providing a clear rationale and evidence of implementation is sufficient for accreditation.
 - a. Hai: Program review is referenced across all accreditation standards and represents a significant portion of required evidence, making changes to the process a valid concern.

2. [Roadmap 2.0 Update](#)

Slides 2-3 Hai: Mission updates follow a 10-year cycle with a mid-cycle review every 5 years (years 4 and 9).

The next mission review is scheduled for 2029 and aligns with reviews of vision, values, and strategic priorities.

- a. Ryan: Could an evergreen planning model be used, with overlapping 10-year plans that reassess progress at year 5 and integrate transitions to avoid a mid-cycle break?
 - i. Hai: The final year of the five-year cycle serves as a transition into the next plan.
- b. Ryan: With Mesa2030 in its second half (2025–30), when will planning begin for the next phase beyond 2030 (2031–35)?
 - i. Hai: Mission, vision, and values will be reviewed in Spring 2029 to prepare for Mesa2040. This serves as a transition period at the end of Roadmap 2, with the next roadmap beginning in 2031.
- c. Ryan: A longer transition period may be needed to develop and launch MESA 2040 if significant changes are required, but 1–2 years may be sufficient if direction remains consistent.
 - i. Hai: Consider a minimum timeline, with the option to initiate a review if major changes occur.
 - ii. Holly: During the 2028–2029 review, gaps and unmet goals will be identified and carried forward into the next 10-year cycle for continued improvement.
 - iii. Ryan: Concerned that a 10-year timeline may be too long.
- d. Blythe: Were there significant changes or shifts during the transition to the Mesa2030 Plan?
 - i. Ashanti: There was no major change. Ongoing roadmap work will help identify gaps and adjustments needed. Core goals are expected to remain stable, while strategies may change based on data, with opportunities to update every 5 years.

Slides 4-16 Hai: Since Spring 2025, the process has progressed to refinement and approval, shifting from broad input to targeted review. The plan, informed by state and national trends, includes a nearly complete strategic component (~90%) and a developing implementation approach (~50%). Roadmap 2 emphasizes measurable outcomes, with divisions and departments determining strategies, and aligns planning across all levels, with program review guiding implementation and reporting.

- e. Mary: How does the model account for budget changes, such as federal funding cuts, and their impact on planning?
 - i. Hai: Improving alignment between activities and goals can help address budget challenges by focusing efforts on division priorities, rather than broad or scattered initiatives.
- f. Ian: Can the newly added outcomes (in green) for stewardship/ pathways & partnerships be revised?
 - i. Hai: The new items (in green) are open to revision, while existing elements (in black) are considered stable unless significant changes are needed.
- g. Holly: Not all activities need to be formal outcomes, especially if they are already captured by existing measures.
 - i. Hai: The outcome may fit structurally under stewardship, though it is also included under partnerships based on differing perspectives.
 - ii. Blythe: Option to remove the outcome from pathways and instead include it as a new outcome under stewardship, without adding new measures.
- h. Ian: Concerned that the new outcome is unclear and difficult to measure.
- i. Holly: Is the new outcome necessary if the existing measures already support other outcomes?
- j. Ian: External partnerships are part of the goal, but no current outcome reflects them; adding an outcome aligned to these measures may be appropriate.
- k. Isabel: Outcomes should be more clearly defined and measurable, potentially including specific targets or percentages to better align with goals and track progress.
 - i. Hai: Specific targets will not be set at the college level due to limited expertise of the workgroup; instead, measurable goals will be defined at the division level and subsequent conversations with appropriate inputs from the relevant folks/content experts.
 - a. Isabel: Concerned that without clear, centralized targets, division-level goal setting may lead to misalignment with overall institutional goals.
 - b. Ryan: VP-level plans should be established first to guide division and department goals, ensuring alignment with institutional priorities and preventing fragmented efforts.
 - c. Mary: Where in the model does district-level funding get allocated—at the divisional level or through program review?
 - i. Ayana: I believe Nicole handles that process and can provide more clarity.
 - ii. Hai: Regular program review allocations (e.g., ~\$250K) and funding for hiring are managed within this scope.
 - iii. Ryan: The core question is whether campus-level funding decisions, beyond set allocations, are made at the divisional level by VPs or at the department level by deans and chairs.

- l. Isabel: Planning should include a strategic component to align goals with funding opportunities and potentially increase resources.
- m. Hai: PCAB will review the overall framework next week; detailed elements, including timelines, goals, and revisions, will be addressed in PIE afterward.

D. New Business

1. ACCJC Annual Report (Due April 15- Extended to May 1): [Outcomes Transparency](#)

Hai: ACCJC annual reporting is in progress, including student achievement data and data transparency reflections. Improvements include homepage access and strong dashboards, though challenges remain with public data, learning outcomes, and institutional storytelling. Improvement actions will be developed based on this analysis, and the report will be submitted accordingly.

2. [Governance Survey](#)

Hai: A governance survey will be sent out now and again in the fall to ensure participation and allow year-to-year comparison.

- a. Blythe: What is in the survey?
 - i. Hai: The survey will assess alignment with college goals, meeting effectiveness, participation, inclusivity, and overall committee operations and culture.
- b. Victoria: Is there anything you need from us? Can a QR code be included? What was the 2024 response rate, and when will the survey be distributed?
 - i. Hai: Please remind your teams; a QR code will be included, and the survey will be distributed next week.
 - ii. Holly: The turn out in 2024 could be better.
- c. Blythe: Can this include guidance on administering the survey, such as setting aside time for completion.
 - i. Hai: Yes.

3. [CHP Presentation](#)

- a. Larry: The process is complete and had its first reading at PCAB. While no major improvements were identified, discussions noted challenges when no positions are available. Top-ranked items were identified, and a second reading will take place at the next PCAB meeting.

4. SPAA **[Next Meeting]**

5. [Governance Handbook; Mesa Master Committee Flow Chart](#) **[Next Meeting]**

Meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m. by Hai Hoang; Minutes Submitted by: Brenna Bonikowske

Approval of Minutes on 4/28/26

1. Motioned: Blythe Barton - Seconded: Ian Duckles
2. Outcome: Minutes Approved by Consensus
3. Abstained: Lisa Burget and Lisa Shapiro