

San Diego Mesa College  
Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Meeting Notes

04/25/2023

3:30 – 5:00 PM, Zoom

ATTENDEES	
<b>Co-Chairs</b>	<b>Classified Professionals</b>
Holly Jagielinski	VACANT (Administrative)
Hai Hoang	Courtney Lee
	VACANT (Instruction)
<b>Administration</b>	
Victoria Miller	<b>Faculty</b>
Ryan Shumaker (Absent)	John Crocitti (A Senate President)
	Ian Duckles
<b>Consultants</b>	Jill Moreno Ikari (Absent)
Marisa Alioto (Excused)	Holly Jagielinski
Howard Eskew	
Ashanti Hands	Scott Plambek
Lorenze Legaspi	Nathan Resch (Absent)
Larry Maxey	Lisa Shapiro
Isabel O'Connor	Barbara Sexton (Absent)
Toni Parsons	Valerie Pallares (Absent)
Michelle Rodriguez	Andrew Hoffman
Alexander Berry	Paige Hu
	<b>Student Representative</b>
	VACANT
<b>Administrative Support:</b> Gity Nematollahi	<b>Guest(s):</b> N/A

**Agenda Item A:**

DISCUSSION:
<p><b>1. Call to Order:</b> Holly Jagielinski at 3.33 PM in Zoom.</p> <p><b>2. Approval of DATE Meeting Minutes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A draft of the agenda and minutes were emailed to PIEC (Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee) prior to the meeting for review.</li> <li>○ The minutes from 04/11/2023 were M/S by Ian Duckles and John Crocitti and approved by all.</li> </ul>

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post approved minutes to the website.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gity Nematollahi</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Before the next meeting.</li> </ul>

**Agenda Item B: Continuing Business**

DISCUSSION:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Introducing Paige Hu, the new committee member.</b></li> <li><b>BARC and CHP Recommendation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The role of PIE in resource request process is for PIE to help with the templates, and through the program review process, thus comes the planning, driven budget, allocation for BARC, CHP, and FHP.</li> <li>This year, we are trying to switch the system with a shared rubric for the first time with all the committees.</li> <li>With BARC, sustainability is the new additive of the rubric. We are excited to start understanding more how sustainability is reflected within request processes for a BARC. A very similar conversation for CHP. In 2019, we changed the process in BARC and CHP to add equity to the rubric. The first 2 years, people were really trying to figure out how to tie their requests to equity. Now, those are not questions any more about equity. Now, sustainability is one of those areas that is new to the rubric and there are some questions in the norming process for both BARC and CHP</li> <li>BARC recommendation process was smooth. We are being consistent with our own ranking like how we do in hiring committees, and every year with BARC.</li> <li>The one through ten rubric which was agreed upon as the standard for the recommendation committees really allowed us to get granular on the individual requests. Before we used to use a one through 5 rubrics.</li> <li>Through the ranking process, we determined the FAQs and training for next year. Specifically, deciding on what should be in BARC. Currently there might be some suggestions to change, and notifications will be sent out as soon as it goes through PCAB.</li> <li>Next steps of process for BARC and CHP we discuss it here, take your feedback and then take it to PCAB for a first and second reading. Then we will send out notifications to requesters. One of every three requesters will be funded. The ones not funded, we are ready and willing to have a conversation if they have any questions about it and conditionally funded for those projects that require more conversation.</li> <li>How do we determine funding: similarly, to CHP and FHP, for BARC determination of funding or not happens at the President's office and that level. It depends on the needs and the size of the requests. We do not score on cost because it is difficult for the committee without a lot full more information to determine one thing more or less than</li> <li>We have enough funds to get through most of the list, depending on how high they ranked.</li> <li>CHP has a new scoring system. One thing that we have noticed is the size of the committee this year. There were some transitions in the leadership, as Ellen Angles received a promotion to the district office, we have one less person scoring. There are only about 6 or 7 people ranking in the committee which we thought might skew or might not be a full representation of the classified perspective of needs on campus. We are going to be looking at, making sure that we have more representation from all areas of campus, looking at the charge and composition and</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

making sure that all areas are there scoring, because if only 6 people are scoring, that is not what each person weighs. They are scoring a little bit more than we have in the past years.

3. FHP recommendation

- We are going to have our business meeting, so we can have input on how to improve the process for next year. The titles are something that we suggested that people should be a bit more explicit on exactly what they are asking for, because there were some new faculty.
- There were several requests for C-Cap faculty members, and we really cannot ask specifically for that because that faculty member might not be scheduled on our campus. They might be scheduled in high school. It is not a separate minimum call; it is not a separate teaching specialty. You teach the same college level course for C-CAP (College and Career Access Pathways) that you do here on the Mesa campus.
- We initially had a problem where the English program put 4 or 5 into one request. The requests must be separated even for the same faculty.
- As of yesterday, we do not know how many retirements took place, so how many full-time faculty hires we will get for the next cycle.
- In general, the process worked much better and smoother this year. Last year, we did it twice, the first time was during Covid. We tried the best we could to do a process that we thought would work, and we were trying to apply the second time around.
- The committee is half deans and half faculty, and it rotates every 2 years. So, if your school is for 2 years as a dean. Then the next 2 years it goes to faculty, and then it is co-chaired by the Academic Senate President and the Vpi. In the past we struggled because the process was unusual, and it was an accelerated process, but we tried the best we could.
- There was data available, and one had to interpret it or justify the request, based on data. But the data did not automatically fill in a portion of the score, and that improved the process.
- We had some very well-organized training sessions. It was not overwhelmingly attended, but for the people who did attend it it was helpful.
- We did not get an opportunity to apply for the Native American supporting institution. the request for a native American tenure track was independent of the grant that our college did not receive.
- Regarding the English Faculty hiring request, it is possible that people lowered the score because there are multiple requests and they gave a certain score to the first one they read, and then, if the second one was identical, they gave it a little lower score. There is a next level review which is the president, and she looks at the comprehensive picture. English has suffered a lot of retirement, and they have not been filled in, she will know that people on this committee do not necessarily know that. So that is why this is not the final list. There is a different level of review, and I know the President takes this very seriously.
- Staying on the committee are 3 of the Deans, Linda Hensley from Humanities, Andy Mcneil from Library Resources, and Cassandra's story from Allied health. The faculty who will remain on the committee are Marriott Ratner from business technology, Michael Brewer from Math and Science and Lindsay Samaniego from Exercise Science. Those who will be rotating out from the faculty Thekima Mayasa will rotate out, as will Nellie Dougherty and they will be replaced by Deans from their respect of schools. The Deans who rotate out will be Ailene Crakes and Leslie Shimazaki, and they will be replaced by faculty members from their respective schools.

4. Governance Survey

- We have set the governance survey on a three-year cycle, and in the year of 21-22. We sent out the governance survey, looked at the findings, and then discussed earlier in the fall semester. Ian was acting Co-chair with Bridget. There was some conversation about the governance survey, and I wanted to dive deeper into some information.
- We had some questions about communication, and how the different governance committees were communicating their work to the broader campus community. We had sent out a request to 12 governance committee chairs that we identified, asking them about how they handle their website, and who updates it. who how often they update it. Their procedure for updating it, etc. Of the 12 we got responses from 3 committees. We need to go out again requesting that information.
- That action item about communication was a result of what we saw on the Governance Survey that was sent out Spring of 2022.
- We will continue with this charge of working to get more information from the other 9 committees to be able to produce either some form of survey, or some form of finding to be able to see what is needed to better improve communication.
- We are on a 3-year cycle, and most of the members of the committee are new in comparison to when that 3-year cycle was determined. We were thinking that it might be a better opportunity to run the Governance survey every other year.
- Ian Duckles motioned to move it to a 2-year cycle instead of 3-year. Andrew Hoffman second it. All in favor.
- We will send the survey out again next march instead of waiting for the 2024-25 calendar year.

5. **Follow up on GOV 101**

- At the last GOV 101 meeting we created an agenda template suggestion for committees to use as a tool if needed. It was sent out to the GOV 101 workgroup to receive feedback. It was just a suggestion and reminder to our chairs to help them be more efficient and effective in orienting their new committee members.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• none	•	•

**Agenda Item C: New Business**

DISCUSSION:
1. None

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

**Agenda Item D: Announcements/ Adjournment**

DISCUSSION:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The meeting adjourned at 4:10, motioned by John Crocitti.</li> <li>2. <b>Next meeting: 05/09/2023</b></li> <li>3. <a href="#">Meeting Schedule 2022-2023</a></li> </ol>

Submitted by: Gity Nematollahi

Approved on: