

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes

March 12, 2024

LRC 435

3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Attendees

Holly Jagielinski, Hai Hoang, Andrew Hoffman, Howard Eskew, Ryan Shumaker, Michelle Rodriguez, Victoria Miller, Courtney Lee, Michelle Rodríguez, Jill Moreno Ikari, Simpliciano

A. Call to Order: Holly Jagielinski

1. Approval of [02/ 27 /24 Minutes](#)

- Motion: The motion for the approval of the minutes from February 27, 2024, was presented by Andrew Hoffman.
- Second: The motion was seconded by Ryan Shumaker.
- Approval: The minutes were officially approved on March 12, 2024.

2. Committee Report Out (2 minutes per committee)

1. Mesa Pathways (Eskew)

- A. **Mapping Process Update:** The mapping process, conducted by our counseling team, is still underway. As of our latest meeting, programs are complete, requiring only minor updates. These updates will soon be distributed to the appropriate faculty teams, with the aim of finishing the first round by mid to late April.
- B. **Future:** Work will continue updating the next batch of program maps, focusing next on our local associate degrees and certificates. This effort will lead to the final group of program maps, achieving the target of 90 set by the foundation.
- C. **Presentations and Outreach:** Our team is scheduled to present to one final constituency group, the Academic Affairs and Academic Senate, in April. This session is part of our ongoing efforts to engage with key groups within the institution.

2. SET (Maxey)

3. Program Review (Hoang)

4. Budget Allocation and Recommendation Committee (Legaspi)

A. BARC List

5. Faculty Hiring (Hoffman)

6. Classified Hiring (Legaspi/Cannock)

A. Classified Hiring Priority List

7. [Environmental Sustainability \(Rodriguez\)](#)
8. [Diversity, Action, Inclusion, and Equity \(Miller\)](#)
9. Accreditation (Hoang)
 - A. We are currently awaiting the ACCJC report and findings. The anticipated receipt of this information is by next week.
 - B. A committee member raised an important question concerning the oversight and integration of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the institutional level. There's interest in developing a systematic process like the Program Review. The member proposed exploring a more intentional and systematic approach to ensure SLOs are addressed during the curriculum approval process. The idea is to establish clear timelines and review processes for Outcome assessment rather than retroactively. This would involve a preliminary review of course proposals or revisions for SLO compliance, potentially streamlining the process for updating or deactivating courses that are underused or were established before the current emphasis on SLOs.
 - C. The conversation highlighted the need for a more structured framework
10. HSI (Hispanic Serving Institution) Programs (Parsons)
11. [AANAPISI Programs \(Simpliciano\)](#)

B. New Business

1. [FHP \(Faculty Hiring Priority\) Presentation](#) - First Reading (I. O'Connor, A. Hoffman) (15 minutes)
 - A. **Membership:** The FHP committee, featuring a broad representation from across the campus including many administrators and some faculty members, provided an update on their recent activities. The committee outlined their timeline and review process, noting that the review initiated on February 23rd was not entirely completed due to some confusion over multiple position requests (e.g., English 1, English 2, English 3), which led to inconsistencies in scoring. Despite these challenges, a vote was successfully conducted by the March 1st meeting.
 - B. **Rubric:** The presentation reiterated the use of the familiar rubric, shared in the previous meeting, which focuses on equity, excellence, innovation, and sustainability. This rubric supports the evaluation across these key areas, with detailed bullet points provided for each criterion.

- C. **Faculty Hiring Priority List:** A list of prioritized areas was revealed, which had been determined through the scoring process. This list includes prioritized areas such as Business Biology, Communication Studies, and English Journalism, extending down to Japanese and Japan Studies, among others. Unlike the budget allocation process in previous year, there was not a fixed amount of funding to delineate a cut-off; however, a prioritization line was established to guide the allocation of resources.
- D. **Recommendation:** The committee citing examples like the need for new contract faculty in Communication Studies to replace two retirees. The presentation concluded with an opportunity for attendees to review the data and ask questions, emphasizing the ongoing need to refine the request and evaluation process for clarity and consistency.

2. [Mesa College Climate Action Plan](#) feedback (Rodriguez) (10 minutes)

- A. The report began with an acknowledgment of the importance of addressing sustainability and the challenges of integrating exact language and criteria into our processes without a thorough vetting, specifically in areas such as sustainability evaluation. The lack of discussion around these criteria was noted, highlighting the ongoing effort to address these concerns within the Climate Action Plan (CAP).
- B. **Key Highlights:**
 - a. **Framework Adoption:** The CAP is structured around the framework developed by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE), utilizing the STARS (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System) to set measurable goals. The aim is to achieve a gold rating from AASHE, indicating a broad commitment to sustainability.
 - b. **Action Plan Components:** The CAP covers several critical areas, including planning and governance, education, transportation, waste management, building standards, and district-wide initiatives. Each segment outlines specific goals and recommended actions to enhance sustainability practices across the college.
 - c. **Academic Integration:** A notable goal is to ensure that 90% of majors include at least one course with a sustainability designation, promoting sustainability education across disciplines.
 - d. **Transportation:** As the largest source of campus emissions, strategies for promoting alternative transportation and recognizing students who utilize sustainable transport methods are emphasized.
 - e. **Engagement and Governance:** The report stressed the need for a coordinated sustainability governance structure. It discussed the potential for a district sustainability officer to oversee and drive efforts across campuses, leveraging funding opportunities for sustainability initiatives.
- C. **Discussion and Suggestions:**

- a. The necessity of clear governance and coordination for sustainability efforts was a recurring theme, underscoring the challenge of integrating sustainability into various facets of campus operations without a centralized body.
- b. The idea of a self-sustaining position funded through grants was suggested, highlighting the potential for a district sustainability officer to not only coordinate efforts but also secure external funding to support sustainability initiatives.
- c. Community engagement and leveraging partnerships with other institutions were discussed as crucial strategies for enhancing sustainability practices and achieving the CAP's goals.
- d. Innovative ideas for campus-wide sustainability initiatives, such as textbook recycling events, were proposed to foster a sense of community involvement and contribute to the broader goals of the CAP.
- e. The presentation concluded with an invitation for feedback and suggestions, emphasizing the open comment period for the CAP and the importance of community input in shaping Mesa College's sustainability efforts.

D. Next Steps:

- a. Feedback and suggestions from the college community will be solicited to refine and improve the CAP.
- b. The CAP will be presented to support various campus bodies, including the Associated Students, Classified Senate, and Academic Senate.
- c. The Mesa College Climate Action Plan represents a comprehensive approach to enhancing sustainability practices across the campus, with a focus on measurable goals, community engagement, and strategic planning for a sustainable future.

C. Continuing Business

1. Mesa 2030 focus: Completion
 - i. Review [Electronic results](#), review the [Activities](#), discussion on progress and success, confirm the leads, communication update

D. Announcements

1. [Meeting schedule for 2023-2024](#)
2. Next Meeting: April 9, in person – LRC 435

E. Action Items

1. Remarks from the Chair of the PIE (Planning and Institutional Effectiveness) Committee:
The chair provided an update on the ongoing efforts and priorities of the PIE committee, emphasizing the continued focus on the roadmap and its associated metrics. Despite recent delays due to time-sensitive tasks and ensuring adherence to correct processes, the chair assured us that the work related to the roadmap has not been overlooked and remains a priority for the committee.
2. Furthermore, the chair highlighted the importance of the upcoming discussions around the ACCJCC Annual Report. This annual exercise, familiar to the committee, involves setting standards and aspirations for various metrics. The next meeting, scheduled for April 9, is expected to dedicate significant time to this activity, reflecting its importance to the committee's work.

Reminders

Useful links:

[Review of PIEC \(PIE Committee\) website](#)

[2023-2024 Goals](#)

[Integrated Planning](#)

[Program review resources](#)

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned by Holly Jagielinski at 4:35 p.m.

Note: The minutes capture the essence of the discussions, focusing on the outcomes and decisions made. Specific details and participant contributions are documented in the full meeting transcript for reference.

Submitted by: Mona King

Approved on