

**San Diego Mesa College
PIE Committee
Meeting Notes**

September 27, 2016
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., MC 211B

ATTENDEES	Madeleine Hinkes, Co-Chair	Pamela Luster
	Meegan Feori, Co-Chair	Andrew MacNeill
		Tim McGrath (excused)
	Rachelle Agatha	Victoria Miller
	Danene Brown (excused)	Kim Perigo
	Kristan Clark	Charlotta Robertson
	Genevieve Esguerra	Monica Romero
	Matt Fay (excused)	Irena Stojimirovic
	Rob Fremland	Manuel Velez
	Ashanti Hands	Yolanda Catano
	Brianna Hays	Charlie Lieu
	Leroy Johnson (excused)	

Agenda Item A: Call to Order: By Madeleine Hinkes at 3:34 p.m. in MC 211B.

DISCUSSION	<p>1. Approval of the September 13, 2016 Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes draft was emailed to PIEC prior to the meeting for review. • Victoria Miller will recruit a Student Representative. • The minutes were M/S/C by Rob Fremland and Kim Perigo .
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post the PIEC minutes to webpage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yolanda Catano 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As soon as possible

Agenda Item B: Continuing Business

DISCUSSION	<p>1. Integrated Planning Calendar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few changes were made to the Integrated Planning Calendar. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fremland made changes to the Program Review cycle. ▪ • Based on the results of the Integrated Systems Planning Survey, Program
-------------------	--

	<p>Review makes the recommendations for changes before summer. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness implements changes approved during spring and tests functionality of modules.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hinkes combined BARC, CHP, and FHP. It could be changed to Resource Allocation. • The Outcomes Assessment planning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summer will be the time when we close Taskstream in order to clean up all of the tasks and move the new entries to Curricunet. ▪ The deadline to change PLOs in catalog needs to be included under Outcomes Assessment. The deadline is March 7, 2017. <p>2. Proposed Goals for 2016-2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hinkes will send PIE the Proposed Goals for comments. <p>3. Institutional Planning & Governance Guide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Guide will be expanded to Institutional Planning & Governance. Susan Topham did a lot of the governance work. It will discuss what shared governance is and what type of work the committees will do. • Dawn Whiting, Administrative Technician for the President’s Office will be the governance administrator and will ensure that all the minutes from participatory governance committees are posted. • The Instructional Structure will be updated with all of the contact information. Student Services and Administrative Services are currently being updated.
--	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1. Homework: Look over the Integrated Planning Calendar and provide feedback ▪ 2. Hinkes will email all assignments from IP Guide. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. ALL • 2. PIE, Catano, and Hinkes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. October 11 • 2. October 11

Agenda Item C: New Business

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Multi-Year Cycle <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 2. Vision Statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
-------------------	--

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

Agenda Item D: Research

DISCUSSION	<p>Bri Hays (30 mins)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hays provided a PowerPoint presentation on Distance Education Student Achievement Trends. • Link: http://www.sdmesa.edu/about-mesa/institutional-effectiveness/planning-and-institutional-effectiveness-committee/bri-
-------------------	---

[powerpoints/Distance%20Ed%20ISS%20Presentation%20to%20PIEC%209-27-16.pdf](#)

- Online education has changed in the past 10 years, with improvements in course success rates for both on-campus and online classes. However, there is still a gap between online and in person classes. In program review research and data trainings, questions have come up regarding course retention. Is a low online course retention rate driving the lower success rate? Ideally, we need to answer a number of questions related to distance education (DE), including distance education student demographics, needs for support, and course-taking patterns.
- Hays allowed a couple of minutes for discussion on the following:
 - 1) How will we establish standards for distance education student achievement and other key performance indicators?
 - Success
 - Retention
 - Others?
 - 2) What information do we need?
 - Perigo-If the argument is made that DE courses are equivalent, what we are using face to face courses should be the equivalent for student experience. This means we could expect success rates to be similar to assure the educational experience is comparable.
 - With the new use of technology, we look at a data set that gives us an accurate predictor. Not trace it back too far back where we can't get too much information.
 - MacNeill-Establishing standards and goals from the beginning. Look at the history of improving and where we were at the beginning and where we are now. For example, has an instructional design been helpful for instructors?
 - Fremland-If our success and retention is better than the state or the nation? That would help us move forward.
 - Do we have data on student retention?
 - Clark-Track those students who have previously taken DE classes versus who are first timers.
 - Hinkes-Look at the data from the instructors who have high success rates.
 - Feori-Maybe separate DE from CTE. It would then be a different discussion.
 - Hays-A lot of this was placing the data in a context. We need a research agenda that would inform the work that we do in Institutional Research to support DE planning. There will be an online survey about what classes students want to take. The district does send a satisfaction course survey, but Mesa IR would create one that is more directly tailored to our students.
 - Velez-Chair of Chairs is developing a document for guidelines and recommendations for instructors when they develop these courses. Would like to work closely with Hays on this.
 - Perigo-A lot of questions have come up in Academic Senate about DE.
 - There is a sub-committee for DE under Academic Senate. I think part of the discussion is the evaluation process. What about if the faculty who is aiding the evaluation process, but does not teach DE, what does that look like?
 - Stojimorovic-Do we have some information over success rates for students who are taking online classes? Students who are taking online

	<p>classes need to be more motivated in order to succeed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lieu-Are there standards that faculty have to follow with DE? Does someone monitor their work? ▪ Perigo-They've been through an evaluation process.
--	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Hays will bring data on region and state comparison to Mesa College 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Hays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. By next meeting

Agenda Item E: Accreditation

DISCUSSION	<p>Danene Brown: 5 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard IIB is up for vetting. • There is a form where you can comment on Accreditation webpage. • Standard IIC is next.
-------------------	---

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

Agenda Item F: Student Success/Equity/Title V:

DISCUSSION	<p>Monica Romero: 5 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Romero provided a Prezi Presentation on Proyecto Exito 2016. • Link: http://prezi.com/hftq8dzlwrqg/?utm_campaign=share&utm_medium=copy • The Hispanic Serving Institution, Title V Grant is starting its third year. The goal of the grant is to make institutional change. • Student Engagement-We have three different pieces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summer CRUISE ▪ Peer Navigators ▪ Developing the Student Engagement Center • Tutoring-To cover our gateway courses: English, Math, Astronomy, Geography, ESOL, Psychology, French, Chemistry. The model of supplemental instruction came from the STEM fields. • Professional Learning-One of the pieces was to build a place for professional engagement and learning. The center was developed and that is the LOFT. • Curriculum- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Personal Growth 110 ▪ English 31 ▪ Service Learning ▪ Learning Communities • Math- Identified a number of areas that needed assistance in professional development. Modified the basic skills and basic skills pathways and assessment. From the grant perspective, they want to look at all the gateway courses and the success rates. What do most students need? • ESOL-The first step is that they had a piloted course. They began with accelerated pathways.
-------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team-On link.
--	---

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

Agenda Item G: Program Review

DISCUSSION	<p>Madeleine Hinkes: 10 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
-------------------	--

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

Agenda Item H: Committee on Outcomes and Assessment (COA)

DISCUSSION	<p>Kris Clark: 5 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark took the Revised ILOs to Academic Senate and they voted them down. • Fremland brought feedback from Academic Senate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ They expressed that there was an issue with timing and that they felt pressured to conduct outcomes assessment. ▪ The general consensus was that people feel that the benefit to make the changes outweigh the costs. The mapping was an issue. They weren't convinced that there was a benefit from the changes from 6 to 4 ILOs. ▪ Velez-The faculty didn't feel like there was a compelling argument on why there were changes to the ILOs. And in part it was the issue of the principle of the thing. • Luster-The governance group did an amount of research that would justify the reason for sustainability quality improvement. My question is: Where do we go from here? We have done quite a bit of research on what could create a better outcome from an institutional standard standpoint. How does that get translated then? The college needs to move forward to sustainable institutional outcomes. How do we get away from a veto process? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The changes that are made have a major implication for faculty. There is an issue with the larger shared governance communication. The other side is that are the ILOs operational? How are they significantly better than our old ones? Clark provided great clarification for the Academic Senate. It is a significant workload issue to map the amount of course works for specific programs. People are not necessarily rejecting it whole-hearted. There needs to be a system in place with a timeline in a similar way to program review. • Velez informed COA that Academic Senate recommended keeping the current ILOs and then seeing if they can be changed next year and then the mapping will occur.
-------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individuals from Academic Senate had concerns with the idea of the three year timeline for assessment. The general consensus was that it was not doable. ▪ A four-year cycle was proposed. ▪ Luster-Is Academic Senate going to bring a recommendation to President's Cabinet? ▪ Perigo-We can certainly devote time on this.
--	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Invite some people from Academic Senate to attend COA meeting • 2. Academic Senate will provide recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Fremland • 2. Perigo and Fremland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. As soon as possible • 2. As soon as possible

Agenda Item I: BARC

DISCUSSION	Rachelle Agatha: No report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
-------------------	---

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

Agenda Item J: Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC)

DISCUSSION	Rob Fremland: No report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
-------------------	--

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

Agenda Item K: Classified Hiring Priorities Committee (CHPC)

DISCUSSION	Trina Larson: No report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
-------------------	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
--------------	--------------------	----------

• None	• N/A	• N/A
--------	-------	-------

Agenda Item L: Goals for 2015-2016 (Need to be Updated)

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure our actions address our strategic goals 2. Work towards improvement of institutional effectiveness 3. Meet accountability obligations (ACCJC, IEPI) 4. Review mission, vision, and values and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• None	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item M: Adjournment

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting was adjourned by Madeleine Hinkes at 5:21 p.m.
-------------------	--

Next Meeting, October 11, 2016 in MC 211B

Submitted by: Yolanda Catano, Senior Secretary

Approved on: October 11, 2016