

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

April 11, 2017
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., MC 211B

ATTENDEES	Madeleine Hinkes, Co-Chair	Leticia Lopez (excused)
	Meegan Feori, Co-Chair	Pam Luster
		Andrew MacNeill (absent)
	Rachelle Agatha	Tim McGrath (absent)
	Danene Brown	Victoria Miller
	Kris Clark (excused)	Kim Perigo (absent)
	Ian Duckles	Charlotta Robertson (Proxy for Danene)
	Matt Fay	Monica Romero (excused)
	Rob Fremland	Irena Stojimirovic
	Ashanti Hands	Manuel Velez
	Holly Jagienlinski (excused)	Staff Assistant: Yolanda Catano (Alanna Milner subbing)
	Leroy Johnson	Guest: Hai Hoang, Larry Maxey

Agenda Item A: Call to Order: By Madeleine Hinkes at 3:33 p.m. in MC 211B.

DISCUSSION	<p>1. Approval of the March 14, 2017 Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes draft was emailed to PIEC prior to the meeting for review. • The minutes were M/S/C by Ian Duckles and Rob Fremland. • Introduced Hai Hoang, new Research Analyst.
-------------------	--

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. Review SP Grid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Madeleine Hinkes presented the SP grid and noted that there were a lot of good comments, which will get incorporated. • The plan is that, starting with the committees that Hinkes is responsible for, to
-------------------	---

pick out goals that match what that committee is doing and then at the end of the year we can pick out ways to evaluate the goals.

- If this works we will start this process with other committees.
- Strategic Goal 2.5:
 - Shared governance goal
 - As an example, PIE contributes to this so will start with this goal.
- Strategic Goal 6.1:
 - External accountability goal
 - This is another example of a goal PIE will start with because by helping to sponsor PCab retreats, looking at IEPI ISS, dashboards, and playing a role in accreditation, this is definitely something PIE does.
- Next meeting we will look at how far we can go with some of these goals.
- We will also add more to this list over time.
- Hinkes presented a tool that she received from the IEPI workshop. It is a tool that contains all of the accreditation standards on the left and then on the top are all the ongoing projects/grants at the colleges. It is a matrix of which of these initiatives the accreditation standards touch. So, we can also do this for our strategic goals and the ongoing projects/grants.
 - This sounds like a good idea, but will these accreditation standards still be what we follow? Do we know what standards we will be graded on in the next 6 years?
 - We will be tracking to these standards until new standards come out (which takes about 18 months before go into play). These are the ones to which we would write our report.
 - The same general themes will always be there even if new standards were adopted.
 - Sometimes themes are reorganized, but nothing has been removed.
- Rob Fremland projected the SP Grid at the last Academic Senate meeting and asked for feedback. By next meeting we should have some feedback.

2. Review Vision Statement:

- Meegan Feeori reported that we simply inserted college of equity and excellence into the statement. It is up for discussion. We had something to start with but knew word massaging would happen later.
- We should change the statement to “to become a key force in our community to educate our students to shape the future.” (The “and” between “community” and “to” should be removed.)
- What about “key force by educating our students”?
- What is the timeline for sending the vision statement out to governance committees?
 - We can adopt the statement at the PCab retreat.
 - So we will need to send it to governance meetings before then.
 - Fremland will ask for feedback at next Academic Senate meeting.
- We already are a key force.
- What about using the original statement?
- There is an issue with the equity statement because a vision statement should be what we are moving towards and this says what we are.
- Is leading college of equity and excellence the vehicle to the first statement?
- It should be more along the lines of something we should strive to be.
- There is value in the simplicity of “leading college of equity and excellence.”
- This can still be what we are in the future.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What if we said “by being the leading college of equity and excellence we shall be...” The idea is to be the leading college of equity and excelled to do the other things. We are going to educate students a lot better by being the leading college of equity and excellence. • Is this a mission or a vision statement? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It overlaps our mission statement. • The mission is what we are, the vision is what you want to become, and value is what makes you whole. • Should it say, “we strive to be...”? • What if we just say “to be the leading college of equity and excellence”? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should we send this forward? ○ Yes, all agree. • There needs to be a framework for how this is taken to the governing bodies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We need to provide what the dialog has been, the definition of a vision statement, what our mission statement is, and then let people work with that. • To confirm we are sending out “to be the leading college of equity and excellence.” • There is concern that we took students out of the vision statement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ But students are in the mission statement, and it’s implied by “college.” <p>3. Additional Business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hinkes reported that she attended a district strategic plan meeting yesterday to bring together all the comments from the colleges and CE. They edited what they had. The strategic plan has not been officially released but should have it soon to take a look at. • This should be pretty inclusive since this is a second draft now. • The meeting went well and we think our comments were incorporated. • Mesa had the most comments compared to the other colleges and CE.
--	--

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

Agenda Item C: New Business

DISCUSSION	<p>1. Prepare for Retreat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Associate Dean, Research and Planning arrives tomorrow so will start planning for the retreat with her. • The next meeting we will totally be preparing for the retreat. • We will be looking at student achievement data and we hope to have something from ACCJC by then. • Next meeting we will review data I preparation for the retreat.
-------------------	--

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

Agenda Item D: Research

DISCUSSION	<p>VACANT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are still waiting to get research staff up to full capacity. • Thank you for being patient. • Will give Bridget time to settle in and will get things rolling again.
-------------------	---

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

Agenda Item E: Accreditation

DISCUSSION	<p>Danene Brown: (Madeleine Hinkes reported on her behalf)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We heard a short version of the commendations and recommendations. Most in attendance went to the outgoing site team meeting. • Madeleine Hinkes reported that the last PIE meeting was while the accreditation site team was still here. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Turning data into meaningful dialog, which is a lot of what this committee does. Thank you. ▪ Embedding equity and diversity throughout campus ▪ A student-centered approach ▪ Professional learning ▪ Use of district resources to fund future obligations ▪ Leadership ○ Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outcomes assessment – COA is looking at those. ▪ Making sure outcomes are analyzed and accessible to the public. ▪ Align district plans ▪ Formal self-evaluation of committee effectiveness (We do this informally, so they suggested we make this more formal.) • President Luster has not heard anything but it should be any time now. • Hinkes reported that at ACCJC conference they are getting away from a more punitive approach. They are interested in building more partnerships.
-------------------	--

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

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

DISCUSSION	<p>Monica Romero & Leticia Lopez:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashanti Hands reported that for SSSP, Equity and Basic Skills, the state has shifted to integrating all three plans, which will be completed at once.
-------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each program will still be responsible for their annual responsibilities, but we will be submitting on 2 year cycles. • Hands attended a conference and heard from state what their thoughts are for the plan. She will host an initial meeting regarding the plan integration and invite a variety of people, since we need integration from variety of places. There will be activities to help with integrated thinking. • The first integrated report is due December 1st. The campus will be hearing a lot about it and she plans to bring Madeleine Hinkes and Bridget Herrin on board early. • Hands shared update on behalf of Monica Romero. The monthly update for Student Services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Link to Student Services Monthly Report (March): http://www.sdmesa.edu/student-services/reports/Monthly%20Update%20Mar%2017.pdf
--	---

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

Agenda Item G: Program Review

DISCUSSION	<p>Madeleine Hinkes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review are working on the revisions for next year with the committees.
-------------------	--

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

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

DISCUSSION	<p>Kris Clark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Madeleine Hinkes reported that Kris Clark could not make it but there is also nothing to report.
-------------------	--

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

Agenda Item I: BARC

DISCUSSION	<p>Rachelle Agatha:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We changed the form and gathered different data this year. • Agatha presented the requests from this year. • There were 112 one-time requests to be reviewed for funding totaling \$825,000. • The 53 augmentations were not presented because they will go through a different process.
-------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$400,000 has been set aside for IT improvements. • There are 26 facility requests going through the facilities committee, which will be the basis for the facilities master plan. • There was a total possible score of 175 points and we drew a red line at 60%. • The list is in order of points. Items #1-56 could be funded. • If there is money left after we do the estimate for the year, we will start purchasing items at the top of the list. • This is the first year that BARC has had data as opposed to just narratives. • There was \$59,000 worth of requests. • We will have the order in which we start purchasing once we know the balance. • This is a massive process that coordinates with Perkins and other funding sources to protect the general fund. We buy what we can through other sources. • This list does not consider the funding source this comes from. It is just what was submitted through Program Review. • It is recommended that this be passed on to PCab to start purchasing when we know we have money. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BARC will present to PCab. • There were a fair number of comments in the IP survey about BARC requests. • There were also a lot of comments that were positive during training. • We plan to create trainings for people who cannot make it to in-person options. • Currently, the committee does not want to change the forms, the first year of a new one has growing pains. • We will create some sort of reference list for costs. • It came up in Program Review too. People wanted to see how much things cost. • We did have samples of properly and improperly completed forms but we will rearrange the website so people get what they need most from it. • We also showed the accreditation site team about how we close the loop.
--	--

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

Agenda Item J: Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC)

DISCUSSION	Rob Fremland: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
-------------------	--

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

Agenda Item K: Classified Hiring Priorities Committee (CHPC)

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larry Maxey presented the CHP data and list. • The CHP committee introduced a new scoring rubric. Much of the past was based on who could write effectively to certain domains, but not a lot about data or how or why they wanted a new position. • We changed forms to incorporate use of data. • There were 150 total points that a request could receive and 27 scored higher than 75, while 14 scored lower than 75. • Those who attended the training sessions did better than those who did not. • In the future we hope that individuals will be able to use the data to paint a complete picture of why they need the position. • Again, we found last year that there was a lot of narrative that was rolled over from year to year, requesting positions to keep positions on the list. • There needed to be more emphasis on data and less on narrative. For example, how many students did you serve? • We did not direct the writers about how to use data, and were a little disappointed that the data was not always effectively used. • This is the standard we are using and are confident in the list. • Plan to have more training regarding the new process, and more variety in training (different modes). • BARC is using a similar form. • We need to provide better dashboards because even with FHP we see that there are 5 different data points that are important but what is not available is how many new hires there are, how many total positions are available, etc. A number of things happen after program reviews are written that impact decisions. We need to sit down with research to make sure the right data is provided. We are going to get better at using the appropriate data, and perhaps have a training on rubrics and how one develops one would be useful for committees. We will get better at it each time, but CHP would benefit with dashboard information, new operations in your area, how many staff do you currently have. Having prompts will help with this. This is very different from how we first did it. • Hiring comes from retirements and the CHP list. No matter what the funding source, the position has to be on the list. We will be hiring some off this list, but it may not go in order due to the funding sources.
-------------------	---

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

Agenda Item L: Goals for 2016-2017

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor and support progress of our equity initiative and institution-set standards 2. Communicate institutional efforts through the Institutional Planning & Governance Guide (IPGG) 3. Advance the planning work of the College using data-informed dialogue and decision-making 4. Re-evaluate College-wide goals and assess whether current Educational Master Plan still fits 5. Maintain our sustained continuous quality improvement as we move through the accreditation process
-------------------	---

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 M: Adjournment

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting was adjourned by Madeleine Hinkes at 4:48 p.m.
-------------------	--

Next Meeting is on April 25, at MC 211B

Submitted by: Alanna Milner, Research Associate

Approved on: April 25, 2017