

San Diego Mesa College
PIE Committee
Meeting Notes

May 10, 2016
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., A-104

ATTENDEES	Madeleine Hinkes, Co-Chair	Brianna Hays
	Angela Liewen, Co-Chair	Leroy Johnson
		Trina Larson (excused)
	Rachelle Agatha (excused)	Pamela Luster
	Mariam Ahmed (absent)	Tim McGrath (excused)
	Danene Brown	Kim Perigo
	Kristan Clark	Charlotta Robertson
	Genevieve Esguerra	Monica Romero
	Meegan Feori	Cheryl Ching
	Rob Fremland	Yolanda Catano
	Ashanti Hands	

Agenda Item A: Call to Order: By Madeleine Hinkes at 3:38 p.m. in A-104.

DISCUSSION	<p>1. Approval of the April 26, 2016 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 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. Post-Retreat Discussion (Hays, 40 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed the venue, food, and location. • Hays and Hinkes reviewed PCab post-notes. • Suggestions for next PCab (Feori): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Email attendees the notes, agendas, and presentations a week prior to PCab Retreat. • Hays: There were a few areas that we did not set goals for. Several scorecard
-------------------	--

indicators have red zone, green zone, and yellow zones. The indicators are used to measure the goals met/not met.

Background:

- Follow-Up to Presidents Cabinet Retreat
 - Reviewed College goals and associated performance indicators
 - Examined historical data on key performance indicators
 - Discussed contextual factors related to indicators
- Retreat participants recommended:
 - New Institution-Set Standards (for indicators without them)
 - Any changes to aspirational goals or
 - Continuance of previously –set goals for 1-year and 6-year time frames.

2. Review of Goals (Hays)

- A PowerPoint Presentation titled, “Examining Our Institution-Set Standards and Goals through a Pathways Lens” by Bri Hays.

Goals for Today:

- Review recommendations from President’s Cabinet Retreat
- Make any necessary adjustments based on...
 - Pathways perspective
 - Additional Contextual Information
- Forward recommendations to President’s Cabinet

- Reminder of Key Terms: Standard and Goals

Completion:

- % of first-attempt students who within 6 years graduate (certificate or degree), transfer or become transfer-prepared.
- The unprepared dropped a bit. Looking at the statewide data, transfer rate was driving a lot of the completion rates down. We are a heavy transfer rate institution.
- Robertson: The prepared number was a lot smaller than we had anticipated.
- Hays: The decimals were a bit confusing for the people, so the researchers will be making those changes to the data and rounding out the percentages.

30-Units Recommendations:

- % of first-time students who complete (grades of A, B, C, D, or P) 30 units within 6 years.

Persistence Recommendations:

- % of first-time students who enroll in 3 consecutive terms.
- If the students attend classes outside of the district, the students don’t get counted on the data here.
- The scorecard value comes directly from the Chancellor’s Office and that is how we track student enrollment and persistence.
- To contextualize data, Palomar College and Mira Costa College are single college districts and Hays will contact the institutions to see if Palomar and Mira Costa will be willing to share the data to see the number of students who dual enroll in different institutions within the region. It would be better to track students from a regional perspective.
- Luster: Students might be persisting, but we are not able to track those numbers.

- Perigo: From an enrollment management perspective, are we losing students because we are not offering the “right” classes?
- Hays: What happens to the students who drop out?
- Perigo: Where are the nighttime students?
- Luster: Parking is an issue for students who enroll in nighttime classes. It is my assertion that students are looking for particular degree driven classes versus taking random classes.

Degrees & Transfers:

- Not required to set aspirational goals for transfer. It is a viable option.
- There has been much discussion about the lack of control over transfer volume.
- Luster: 1610-The current number for All Graduates (any award-certificates and degrees) awarded to students this year. Out of the 1600, 849 are ADTs.
- Committee members need more data and information to set a goal at the moment.
- Group agreed that they would set a standard goal for next year.

CTE Recommendations:

- CTE Rate:
 - % of students who complete 8+ units in a CTE area within 6 years, graduate (certificate or degree), transfer, or become transfer-prepared.
- The group from PCab didn’t make any changes to the standard goals.
- Feori: The group kept the same standard goals that were projected by Hays’ research.
- Students are taking CTE classes to move up the wage ladder.
- Hays: We will put a placeholder on this piece for next year.

Basic Skills Recommendations:

- % of first-attempt students who begin at any level below transfer and successfully complete a transfer-level course within 6 years.
- All of the standards for this year are new.
- Next year we are expecting to see some movement.
- In math, we saw a significant rise in those numbers.
- ESL aspirational goals were the same. We are a bit lower than the statewide average.
- Group agreed to move these goals forward.

Success Rate Recommendations:

- % of students passing courses (college-wide) with a grade of A,B,C, or P
- Romero: Math: 36% is a really low set standard. How do we change this? We might be able to change the 6-year goal to 50% and start at 36% goal for the first year and progressively move up to reach our higher goal.
- Goal: We set the goal higher and re-evaluate it next year.
- Luster: 10 more sections have been added to Math 92.
- **CHANGES-** Adjust the 1-year goal to be a little bit higher to 37% for the aspirational goals in Math.

Next Steps:

- Forward final recommendations to President’s Cabinet on 5/17
- Share the standards and goals (effective for 2016/17) across the College
- Submit revised goals to IEPI
- Evaluate progress toward goals at the 2017 spring President’s Cabinet Retreat.

	<p>3. CampusLabs Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hinkes: We are still pursuing it and not much to discuss now. The CampusLabs people are building on the database based on the comments and feedback given from Mesa.
--	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review persistence numbers within the districts for benchmarking. Also look for transfer volume numbers and individual numbers of CTEs and ADTs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bri Hays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As soon as possible

Agenda Item C: New Business

<p>DISCUSSION</p>	<p>1. Integrated Planning Process Evaluation Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bri handed out an article titled, "Integrated Planning Process Evaluation Report 2015-2016. Sent out a survey to liaisons, writers, and managers to provide feedback for the evaluation and suggest recommendations. <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Bring trainings to lead writers, revise the BARC request forms, pilot standard data sets for student service areas. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide Additional Research/Data Training and Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Very low attendance for trainings. 2. Improve the Submission and Feedback Process within Taskstream 3. Explore Options for Rolling Forward Resource Request Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Summer Work Group would work on this piece. 4. Provide Additional Samples and/or Examples of Program Reviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Take a moment and reflect on the positive feedback on the surveys from the program reviews process. o Perigo suggested creating more feasible ways to connect the numbers to something tangible in terms of projection. o Write prompts that would help people understand what to write and how to write the program review descriptions. o Luster: Create a Q&A as a resource that is regularly available to the individuals who have questions. It can be made into a video or a document. We could feature this on The Loft and make it fun. o Hays: Make annotations for samples that will also help people. 5. Revise the Program Review Website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Driven from the feedback received from the survey. o Might need to advertise it a little bit more. o Look for ideas on Accreditation website. o Perigo: Create a link on the faculty/staff website. 6. Refine the Liaison Role and Review Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What resources should they be providing for their lead writers? <p>2. Annual Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hinkes: All of the things we have accomplished this year. We need a student member who can attend these meetings. Luster: The idea of making the Institutional Planning Guide into the Institutional
--------------------------	--

	<p>and Governance Planning Guide was discussed at PCab Retreat.</p> <p>3. PIE Goals for 2015-2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hinkes: Part of what we are supposed to do is to advance our goals and the fact that we are re-considering our mission statement means we are on the right track. • The goals are fairly general and we are accomplishing them. • Gave ILOs to COA. We are meeting our accountability obligations. COA needs to bring ILOs to PIEC because they need to be available by Fall. <p>4. 2016-2017 Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All members of PIEC are welcome to re-join for next year. <p>5. Membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All spots are filled, but we don't have a representative from each individual school. We will expand the membership. • PIEC will be meeting in a larger room starting in the Fall semester.
--	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow Up: What documents need to go to PCab? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yolanda Catano 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As soon as possible

Agenda Item D: Research

DISCUSSION	<p>Bri Hays (No Report)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
-------------------	--

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 E: Accreditation

DISCUSSION	<p>Danene Brown: 5 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finish Standard 2A this Thursday, May 5 and will continue with the next standard the following Thursday.
-------------------	--

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>
-------------------	--

	•
--	---

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

Agenda Item G: Program Review

DISCUSSION	Madeleine Hinkes: 10 minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed the memo and 2015-2016 Program Review Annual Report. M/S/C Rob Fremland and Kim Perigo to send this forward to President's Cabinet.
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Forward the 2015-2016 Program Review Annual Report to PCab	• Madeleine Hinkes & Yolanda Catano	• Before May 17th

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

DISCUSSION	Kris Clark: 5 minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A year-end report from COA will be emailed to PIEC.
-------------------	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• COA year-end report will be emailed to PIEC	• Yolanda Catano	• As soon as possible

Agenda Item I: BARC

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

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

Agenda Item J: Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC)

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

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

Agenda Item K: Classified Hiring Priorities Committee (CHPC)

DISCUSSION	Trina Larson: No report •
-------------------	------------------------------

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Bringing CHP attachments to PCab Retreat	• Madeleine Hinkes	• April 29, 2016

Agenda Item L: Goals for 2015-2016

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	• Meeting was adjourned by Madeleine Hinkes at 5:16 p.m.
-------------------	--

Last Meeting May 10, 2016

Submitted by: Yolanda Catano, Senior Secretary

Approved on: September 13, 2016