San Diego Mesa College
PIE Committee
Meeting Notes

November 28, 2017
3:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m., MC 211B

ATTENDEES		
	Madeleine Hinkes, Co-Chair	Leticia Lopez
	Meegan Feori, Co-Chair	Pam Luster
	Yolanda Catano	Andrew MacNeill
	Rachelle Agatha	Tim McGrath
	Danene Brown	Victoria Miller
	Kris Clark (excused)	Kim Perigo
	Ian Duckles	Charlotta Robertson
	Ed Helscher	Bridget Herrin
	Ashanti Hands	Irena Stojimirovic
	Holly Jagielinski	Manuel Velez
	Leroy Johnson	Jason Zuehlke
		Staff Assistant: Sahar King
		Guest:

Agenda Item A: **Call to Order:** By Madeleine Hinkes at 3:38 p.m. in MC211B.

DISCUSSION	1. **Approval of the October 24, 2017 Minutes** • The minutes draft was emailed to PIEC prior to the meeting for review. • The minutes were M/S by Kim Perigo and Ed Helscher and approved.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Post the PIEC minutes to webpage	• Sahar King	• As soon as possible

Agenda Item B: **Continuing Business**

DISCUSSION	1. QFE (Danene Brown): • District has developed an accreditation progress update template, to be used

toward our response to the visiting team's recommendations.

- Propose that a small group of PIE committee members review QFE and Accreditation recommendations, and then develop a plan of action to complete and track progress to entire PIE committee.
- Request for participation was put forward and PIE members volunteered, volunteers represented several constituent groups on campus. (D. Brown, M. Hinkes, K. Perigo, I. Duckles, M. Feori, Y. Catano, later added: L. Shapiro)
- May 4th deadline to submit to district.
- The idea of the template is to follow up with where we are as far as accreditation and annually report to the district our status and progress.
- First draft of the template will be ready by February to present to the committee.

2. **Committee evaluations: Bridget Herrin**

- Going to look at the governance evaluation process as we received a recommendation on this from the accrediting commission
- Emails sent to various people around the state on other campuses and received feedback
- Governance evaluation process has two parts but will be looking at only self-evaluation assessment
- Historically, we have done an annual report from each committee telling what has been accomplished
- We might consider starting with a few committees on campus. We want to look at committee culture and personal contribution. We want to see if, as a member of the committee, your work is effective.
- Want to see how the committee functions and reflect if things are working how they should, then look at the whole picture.
- This evaluation is less about what we did and more about how we did it and whether this process is effective or not
- As we start this process we have some guiding questions. For example: What is the point of an exercise like this? What do we hope to learn? How will we use this information? And who should be targeted?
- We have number of different groups on campus, for example, Governance and operational, Academic Senate, AS committees, Senates, ad hoc group and many others.
- The category of questions we have in this sample evaluation is Committee Culture, Personal Contributions, Quality of Committee Practices, Committee Function, Accomplishments and Improvements
- Those are the basic areas of evaluation we are looking at, so the next step is to step back and see if this structure is functioning the way it is designed to.
- The link will be shared with the group and you can give feedback as to what question works better or should be or should not be a part of the evaluation.

3. **Guided Pathways (Bridget Herrin and Ashanti Hands):**
- Components of the self-assessment tool (Inquiry, Design, Implementation)
- Colleges have been asked to develop their own "pathways" approach
- A growing number of community colleges and four-year universities are seeking to improve student outcomes by redesigning academic programs and student support services following the guided pathways approach.

| | - Guided Pathways is an opportunity for our college to set our own goals and determine our best path to success.
- In order to follow the guided pathways approach or creating the Mesa Pathways, we have to fill certain requirements, Step one: attend the IEPI workshop on October 30, 2017. Step two: Complete Self-Assessment, 14 Elements, due December 23, 2017; draft should be ready for PCAB December 5. The draft will be reviewed by all three senates and the final version will be submitted to the District by December 15 and then submitted to the state. Step three: Multi-year work plan due in March.
- The self-assessment was compiled through:
  - Targeted feedback (October 5-31), Faculty Chairs, Committee leaders, Program Directors/Managers, Operational staff, Administrators
  - Open Forum (November 7)
  - Online review and public input (November 3-19)
  - President's Cabinet Retreat (November 14)
  - Academic Senate , Classified Senate and ASG (TBD)
  - Present to P-Cab for final review (December 5)
- Based on the Self-Assessment above, what do you think best describes your college's guided pathways work overall? Pre-Adoption
- Guided Pathways is not a "one-size-fits-all" initiative
- The enormity and diversity of the California Community Colleges system requires that each college take a customized, self-guided approach.
- The Guided Pathways development and implementation process will focus on four fundamental activities
- Provide an aggregate picture of colleges' Guided Pathway processes with regards to inquiry, design, and implementation of key elements and how they are progressing over time.
- It is useful to note that inquiry, design, and implementation are iterative. As colleges move from initial inquiry into designing and implementing key elements of Guided Pathways, they will need to continue to engage in ongoing processes of inquiry, re-design, and the assessment of strategies and outcomes.
- Does the group to write the 18-month plan already exist or do we need develop the group?
- Once we have the template, we can bring the volunteers together. What resources do we need for this process? We also need to not lose our focus on student Success/Equity.
- |

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON	DEADLINE
1. webinar amassment	1. Bridget Herrin	1. As soon as possible

Agenda Item C: New Business: Hinkes

DISCUSSION	
	• Met with district strategic planning on 11/29/17 • Looked at the goals written last semester and they have not been changed • We will update you next PIEC meeting

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• N/A		

Agenda Item D: Research (Herrin):

DISCUSSION	**Bridget Herrin:**
	• Brief explanation on dashboards we send out by email: we update our pages and we will post the video on our IE website to show how you access the dashboard and gather the data you need • The dashboards will be held in the Office of Institutional Research-Data Warehouse link

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• **Dashboard**	• Bridget Herrin	• N/A

Agenda Item E: Accreditation (Brown): QFE

DISCUSSION	**Danene Brown:**
	• N/A

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

Agenda Item F: **Student Success/Equity/Title V (Hands):**

DISCUSSION	**Student Services-Ashanti Hands:** • No Report

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

Agenda Item G: **Program Review (Hinkes):**

DISCUSSION	**Madeleine Hinkes:** • Program Review deadline is Friday, December 01, 2017 • Program Review committee is working on next year's comprehensive Program Review, and that plan draft will be presented to governance groups in the spring. • Monday, Dec 4, 2017 through Friday, Jan 19, 2018: Liaisons and Managers enter reviews into Taskstream • Final edits are due by Friday Feb 2, 2018 and System Closes. • This year is the last year for updates. 2018 will be a comprehensive year.

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

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

DISCUSSION	• COA working on ILO Survey that we send to Student who petition for graduation. Since we changed ILOs since the last survey, do we want to change some of the questions? COA is working on that but did not finalize it yet, and we are also working on AUOs.

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

Agenda Item I: **BARC (Agatha):**

DISCUSSION	• No Report

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

Agenda Item J: **Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC)**

DISCUSSION	• No Report

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

Agenda Item K: **Classified Hiring Priorities Committee (CHPC)**

DISCUSSION	• No Report

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

Agenda Item L: **Announcements:**

DISCUSSION	1. Next meeting, December 12, 2017

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

Submitted by: Sahar King, Senior Secretary
Approved on: