

March 20, 2017

2:00-4:00 p.m.

Room AC217

Present: Christina Leimer, Connie Siegenthaler, David Everitt, Paul Wilson, Peggy Dodge, Steven Newton, Stacey Lince (guest), Kathleen Smyth (guest), Nicole Oldendick

Absent: Cara Kreit, Carol Hernandez, Ismail Azam, Mia Chia

MINUTES

Agenda

The EPC discussion agenda item was moved to immediately after the Champions' presentations. With this revision, the agenda was approved.

Minutes

Minutes for 2/6/17 meeting were approved.

EPC Report Discussion before Presentations

Christina debriefed the accreditation site visit. At the exit session, the team gave commendations on COM's planning process, plan tracking, and mission review. The team cancelled the meeting with EPC because they received the information they needed at other meetings.

Prior to Champions' oral presentations, members discussed questions and comments that arose based on their review of written reports.

Regarding Student Success 3.1

- Nicole will fix the broken link for "strategic" under action step 1.3 and repost the report.
- Members discussed the repeated course enrollment report, available on PRIE's Research and Analysis webpage. Of particular interest was the financial impact of adding course sections to accommodate course repeaters in the context of a basic-aid district.

Regarding Student Access 3.1

- The distance education plan will be added as evidence when approved in April.
- Christina asked Stacey and Kathleen to provide more information on Action Step 1.1 during their oral presentation. Nicole will add this to their report.
- There are only 2 courses listed under Action Step 1.2 while the narrative states that there are 3 approved courses. EPC would like to know what the additional course is.

Overall

- Moving forward, reports will include "authored by" in the report title.

Champion Objective Presentations

Objective SS 3.1: Institutional/programmatic decisions reflect sound data and analysis of factors impacting student success, presented by Christina Leimer.

- All bullets under Action Step 1.1 are routine except for the hire of the ½-time research analyst. This position will focus on CTE outcomes, including the Skills-Builder metric.
- Studies and analyses under Action Step 1.2 are either department requests or called for in the strategic plan.
- PRIE just completed a report on enrollment patterns of Bay Area students who do not live in Marin County. Enrollment services will use this report and partner with PRIE on other research to determine how to target and increase enrollment.
- COM is doing a good job as a college under Action Step 1.3, but there is still room to improve, especially around evaluating high-priority initiatives (e.g. Puente).
- Performance Indicator SS3.1 is met.

Objective SA 3.1: Evaluate the scope and scale of the Distance Education program to support enrollment and student success goals, presented by Stacey Lince and Kathleen Smyth.

- Activities under Action Step 1.1 include DE Coordinators monthly meetings, attendance at an online teaching conference in June, and review of other colleges' DE plans and their policies. COM is planning to arrange for a Lake Tahoe Community College DE math teacher to come train math faculty.
- The IGETC Grid shows where DE/Hybrid courses are fulfilling the IGETC pattern and where there are gaps in achieving the objective. There is presently not an online/hybrid course for Area 5C – Science Lab. There are some concerns around offering a science lab course in an online format because of the cost of materials and safety for the students. There are not offerings in Area 6 – Languages Other than English. The psychology course is very popular, and DE is looking into other courses that might redirect from this class.
- COM is adding two multimedia courses, African American Dance, and Introduction to World Religions in the online/hybrid course offerings. DE is looking into adding an art history course in the future and bringing back the hybrid English language course.
- The new DE policy includes requirements for roster management, training (all new faculty take DE standards and practices), regular and effective contact.
- Performance Indicator SA3.1 is not met, but progress is being made each year.

Objective SA 3.2: Faculty members are trained in best practices for instructional technology use, presented by Stacey Lince and Kathleen Smyth.

- Regular DE meetings during Flex have helped develop a DE faculty community where best practices are shared.
- Reviewing courses for content revision/updating is one aspect of preparing Moodle courses for Canvas migration.

- The DE website has been rebranded as online learning because the latter term is better recognized by students. There has also been increased communication to students regarding their enrollment in online/hybrid courses and course requirements.
- Course success rates have improved by 2.6%, exceeding the 2% goal. Roster management has contributed to the improved rates.
- The DE program also provides instructional and technical support for web-enhanced courses.
- Performance Indicator 3.2 is not met, but based on contract rules, all faculty would have to self-evaluate in order to confirm scores for their courses. Informal evaluations have yielded scores of 2 or 3 for all courses. If faculty are following the rubric, their course would score a minimum of 3. The EPC discussed whether the performance indicator can be measured given contractual restraints.

EPC Discussion/Rating of Progress

Ratings

Student Success 3.1: Institutional/programmatic decisions based on sound data and analysis.

- Activity: Green
- Objective Met: Yes

Student Access 3.1: Scope and scale of DE program.

- Activity: Green
- Objective Met: No

Student Access 3.2: Faculty members trained in best practices for instructional technology use.

- Activity: Green
- Objective Met: No; the presenters verbally indicated that most courses score 2 or 3 based on informal evaluation. The EPC will discuss this objective further before writing the final report.

Final Annual Report Format

This year's report will include explanatory narrative to accompany the EPC ratings. It is suggested that the report also include an explanation of, and any challenges within, the process. The report will also be used as a tool in developing the new plan. Those who develop performance indicators in the next plan will need to be worked with to ensure the indicators are valid and reliable.

Next meeting: April 17, 2017

Agenda items to include presentations on Student Access 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, and 5.2.