Committee Chairs:
   Manager: Marybeth Buechner, PRIE
   Classified: Anne Danenberg, PRIE
   Faculty: Dena Chubbic, Chemistry

Members Present:
   Marybeth Buechner, Dena Chubbic, Anne Danenberg, Thomas Greene, Amanda Hamilton, Lonnie Larson, Don Palm, Mary Turner, Tracey Valverde

1. Call to Order: 9:05 a.m.
2. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from September 25 meeting were approved without objection.
3. CSPC Suggestions for 2010-2011 College Goals:
   The emphasis on research and data was noted.
4. Committee Notes Handout, PRIE Committee:
   Survey results regarding importance and effectiveness of the PRIE Committee were discussed. Marybeth Buechner mentioned that the survey was taken in 2006.
5. The PRIE Committee’s current charge and possible revisions were reviewed (second reading).
   a. Mary Turner suggested that the phrase “acts to” was redundant and should be removed.
   b. The revised charge, with “acts to” removed, was approved without objection.
6. Student and Staff Characteristics Data were discussed (from pages 25-36 of the Institutional Effectiveness report that was provided to CSPC in August of 2009).
   a. Larger chart sizes were requested. It was stated that the charts were designed to be larger, but a software fluke caused them to be smaller when the report was printed.
   b. Admiration was expressed for a single-page district trend lines report that President Kathryn Jeffries distributed to the Executive Council. One side addressed issues of access, including enrollment and demographics. The other side addressed issues of student success. It was mentioned that a list of student services might be an inspiring addition to such a report. It was stated that the district has information regarding the numbers of class sections offered.
   c. Pages 26-29: Student and Staff Characteristics: Age, Gender, Ethnicity, and Language
      i. Interest was expressed in a future survey of languages spoken by faculty.
ii. Thomas Greene explained that sometimes issues arise regarding the application of such data, such as whether use of proficiency in various languages is included in a given employee’s job description.

d. Page 32: Staff Demographic Data

i. Anne Danenburg mentioned that MIS summarizes age, gender, and ethnicity data.

ii. Anne Danenburg and Marybeth Buechner pointed out that the PRIE office can’t access the raw data of the MIS report, and that there are some confidentiality issues in obtaining data about management, staff, and faculty.

iii. Don Palm suggested that College Goal #6 might be used to request more data from the district.

iv. Thomas Greene said it could be useful to see separate data for teaching faculty and counseling faculty. He mentioned that some other members of the campus community seem interested in looking at staff and faculty separately, and in looking at full time and part time faculty separately.

e. Page 30-31, 33-35: Student Demographic Data: Workload, Income, First-generation college student, and Educational goal

i. Thomas Green pointed out that 1/3 of our students have incomes below the poverty line, and many of our students can be classified as “working poor.” He said that this information might be a good topic for a future “Did You Know” short data announcement from PRIE.

ii. Don Palm suggested a cross-check with the Financial Aid Office: what data is included in the assessment of whether a student is poor?

iii. Mary Turner suggested that it would be good to include a definition of the poverty line.

iv. Don Palm suggested that it would be good to include the median income of the Sacramento area, to help give the reader perspective.

v. Anne Danenburg said that half of SCC’s students receive financial aid in the form of a Bogg fee waiver.

f. Page 36: CCSSE Data

i. Mary Turner said it would be helpful to have the “n” (sample size) and the percent values on each of the CCSSE Data pie charts on page 36. Marybeth Buechner stated that this was her preference also, and that information had been removed at the request of CSPC.

ii. Marybeth Buechner pointed out that the CCSSE survey asked students different questions about the quality of their relationships with staff, faculty, and peers.

iii. It was mentioned that a variety of data sources exist, such as CCSSE, MIS, and SARS.

iv. Thomas Greene said it would be useful to show where SCC is positioned relative to other colleges with respect to the CCSSE benchmarks. He pointed out that there are some benchmarks, such as the engagement level of part time
students, that show SCC at or below the average ranking for colleges of similar size.

v. Marybeth Buechner pointed out that by pooling survey data into benchmarks, some important information is obscured, such as the information that the engagement level is much better for students who have completed 30 or more units, even if they are part time students.

vi. Thomas Greene confirmed that student success is greatly improved for students who are able to complete 15 or more units.

vii. Mary Turner mentioned that SCC’s data would likely differ from that of other colleges with respect to understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds in the student orientations.

viii. Mary Turner suggested that it would be beneficial to include some discussion about understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds in the student orientations.

ix. Thomas Greene described how Student Services has improved student orientations and increased the likelihood of student participation in the orientations. He invited PRIE committee members to attend a “New Student Fridays” orientation.

7. Mary Turner, Thomas Greene, and Marybeth Buechner said that it would be beneficial to examine the CCSSE data more closely at the next meeting of the PRIE Committee.

8. Meeting Adjourned: 10:15 a.m.

Next Meeting: October 23rd 9:00 a.m.