

**PIE Council Minutes**  
**April 29, 2011**  
**1:30pm**  
**Welty Board Room**

Members Present: Dionne Fortenberry, Michael Longton,  
Cathy Young, Dave Haffly, Sirena Parker,  
Nora Miller, John Davis, Jim Roth, Brandon Newsome,  
Vicki Leach, Kimberly Dorsey, Larry Jones,  
Rusty King, Twila Alpe, Sherry Harper for Cathy Mitchell,  
Allergra Brigham, Marty Hatton (Chair)

Members Absent: Alisa Holen Carlos Williams, Jr. Sheila Adams, Cassie Derden,  
Mark Bean, Perry Sansing, Gary Bouse Martha Jo Mims, Carla Lowery

1. Approval of minutes from January 21, 2011. A motion to accept the minutes as read was made by Twila Alpe and duly seconded by Kathy Young.
2. A moment of silence for the tornado victims.
3. Faculty/Staff Satisfaction Survey Results
  - a) Positive results
  - b) There were 74 responses for Staff
  - c) There were 470 responses for Faculty
    - i. Mostly positive
    - ii. The results are not valid
    - iii. No explanation – Carla tried to figure out what went wrong to no avail.
4. Close to 25% rate on course evaluations
  - a) The first few days it was only at 10%
  - b) The process started late.
  - c) The course evaluations will be on going until midnight Sunday.
  - d) Single log in for students.
  - e) Working out a few glitches that exist. One issue that occurred but has been fixed was that a student that had withdrawn had received an invite to fill out the course evaluation.
  - f) \$3000 gives 10,000 instruments
  - g) We are still in free pilot trial until the end of June.
  - h) Charged per instrument
  - i) Money wise it is comparable to class climate.
  - j) Deans can view everything
  - k) Chairs can view within their department
  - l) Faculty within their department
  - m) Believe it is a much improved process

Q: Can faculty see the student's responses

A: No – but they can see who has completed the process.

If you hear of any issues please forward them so we can address the issue.

5. The Summary & Discussion of ACTION Assessment Process

- a) It has gone fairly well.
- b) There are concerns about the way the system is set up now.
- c) Could be accepted or ignored.
- d) How much weight should this group have in making decisions?
- e) Will look at suggestions for changes.
- f) How serious are suggestions for improvement taken?
- g) It impacts the entire university it needs to be discussed.
- h) Need to include some specifics – tends to be very general.
- i) It seems logical for this to be addressed at the end of year retreat.

Q: Could an answer be -“We disagree and this is why we aren’t making any changes.”

Would that satisfy SACS?

A: Yes, they want to know what is being done with the results and is it being communicated.

SACS doesn’t care about the amount of work they want to know how productive the work was.

- j) There needs to be an explanation of what they are doing and why they are doing it. It needs to be a clear articulation so that everyone can understand what is meant.
- k) Needs to be sent out sooner so that it can be looked over more carefully and feedback can be given sooner.

Q: Is there documentation so we don’t have to guess what was done in previous years so we can build on that?

A: Dr. Hatton can provide a report. We can send memos out as feedback is received.

- l) Maintain files in Graduate Studies office opposed to the different chairs.
- m) Should encourage people to review quarterly and if you haven’t adopted as you go into the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter please give a reason why not.

Q: Should we get feedback from employees?

A: Yes, if comfortable encourage folks to contact a member of the PIE Council.

- n) Like the idea of hearing back from a department on why they choose not to change something. A good rationale might make more sense and may be able to pick up on what a real underlying issue is.
- o) Some are just not utilizing the form correctly.
- p) Maybe offer a tutorial & answer questions. Give a better explanation of what belongs in each section with an example.
- q) Will create a summary report with the results from this year.
- r) It is up to you if you want to see a copy prior to it being sent to the president. Email Dr. Hatton if you want a copy.

6. QEP—Quality Enhancement Plan (initial plans for 2011-2012 year)

- a) We have to do this for the 10 year review.
- b) 1<sup>st</sup> time we have had to do one.
- c) Dr. Hatton will be going to Houston for the SACS conference in July.
- d) 1<sup>st</sup> year – year of discussion by campus committee.
- e) Will kick off with Retention which will be quite a lot of work and discussions.
- f) Standing retention committee
- g) All tied to QEP

- h) Everyone must be committed or it won't work.
- i) Retention affects the whole campus.

Allegra Brigham: We need to implement a performance based system in a matter of time. We have poor retention and graduation rates. We do not know why they are leaving and we need that information. The process starts with the advisors.

Nora Miller: Devising ways to look at this hasn't been used in the past. Now they are measuring each institution. Graduation rates and retention rates are key. We have got to do what we can to get the numbers up. The direction is shifting to the end of year numbers so the issue needs to be addressed immediately. We have got to tackle this in a big way. Last week in a meeting the discussion was rebalancing. They are looking at a system wide retention model.

The recruitment number is small if the university is able to retain students.

Allegra Brigham: That is the faculty's responsibility. It requires advisors working with students and faculty doing a great job. Admissions is up, if we retain we could be over 2800 this fall. We must provide better support for our students. That means year round support.

We must educate the faculty and let them know they are the key to retaining students and they must treat each student as an individual. Their primary job is not to weed people out, their primary job is to keep them here.

The new Coordinator will implement faculty training.

- a) Students need to articulate solid goals.
- b) Help shape them
- c) Help the students think of it as their academic career
- d) How to balance and put into prospective
- e) Formalize some models for communication with students.

The new VPSS that is coming in has academic experience. Should have some good ideas on how to make the two work together.

Retention may or may not be tied to QEP.

- 7. Nora Miller spoke concerning the recommended Budget Priorities. (Handout on file)
  - a) Increase in retirement, unemployment and faculty promotions.
  - b) Recruitment and retention would get us out of the crunch.

Things that need to be pursued more aggressively:

1. Dual enrollment
2. We need a more seamless process from High school to college.
3. We need to strengthen EMCC and ICC relationships.
4. We need to develop a strategy for growing relationships.
5. Once started we need to maintain that relationship and move to start another one.
6. About 24% of our students are community college students.
7. Nontraditional students see the need for college. They are also easier to retain. They are goal oriented and focused.

Will recommend the priorities to the President.

Will send out to individual department.

Will meet with the Deans

Then full cabinet

Determine priorities

Will send out next week they have to be in to IHL by June 3<sup>rd</sup>.

It is cheaper to retain students than it is to recruit them. There was a motion passed to reverse the priorities. Retention was put as number 1 and increase enrollment moved to number 2.

Meeting was adjourned.