MINUTES

Meeting of Wednesday, March 4, 2015
12:45 pm - 2:45 pm
SSB-414

Meeting Start
Meeting called to order at 12:55 by Alice Taylor.

Minutes of Previous Meeting
Minutes from the February 4, 2015 and February 23, 2015 meetings were approved with minor changes.

Program Review Prioritization Retreat Report

The retreat to prioritize resource requests from Program Review occurred the previous Friday, February 28, 2015. A. Taylor provided background about the retreat for those newer to PIE and briefly recounted the day’s activities. The essential characteristics of this year’s retreat were: i) resource requests were limited to requests having to do with computers, software, technology, equipment, or books to accommodate the requirements of a large instructional support block grant from the state; ii) unlike in previous years where the principles of prioritization were used to shorten the list before the rubric was applied more directly, every resource request under consideration was rated on each rubric point by the raters; iii) the participants were limited to individuals who attended either the February 4 or February 23 PIE meetings.
One discussion point regarded whether all of the resource requests came from validated program reviews. A. Taylor responded that not all program reviews were validated by last Friday, but the list of unvalidated program reviews by then was considerably smaller than at February 4. There was consensus among the members present that resource requests submitted on time should be accepted regardless of whether the program review validation was completed since completion of the validation process was not entirely in the hands of the programs themselves.

The committee then discussed the ranked list of prioritized resource requests. After tallying the scores, the median score had been used to rank, with the mean score used as a secondary ordering factor. B. Blustein commented that one benefit of using the median is that it was sensitive to outliers in a way that the mean is not.

There was also discussion about which years’ monies would be spent on which years’ list. K. Takeda informed the group that College Council has recommended that last years’ requests be met with this years’ funds, so some purchases (Audio-Visual equipment) have been made, however few. This prompted more questions, including, “is last year’s money allotted following last year’s prioritization or is it mopped by this year’s list,” and “is it possible that the entire 15-16 pot could be spent before the Fall 15 list exists?” The 2013-14 list was used to direct the dispensation of 2013-14 block grant monies. When 2014-15 block grant monies became available, a portion of these were also used for the 2013-14 list (since, until the time College Council approves it, there is no 2014-15 list). Going forward, the current list will be consulted as monies become available, whatever they are, at whichever point. If all of the following years’ funds ever become consumed by a prior year’s list, then the process should be reviewed.

Before the list was approved, the group discussed a quirk between the Program Review/Prioritization process and the Foundation Grant process. K. Takeda asked the committee to consider making a recommendation to address the following scenario concerning two items granted funds by the Foundation Grant process. Item “A” was requested in Program Review but may not be eligible for the instructional support grant. Item “B” was not requested in Program Review, but is eligible for the instructional support grant. The recommendation under consideration was: since item “B” can be funded under the block grant, PIE should recommend that it be included in the prioritized requests, to free Foundation funds for item “A”.

With the exception of K. Takeda, the other PIE members agreed to reject the requested consideration. There were a number of reasons for this. One was that even if as worthy a request as “A” was, the Program Review and Foundation Grant processes are distinct and should not be co-mingled. Another was that it would be unfair to allow a request not submitted in Program Review and not considered with the Budget Committee and Vice Presidents. The idea of funding an item not proposed in Program Review (in order to free up Foundation funding for something not eligible for the instructional block grant) did not need the imprimatur of PIE to be considered by Senior Staff.
The draft list of prioritized technology/equipment/books resource requests was approved by PIE to be forwarded to College Council.

Accreditation Announcements
A. Taylor reported to the committee that work on the Self-Evaluation is underway. A Self-Evaluation workshop will be held on March 9th. A draft of the Self-Evaluation will need to be completed by Flex Day 2015.

College Effectiveness
Attendees resumed the review of the data and prompts provided by the District research office for the upcoming College Effectiveness presentation to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee of the Board of Trustees. Some PIE members had questions about the methodology used to produce the data, noting that appropriate responses to the prompts required appropriate understanding and interpretation of the data. Other issues that might affect the data (e.g., Math class caps being dropped, prerequisite enforcement, the “holiday” problem with Monday and Saturday courses in Spring) were also discussed.

Attendees were also apprised of the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Framework of Indicators being forwarded by the State. West will have to set targets for these metrics. Several PIE members felt that the PIE’s process for setting Institutional Set Standards could be mimicked for adopting and setting targets for this framework. There will be a meeting off-campus on March 17th with more information, at which several West personnel will be in attendance.

Meeting adjourned 2:50 p.m.