MINUTES

Wednesday, April 1, 2015
12:45 pm - 2:45 pm
SSB-414

Meeting Start
Meeting called to order at 12:50 by Rebecca Tillberg

Minutes from the Previous Meeting
Minutes from the March 4 meeting were approved

Program Review Prioritization
R. Tillberg distributed a report summarizing the status of the prioritized equipment requests. K. Takeda updated the group on the status. The list, he informed the group, reflects the second review by Cabinet after having been refined since its creation, updated with estimates of cost, block grant eligibility, and amount eligible for funding. One remaining point of clarification needed was whether a requested lab could be utilized by only one department or several. There were also questions about some other individual requests and a technical question regarding bond funding.

K. Takeda reminded the group that another round of funding is made available June 1. Although, he could not say with certainty, he predicted that it would probably contain fewer funds than were made available
this year, and likely have a similar restriction about having to be spent within the year. There was also a discussion about how the list coincides with funding from year to year.

The committee discussed what to do about the remainder of resource requests yet to be prioritized. One member noted that College Council recommended that classified requests go to the classified group. R. Tillberg agreed to create a list of the remaining unprioritized resource requests so there can be clarity about the amount of work to be done. P. Braxton agreed to contact the organizers of the previous classified staffing planning effort. As for the remainder of requests, the group will wait for the Vice Presidents to submit their list of priorities to PIE.

Campus Climate Survey
A. Boateng provided an update about the survey. So far, there have been 190 responses, which is an improvement over the last administration of the survey and approaches the 200+ responses in years before that. The reminder sent the morning of April 1 will be the last to go out. After that, the downloading and analysis of survey responses will occur at the discretion of the Office of Research and Planning. Ideally, the analysis will be done before the term ends, as the results will be useful to inform accreditation self-study activities.

Effectiveness Evaluation
R. Tillberg noted several efforts aimed at getting California Community Colleges to evaluate their effectiveness at an institutional level. The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is the newest of these efforts. P. Braxton provided some background, summarizing that this effort grew out of a desire in the Chancellor’s Office to be proactive in encouraging and assisting Colleges in the evaluation of institutional effectiveness required by the ACCJC.

The task for the college is to set aspirational targets by June 30 and post these on the web. The indicators, as R. Tillberg mentioned, are similar to others (e.g. completion, course completion, degrees, certificates, transfer). There were others that involved fiscal matters that would be computed at the District level.

R. Tillberg presented some charts which included indicators based on a few different strategies for setting targets. There was much discussion about the act of setting targets and how to select a meaningful percentage improvement factor. While the point was made that so much of the input into a student achievement metric are beyond the control of the College or its staff or faculty, some PIE members felt setting targets and taking them seriously was useful for the sake of framing and orienting efforts and attitudes toward improvement, even if the targets were not reached. The conversation then flowed into a discussion about student services and recruitment and ideas that may help to achieve some percentage increase in student achievement and completion metrics over time. Those PIE members who attended the IEPI training communicated to the committee that the effort really was meant to help, and that the point is to encourage colleges not just to be pessimistic about their effectiveness metrics, but to also set aspirational targets. The issue of IEPI targets will be taken up again at the next PIE meeting.

Accreditation Standard Committee I
Nancy Sander joined the group as a member of the Accreditation Standard I committee, and the group, split into subgroups to identify evidence that West meets the particular substandard they were focusing on.

MEETING ADJOURNED 2:50 P.M.