MINUTES

Meeting of Thursday, July 31, 2014
12:45 pm - 2:45 pm
SSB-414

Meeting called to order at 12:55 pm by Carmen Dones.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of both the May and June PIE Committee Meetings (May 8, 2014 and June 4, 2014) were accepted with only minor changes.

Program Review Planning for 2014 – 15

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meetings 2014-2015
First Wednesday of each month; 12:45 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.

Prioritization Retreats:
Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Process Evaluation:
Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Effectiveness Evaluation:
**Divisional Council Kick-off**
Rebecca confirmed that PIE will be able to do the Program Review kick off with Divisional Council on Tuesday, August 5 (although ORP staff will all be absent). Additionally, Rebecca announced that she had received a report from Jane Witucki listing all courses needing to be updated in the COR this coming year. Carmen noted that offering that list at Divisional Council might be wise and the group agreed. Alice then pointed out that it might be time to consider the implications of not having updated CORs since some disciplines are refusing to do so.

**IES Update**
Rebecca reported that the rollover feature in IES has been put into place and demonstrated what this would look like on-screen for the group, using one of Carmen’s Program Reviews that has already been initiated. Specifically, there is a field called ‘Previous Year Answer’ which can be copied and pasted into the current year’s answer if the respondent so chooses.

**Review of Calendar**
The Committee took a closer look at the current calendar and discussed some of the important dates, especially the October 24 due date for Program Review, and noted it would be helpful to have some faculty submit earlier if possible, so that there isn’t a bottleneck in the process. It was also noted that the September 2nd date (Divisional Council orientation) is a duplicate and should be removed. Rebecca asked Ken for the budget preparation schedule for spring so those dates can be plugged in and added to the calendar as well.

**Validation Teams**
Using the handout, Rebecca explained that the structure of the validation teams was adjusted a bit this year because the units doing Program Review were also adjusted. Although Validation Managers have been identified, the Validation Team Members still need to be named. The Validation Teams will have cross-area representation, as well as some faculty. Some PIE members volunteered to participate, and recommended that other faculty be recruited at Divisional Council and through the Academic Senate.

There was extensive discussion about how to improve the quality of the resource requests. Some felt that some divisions score much better than others. Two approaches were identified: improve training, and validate the scoring methodology. Model resource requests could be used in training, and further explanations about the Rubric, and alignment of Goals, Planned Actions and Resource Requests would be helpful.

Rebecca further recommended that a Technology Committee representative on the validation team could assist in ensuring that a likely candidate for resource request funding would not be overlooked. Ken suggested that Larry or Nick would be the best candidates to be validation team members. Bonnie further commented that technology requests could be pulled out before validation and offered to Technology Committee, which could then review them for reasonable cost, coherence, proper specs, etc., and then report back to the validators. Ken added that the Technology Committee doesn’t meet again until September 16th, but would still have 3 weeks to look at the report before their November meeting after the Program Review deadline.

**Training Sessions**
The Committee decided to coordinate program review training with Tech Fair, as was done in the past. Instead of scheduling weekly on Fridays, it was decided to offer training on Friday mornings and Tuesday late afternoon.

Rebecca asked the group whether pre-planned themes are better versus working one-on-one; the Committee agreed the latter is what people seem to need, similar to SLO office hours. Bonnie offered that the only way to circumvent that necessity would be co-opt some Divisional Council time, possibly at the October 7 meeting.

Facilities and Technical Committees
Ken informed the group that the Facilities Committee has voted to implement a new policy specifying that requests for facilities improvement should come through Program Review. Such requests would be set aside, sent to the Facilities Committee for review, then sent back to PIE, ensuring Facilities Committee is included in the validation process. A similar process was carried out last time with technology-related requests sent to Technology Committee but there wasn’t enough time to come back with a prioritization list.

Ken urged PIE to make sure the Program Review schedule includes time for those committees to complete review of the resource requests and return them in a prioritized way. Alice suggested that perhaps Facilities could conduct a process similar to area prioritization parallel to when the presidents are giving their lists, or right after the area prioritization cycle ends. However, both Facilities and Technology would have to finish at their first meeting of the semester or it would be too late for the February 27th Prioritization Retreat, and they would have to produce their own lists. PIE agreed that a good day needs to be found in mid-February to have the Technology / Facilities cycles end officially on the calendar. Rebecca asked if VPs could meet in January, to talk about integrating A&I requests into Program Review, but Ken says they haven’t yet heard about the timeline. Alice pointed out that they could get a report on A&I requests as soon as this year, while asking for feedback on what does or doesn’t work. Ken volunteered to take these ideas to Technology Committee directly.

Influx of Funds
Ken announced to PIE that at the State Chancellor’s Budget Workshop on July 30th, he saw a revised version of what West is getting in terms of facilities and instructional support funding - $13.2 million this year compared to last year $1.2 million (our share of the pie will be $925-950K compared to only $170K) - undivided between Facilities and Instructional Support. Ken also noted that infrastructure is prohibited use of those funds, but that they could be used for resources such as computer labs, servers to support instruction, or anything library-related. He mentioned that the funds can be carried out into the 2015-16 Program Review Cycle if need be. However, it is also one-time block grant money that may or may not happen again in 2015-16, which the committee agreed needs to be very clearly communicated. Rebecca suggested that maybe Ken should be at Divisional Council, so that this isn’t framed incorrectly, and so that he can emphasize that this is where any new process with Technology Committee will be especially important. Bonnie mentioned that Technology Committee may think of things that transcend specific program requests, so IT in particular needs a heads up about any new process so that they can prepare in case they want to put such ideas through Program Review. If there are many
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more technology requests than expected, Technology Committee would likely need to insert a special meeting, according to Ken.

Educational Master Plan Workgroup Update

Use of IES to support evaluation of the EMP
Rebecca proposed putting the EMP on IES for evaluation, thereby hopefully increasing engagement in the EMP among people on campus. She would set up everything in the system and then there would be questions leftover to answer. She wanted input on these, but more importantly wanted to be sure that everyone agrees this is a good way to go. In Spring, PIE would review everything that comes in and make a report, considering anything that needs to be bolstered, clarified, discontinued, etc. The group carefully reviewed the draft questions and agreed that #2 is narrative, but #3 is presumably what’s left to complete from #1, so it was suggested that maybe the wording could be tweaked to say “if you have revised your action steps, describe your plan.” Rebecca asked whether perhaps a question should be added that says “please evaluate your progress on this objective given this data” that includes data for them to consider.

Alice asked whether there are point people identified to evaluate goals and strategic directions in addition to objectives. Bonnie recommended tacking onto Question 5: “comment on goal” and Question 6: “comment on strategic direction”, both of which would allow for reporting. Rebecca noted that there could be a goal coordinator on the team for each of the objectives, though she doesn’t want to overwhelm the point person with a million questions.

SLO Software Selection
Rebecca described the status of this process, noting that resource requests through program review have been put in for several years and it’s been prioritized each time but without funding. After review of 7 software packages by the SLO Committee, the best choices were narrowed down to 2 software packages, eLumen, which is used by City and Trade, and TracDat, which is used by East. Both allow for data gathering at the student level. Having seen the demos, Rebecca shared that she thinks it would be a good idea to move Program Review and Planning into the new commercial software, whichever one it turns out to be, to be pilot tested by the SLO team.

Bonnie expressed concern about a privacy issue with student-level data, though other committee members noted that the data is only available to the faculty member and SLO administrators. There was extensive discussion about privacy and related issues. Rebecca mentioned that Accreditation requires colleges to assess disproportionate impact in SLOs, which then requires student-level data.

Student Survey
In the interest of time, this topic was tabled until the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 pm.