Meeting of Wednesday, October 1, 2014
12:45 pm - 2:45 pm
SSB-414

Title/Role | Name | Present
---|---|---
Academic Senate, Faculty Co-Chair | Carmen Dones | X
Academic Senate | Norma Jacinto | X
Academic Senate | Joyce Sweeney | X
Academic Senate (alternate) | Adrienne Foster | X
AFT Guild | Olga Shewfelt | X
AFT Guild | Bonnie Blustein | X
AFT Guild | Alice Taylor | X
VP, Academic Affairs | Bob Sprague | X
VP, Administrative Services | Ken Takeda | X
VP, Student Services (Interim) | Phyllis Braxton | X
Dean, Research and Planning, Administrative Co-Chair | Rebecca Tillberg | X
AFT Classified | Dionne Morrissette | X
Teamsters Representative | Ara Aguiar | X

Ex Officio
President | Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh | X
Chair, College Council | Fran Leonard | X
Faculty Chair, Educational Master Plan Workgroup | Holly Bailey-Hofmann | X

Resource
SLO Representative | Mary-Jo Apigo | X
Research Analyst | Agyeman Boateng | X
Assistant Research Analyst | Sarah Doerrer | X

Visitors
Jason Coleman | X
Ken Lin | X
Patty Banday | X
Celena Alcala | X

Approval of Minutes
The committee approved the minutes from the September 3, 2014 meeting.

Addition of Patty Banday as a Resource Person
Patty Banday visited the committee and announced that the SS&SP plan successfully went through Academic Senate, then offered to answer any questions the committee has. She also noted that she would like to sit in on future committee meetings to determine if there are shared concerns or activities between PIE and SS&SP. Rebecca agreed to add her to the distribution list and to include her as a resource person going forward.

Program Review Status
Rebecca reported to the committee that the current cycle is underway, and that she and Carmen have already conducted two workshops, Carmen with Allied
Health colleagues and Rebecca with BSS colleagues. Other workshops are scheduled as well. Rebecca noted that people are starting to realize that the goals of the process are far-reaching and useful, and that they seem to be getting more familiar with the process.

**Educational Master Plan Update**

**Action Steps Schedule**

Rebecca announced that the EMP is still on schedule to be presented to the Board on December 17, 2014. She discussed the calendar for initiating the roughly 54 action steps from the EMP, noting that they cannot all be undertaken at once and so have been staggered into different terms over three years. For example, there are about a dozen steps scheduled for initiation during Fall 2014, some of which are already in progress. Although College Council has not approved everything in full, Rebecca explained that it may be better to get started now rather than wait a year, knowing that things will change along the way. Rebecca is working on completing set-up in IES to make it easier to monitor EMP progress.

**Role of Point People**

Rebecca pointed out that there will need to be a meeting of the point people to start the process of having them consider further action steps. The group agreed that there needs to be confirmation that all point people are aware of their roles, and also about that they are encouraged to take any newly-developed actions steps to their respective division meetings for collective approval.

**Division-Specific Concerns**

Bonnie also noted that the math division has not yet discussed any action steps, and there seem to be many listed that the division has never agreed to pursue, to which Rebecca offered to come to a division meeting with the EMP to facilitate the process.

**Successful Course Completion Rates and Equity**

Rebecca brought new data to share with the committee that represents an integration of institution set standards with equity measures. She explained that equity measures are currently being examined as part of the Program Review process and, more recently, the Equity Plan. She reminded the committee that the Equity Plan uses the proportionality index, specifically noting that the measure of ‘0.9’ on the index is being used as the minimum level below which a given demographic is considered struggling and in need of interventions.

**General Data Structure Concerns**

The committee first reviewed the table related to successful course completion and point gaps. Rebecca pointed out that programs with smaller ‘N’s may have comparatively large point gaps, and also that certain programs (such as some in CTE) have small point gaps in part because they have entry requirements that would logically lead to higher rates of student success.
Bonnie commented that what is being used is actually a range measure and that it would be helpful to see the standard deviation of the group data, since standard deviation is a measure that is less sensitive to outliers and thus can offer a more meaningful picture. Then the data could be analyzed as to whether students are typically in the middle of the bell curve versus polarized at the top and bottom. However, there was concern that standard deviation would not offer information about breakdown by ethnic group. Agyeman also suggested that people will want course data next, but that with the current data structure, those who are ethnically categorized as ‘Unknown’ and ‘Other’ would be left out.

Rebecca suggested that the use of the data may be something more appropriate for divisions to discuss amongst themselves and consider more carefully. However, Bonnie questioned whether every division is indeed gathering and talking about these numbers, and understanding their implications. It was suggested that perhaps for programs with such small ‘N’s that data interpretation becomes problematic, there is simply not enough program demand to justify their continuation, though Bonnie noted that such programs may still be in the pilot stage. The question of whether to suppress the low ‘N’s or the point spread data remained unresolved.

**Institution Set Standards**

Rebecca reiterated that Accreditation requires West to articulate institution set standards, an example of which is successful course completion rate. At West, the institution set standard for course completion rates has been set at 60%, a level based on historic data and one which we aspire not to fall below. Ken Lin recommended that perhaps success rates that go into comparing our results against this standard ought to be disaggregated demographically. The committee also agreed that course completion rates can be tricky to address because improvement in that arena needs to be weighed against the possibility of incentivizing grade inflation. However, West is falling below institution set standards in various areas, and PIE needs to examine what factors are contributing to these trends.

Bonnie noted that class size is an important factor that seems to be missing in the data, despite the fact that it is a known variable in student success and is very different depending on the discipline. Yet class size data are not reported alongside discipline-specific course success rates, even though class size could be contributing to success rate discrepancies. Rebecca agreed that class size may be a variable that needs to be added to future reporting.

**Program Set Standards**

Rebecca went on to say that Accreditation also wants Program Set Standards to be developed and reported. She presented a draft interpretation of data for those standards, including the addition of question marks by disciplines with low success rates, and color coding of quartiles based on discipline success rates relative to one another. Bonnie raised the concern that such coding means that half of the programs will be automatically be red (much lower than average), which Rebecca acknowledged may be problematic. Bonnie recommended that color coding be removed as part of the quartile coding, if only because colleagues often print in black & white, which would mean some of the nuance of the data is lost.
Members of the committee did not reach consensus on whether the goal of accreditation (i.e. creating higher stakes for programs falling into the lower quartiles) is a positive goal to strive for. On the one hand, some argued that the raw numbers that go into the quartiled data may be lacking in important context and that comparing one discipline to another may be arbitrary, while on the other hand, others pointed out that it’s impossible to talk meaningfully about student success without such data. There was not consensus on whether such discussion was a helpful use of the committee’s time. Ultimately, Rebecca recommended that colleagues individually consider these data and then engage in further discussion within their divisions. Celena suggested that perhaps program set standards could be set during the Program Review process, which the committee agreed was a valuable idea.

Bonnie suggested that a request ought to be made at Divisional Council, as well as in any discipline-specific communications about these data, that faculty consider more precisely what data they would find useful to facilitate their discussions around disproportionate impact and equity. Then, a process could be created for colleagues to get the data they really need rather than the data Accreditation considers most important. Rebecca pointed out that many disciplines and divisions have approached the Office of Research & Planning already with such requests. Bonnie further suggested that because we know the two largest at-risk groups identified by West are young adults and African-American students, it might be useful to analyze the data about the success of those students in a multivariate way, with the hope that seeing how such variables intersect will point towards interventions. The committee agreed that the key question is whether we are primarily interested in highlighting the differences between disciplines versus catalyzing meaningful discussion about student success within disciplines.

**Districtwide Student Survey and Campus Climate Survey Updates**

Carmen explained the plan for completing implementation of both the Districtwide Student Survey and the Campus Climate Survey. Rebecca explained that the sections were randomly selected for inclusion in the District survey (with online sections excluded and those students surveyed separately and directly), and that the survey window will close on Friday, October 31. There has not been any new progress on the Campus Climate Survey since the last PIE meeting.

**Participatory Governance Handbook and Diagram**

Rebecca announced to the committee that the handbook is still a work-in-progress, but that there is an updated diagram of the shared governance structure to be included as part of the Participatory Governance Handbook. Also, she noted that the main updates to the handbook will be related to the details pertaining to each standing committee. She further explained that the structure doesn’t necessarily imply that all bodies below the President report to him directly, just that they have a role in advising him and have a direct line to him.

There were a number of questions about elements of the diagram, including whether there currently exists a Professional Development Committee, and also...
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whether SS&SP actually reports to Senate. The correction was also noted that Work Environment Committee reports to Senate, not College Council.

Bonnie also recommended that it would be useful to review the minutes of various committees’ meetings to note who actually attends so that if there is enough overlap, committees could be merged for the sake of greater institutional effectiveness. Relatedly, if reports that come out of committee work could be distributed via e-blast to all West colleagues, then those reports would only need to be discussed at meetings where further action is required.