MINUTES

Meeting of Wednesday, November 5, 2014
12:45 pm - 2:45 pm
SSB-414

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

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Minutes from the previous meeting were not available. Approving the October 1 minutes will occur at the next meeting.

Program Review Status

R. Tillberg distributed a handout listing by department/program the status of progress in conducting program review. By the time of the meeting, the completion rate was 59%. Most of the administrative program reviews had not been submitted and a few instructional units had not yet submitted. The instructional units with outstanding program reviews were of concern because such units risk being excluded from the FPIP process. The group discussed the particular circumstances of the instructional programs with outstanding program reviews and resolved to follow-up with the programs in question.
The group then discussed the experience of this year’s program review so far. Some reported hearing that return users of IES were pleased with the improvements each year and felt it became easier to use each year. There was also frustration voiced about the content and volume of program review and planning items that seemed redundant given other similar and increasing obligations (e.g. SLO’s).

Another sentiment that resonated with several attendees was that the process as-it-is is too much work for the chairs given other demands, and perhaps something could be done to lessen the workload—especially since much of the responses to the program review questionnaire don’t need to be changed year-to-year—such as requiring a full survey every other year and a shorter annual update in off years. R. Tillberg suggested that the Spring annual meeting to evaluate campus processes would be a good venue to determine how to address the reconfiguration of the program review process to alleviate the burden of the chairs. R. Tillberg also highlighted this issue’s relation to an idea in the accreditation standards of “sustainability” of processes.

There was further discussion about the potential fates of the outstanding instructional program reviews in relation to FPIP. The group coalesced around the principle of allowing natural consequences to govern programs’ behavior. In alignment with this principle, R. Tillberg agreed to notify the programs of the date on which she would publish the list of completed program reviews to send to FPIP ahead of the FPIP deadline. Those still incomplete by that deadline would face the natural consequence of being excluded.

The group also discussed the timing of the program review evaluation survey and decided by consensus to not conduct the survey this year.

**Accreditation 2016 Self Evaluation**

R. Tillberg reported that the Accreditation Steering Committee was organizing a workgroup or subcommittee (separate from PIE) to look at each standard. Since PIE’s role relates to several standards, R. Tillberg encouraged PIE members to volunteer when the call is made.

She updated the group that the “Self Study” is now called, “Self Evaluation,” and that the ACCJC is changing substantially what they want in the self-evaluation. We should expect to receive the new guidelines in December). The group agreed to either use PIE meeting time or schedule the workgroup meetings to coincide with a shortened PIE meeting for the work of brainstorm what assertions we might make and how we would document them. Each standard and substandard should be discussed, and gaps in evidence could be identified as an outcome of the brainstorming.

F. Leonard mentioned that activities at the upcoming leadership retreat might provide the opportunity to review and reaffirm the college mission and vision with broad input.

**College Effectiveness Report 2014**

R. Tillberg provided background that the College Effectiveness Reports are reports that have been presented by each of the nine district colleges to the Board’s Institutional Effectiveness Committee.
annually for the past five or six years. The format of the presentation, which may change from year to year, is determined by the IE Committee. West is currently scheduled to give its presentation in April.

R. Tillberg then distributed some district-prepared data upon which our report will be based for review and discussion.

In response to some of the numbers that were lower for West than for the district, one PIE member was curious about the average number of hours worked on a job by students at West when compared to the district and the incoming assessment levels in English and Math compared to the District. R. Tillberg felt these were valid questions, but that the latest ARCC data reports are consistent with the numbers in the report she distributed for this discussion, and also provide some controls for different student populations. In general, R. Tillberg felt that on some level West just has to do better. In response to R. Tillberg’s comments, the issue of grade inflation was raised. One PIE member reported that in her experience, some adjuncts think they are supposed to pass lots of students due to having that expectation at other campuses where they teach.

The conversation turned to some of the things West has been doing over the past few years to improve student success such as summer bridge or West Expressway. One member wondered if students were showing up sooner or in larger volume trying to gain access to Math and English classes since they had already completed their matriculation requirements with the help of West Expressway. The group continued for some time discussing this data, touching upon issues including: student demand for courses, scheduling, and making sure students had access to entry level courses, the inclusion of particular strategies on various plans (SSS&P, Equity, EMP), demand for financial aid and financial aid service.

Throughout, R. Tillberg recorded responses to the items from the discussion. After some time, discussion was halted since it constituted a good start at processing the data as they relate to the district strategic plan goals and the presentation of the report remains months away.

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

S. Doerrer reported that the rate of return at West for the district student survey was 90% with 128 out of 142 sections of different courses returning surveys as part of the sample. There was also an online survey administered with a return rate of 9% so far with two weeks remaining. While the response rate on the online survey is low, it represents roughly 400 students out of 4000 surveyed, which is a large number of students. In response to some questions about these rates, S. Doerrer explained that the sample selection is determined at the district office, and since each college participates, the ultimate number of students responding to the survey is very large. Following this, several attendees commented on the varied past and anticipated use of the survey results.

S. Doerrer also distributed a mapping of particular survey items to various accreditation standards and Institution Learning Outcomes.
The Campus Climate survey will be conducted in the Spring (probably February). R. Tillberg has a list of volunteers she will be calling upon to help review the questions and determine how they align with the accreditation standards.

Shared Governance Handbook and Diagram

S. Doerrer presented a Shared Governance Diagram mid-progress of being updated. The group collaborated to help make corrections to the diagram. There was some discussion that there may be too many committees and that perhaps some effort should be made to reduce the number of committees. Others disagreed, arguing that our shared government processes are many years in the making and are working very well when compared to other eras in the college’s history, and that all of that work should not be so hastily discarded (i.e. don’t fix what’s not broken), especially when the college received a commendation on its shared governance structure in the last accreditation visit.

Educational Master Plan Implementation Evaluation

This agenda item was tabled until the next meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 2:56 PM.