Minutes
Wednesday, January 9, 2013
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm
President’s Conference Room (PRC)

Title/Role Name Present
Chair, College Council [ex officio] Fran Leonard X
Adrienne Foster X
Olga Shewfelt
AFT Guild [3] Olga Shewfelt
Bonnie Blustein
AFT Guild Bonnie Blustein X
President [ex officio] Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh
Ken Takeda, VP Shalamon Duke, Actg. VP
Bob Sprague, VP
AFT Classified [3] Dionne Morrissette
AFT Guild Bonnie Blustein X
Dean, Research and Planning, Chair Rebecca Tillberg X
Bob Sprague
Teamsters Representative Judith-Ann Friedman X
Shalamon Duke
Student Services Representative (Celena Alcala, also above) (x)
Celena Alcala for Shalamon Duke
Union Rep: SIEU Abel Rodriguez
ASO Representative
Budget Manager Maureen O’Brien
Research Analyst Agyeman Boateng

Also in attendance: Matthew Lee, Joyce Sweeney, Laura Peterson

I. REVIEW AGENDA
A. Foster wished to add to this meeting a discussion on the definition of Program/s. It will be added to an upcoming agenda.

II. REVIEW MINUTES
Minutes approved with no changes

III. CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY, SPRING 2013
R. Tillberg referred attendees to an updated Spring 2013 Campus Climate Survey. This new version featured an additional section of questions geared toward the evaluation of administrative services, primarily for the purpose of evaluating administrative service area outcomes. M. Lee elaborated on the section design, having created it in conversation with the Administrative Services departments informed by the insight that most administrative SAO’s include some measure of client satisfaction. This new section is tentative, he added, pending feedback from Administrative Services.

There was some discussion about specific content and design issues. The committee agreed to remove the “primary services include” descriptors from services that were self-evident, to keep “Maintenance” separate from “Facilities”, and to remove “Event Services” from the questionnaire. M. Lee mentioned he would speak to K. Takeda regarding the committee suggestion of including the Sheriff’s Office. The committee also decided to change the wording of the gender question to “How do you identify yourself” and to modify the age question (collapse younger categories into “under 18”) given the presumption that no one under 18 would complete the survey.
By consensus the committee agreed to approve the document in principle given the changes discussed and to give final approval authority to the chair with the understanding that feedback from Administrative Services may require additional changes to the questionnaire.

IV. Program Review Update

R. Tillberg referred attendees to the “Program Review Validation Status Fall 2012” document distributed at the meeting. She began the conversation reporting that 22% of programs had completed the entire cycle (program review and validation), and delineated the various stages at which any Program Review may have progressed to at this stage are: i) not submitted; ii) submitted but not validated; iii) submitted, validated, and approved; iv) submitted, reviewed for validation but rejected, and not re-opened by the program; v) submitted, reviewed for validation, rejected, and re-opened. There was some conversation regarding the fact that Program Reviews in state i) and state v) fell under the “in progress” classification. M. Lee stressed that there needed to be (if not now, then down the line) a way to distinguish between those who did not submit yet versus those who did submit but had to revise, since from an accreditation standpoint there is a huge difference between the two.

A. Foster called for a much more explicit review of the process of Program Review and Validation, specifically asking, what happens if someone does not submit, or doesn’t revise when they’re in rejection (i.e. the “or else” question). After suggesting referral to the program viability process as a consequence of not being able to complete the program review process, there was conversation about equity of consequences (for one, the viability process as an option pertains mostly to the academic-domain rather than, say, administrative areas; and furthermore, some programs are required by law and cannot be eliminated); as well as the (mistaken) impression that the point of viability studies is to dismantle programs. On this last point, A. Foster and R. Tillberg stressed that conducting a viability study does not necessarily imply imminent program termination, and that the viability process was flexible, providing many options for action (e.g. reorganization). R. Tillberg recommended that the Academic Senate discuss the viability process, and the consequences for Program Review non-compliance, believing that such conversations would be fruitful. The consequences of non-compliance will then be taken up again as a future agenda item. One consequence agreed upon by the committee was the recommendation that Program Review non-compliance be noted on the performance evaluations of program or area managers.

R. Tillberg asked the committee for help in getting outstanding programs to finish their program review and validation. The committee proceeded to go through the list of outstanding programs discussing the reasons for individual programs not having completed the process, many of which were idiosyncratic (e.g. student services was going to have a conference the coming Friday to complete their validations). In the discussion, the issue of program definition came up again, illustrating the need to discuss at length in a later meeting.

M. Lee stated that his review of the outcomes section of the program review results caused considerable concern and that he hoped the validation process had caught the issues he saw. He strongly recommended having validation results as inputs into the program review process evaluation so that errors can be considerably reduced in the next cycle. He also stressed at several points in the discussion the need for urgency about completing the Program Review and Validation process.
The issue of the President’s Office, Academic Affairs, and other areas responsible directly to the Vice Presidents participating in program review (along with the logistics and the timing ramifications) was also discussed. The committee agreed with B. Blustein’s suggestion that when implemented, these higher administrative level program reviews not depend on the program reviews of the units under their purview, given inherent timing and workload issues. R. Tillberg reported that while doing anything for this cycle would not be feasible, conversations with the President had begun and that the President was eager to participate in Program Review in the future. As for the present, M. Lee suggested that the committee consider this cycle transitional, and that any resource request from the Vice Presidents’ or President’s Office come directly to PIEC to be integrated with the others.

V. Program Review Survey

R. Tillberg referred attendees to an updated 2012-13 Program Review Survey. She mentioned she would add language in the introduction alerting participants that their responses would be confidential. After conversing about the target group, the committee decided that information about who did and did not participate would be useful, and so the survey will be administered to the entire campus. The committee also agreed to modify the first question so that responses of “did not participate” would branch immediately to the end of the survey (to accommodate those respondents who did not participate in Program Review); to make reference to the IES software consistent (“IES (online program review)”; and to insert a technical catch-all question (e.g. “If you had any technical issues with IES (online program review) software please list them here”) before question four.

Wondering how a hypothetical survey participant would formulate a response to question nine (“In the following areas, how helpful was the validation cycle to your Division/Dept/Office), prompted the committee to return to discussing program review in the departments. One suggestion was that the form letter received by submitters after their Program Review has been validated should recommend logging back into IES to check for any comments left by the validators. The committee also wondered if there should be a question about “enhancing dialogue in your department and/or division”. The committee recognized that in order for question nine to be meaningfully answered, nearly all programs would have passed through the validation cycle with time to spare to have at least one meeting to discuss their program reviews. A. Foster agreed to ask for divisions to distribute program reviews at their first week meetings, and R. Tillberg agreed to post validation reports online to facilitate access. The survey will be taken up again at the February PIEC meeting.

VI. Effectiveness Evaluation

This conversation was postponed due to time constraints.

VII. Resource Request Prioritization

R. Tillberg referred attendees to a revised “Principles for Prioritizing Programs and Services” document. She reported that upon consulting with the chair of College Council, it would be best for PIE to give Council a draft of updated principles for comment.

B. Blustein raised a question about the point system, pointing out that it did not accommodate a scenario where something was legally required, but got zeroes in all point categories. She
suggested the priorities be framed to accommodate i) the legally mandated/or not dyad and ii) the consequences of supporting or sacrificing particular programs.

The specific examples of the Aviation and Paralegal programs were mentioned. Using these concrete examples, the committee quickly realized that it would not be an option to always withhold funding absent a program review (e.g. if a program loses accreditation because of a rejected resource request, students will be left holding the bag, and there may be liability issues in the wake of such an event). And in any event, there may be multiple mandated items that could not all be fully satisfied and would still need to be prioritized.

The Committee agreed that if a program is claiming that a resource request is mandated, they must submit documentation of the mandate and a statement of the consequences if it is not met. They continued to review the prioritization principles document, applying specific examples to motivate the discussion. There was also discussion about how to incorporate the evaluation or quality of the Program Review into the rubric. The group decided to meet again on January 17th from 9:30 to 12:00 to work further on the principles and rubric. In the meantime, R. Tillberg would send out an email with a ballot asking the committee members about the weight each item on the rubric should receive.

As the meeting came to a close, M. Lee mentioned that prioritization of resource requests was supposed to begin on January 22 and end March 6th. M. Lee suggested that it would be difficult to make a March 6th deadline without a few intensive meetings. The presentation to the budget committee was scheduled for March 28. Because of this workload, R. Tillberg floated calling another PIE meeting Jan 23rd at 1pm in addition to the Feb 13 meeting already scheduled.

The Meeting Adjourned at 3:14 pm