Minutes
Wednesday, December 5, 2012
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm
SSB -414

In Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shalamon Duke</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Bonnie Blustein for Olga Shewfelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionne Morrissette</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Abel Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristi Lizares</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mary-Jo Apigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Sprague</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Aimee Preziosi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Takeda</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Marlene Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Tillberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Maureen O’Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran Leonard</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Adrienne Foster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guest: Matthew C. Lee

I. REVIEW MINUTES
The minutes were approved with a number of corrections (please see supplemental on page 4)
No objections were made to these corrections as discussed.

II. REVIEW AGENDA
Agenda approved by consensus.
• Agyeman Boateng was introduced as the new Research Analyst as of November 26, 2012.

III. PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE
R. Tillberg distributed a handout of the status of Program Review and Validation to date,
announcing that most Program Reviews were in. The attendees proceeded to discuss a variety
of issues concerning Program Review. After the discussion had gone on for quite a while, R. Tillberg
distributed reports produced from the program review data, which prompted further discussion.

Some of the issues discussed were:

Nomenclature and Definitions
• “Program”: M. Lee raised the question of what defined a program. Discussion followed
  illustrating the variability in what could constitute a program and that Program Review and
  SLO had different taxonomies. M. Lee recommended that the College adopt a common
  definition of a program, and that while it was too late for this cycle, it is not too late for the
  next one. He also said that everyone needs to know what a program is if the question comes
  up during the evaluation team visit. Later in the discussion he added that as long as from
  year to year the College’s program definitions are the same and everything that is a
  program knows it is a program, the College should be fine.
• “Division”: M. Lee proposed using the term “Area” rather than “Division” to denote the
  large fields of responsibility under the Vice Presidents.
• “Goal”: In the second half of the conversation there was some discussion about the term
  “goal” and the gap between its technical meaning in the context of Program Review and its
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colloquial meaning among faculty and Deans. M. Lee reiterated that the purpose of the program review process is not the acquisition of resources but program improvement, thus “goal” in this context meant “program improvement goal”.

Scope of Program Review

• Much of the early conversation (confluent with the exchanges about definitions of “program” and the “division”/“department”/“area” nomenclature) involved answering individual participants’ questions about where certain units lay in the Program Review terrain, and if there were any units that somehow did not or rightly should not participate in Program Review.

• It was discussed and determined that units reporting to the President’s Office, (e.g. Marketing and Communications), should fall under Program Review. The committee agreed with having a conversation with the President about the breakdown of appropriate units for Program Review, but that given the short notice, asking for some response from a particular unit for this cycle would be an undue burden on the staff. Toward the end of this conversation, M. Lee cautioned that not every single resource allocation need come out of Program Review, illustrating with examples.

Process and Next Steps

• Evaluation: Aspects of the evaluation of the Program Review process came up periodically over the course of the conversation, particularly, by B. Blustein. There was also some discussion about the PIE Committee’s self-evaluation. For each, timing was a crucial concern discussed. There were differing ideas on whether the PIEC self-evaluation should occur in Spring or early Summer – it will need to coincide with the joint PIEC-Budget committee meeting and precede the August review cycle. R. Tillberg reported that she was updating a calendar of the committee’s activities. M. Lee suggested the Program Review evaluation survey be administered in February with results presented in March.

  o Validation: R. Tillberg highlighted the importance of the validation phase in facilitating appropriate responses to program review prompts. In conversation about the understanding on the ground of the term “goal,” M. Lee reiterated that the purpose of the Program Review process is program improvement. D. Morrissette recommended providing examples of Program Reviews done well in the training materials.

  Further discussion ensued about how far to go in terms of the rigor of the validation stage, in particular, concerning the problems among some Program Review submitters in distinguishing goals from resource requests. M. Lee offered that perhaps the validators could accept everything this cycle, but warn submitters now, and later with a memo in September, that all future Program Reviews with resource requests as goals will be returned for revision. The discussion closed with K. Takeda’s suggestion that if resource allocation is a person’s goal, that person may not be able to make the distinction.

IV. Prioritization Rubric

Opening up conversation regarding how to prioritize the resource requests that come out of Program Review, R. Tillberg distributed a draft rubric developed quite a while ago.
M. Lee suggested that the principles, which were formally approved in 2011, be updated, noting that principles for prioritizing resource allocation should be improved or arrived at first, with the rubric arising out of the principles. Upon some initial conversation critiquing the current document, and recognizing that FPIP was a well-established process for faculty hires, it was suggested that: i) the committee should perhaps focus on resource requests that come out of Program Review, and ii) since the current Principles document was already formally approved, it was best to start with that.

Motivated by a desire to clarify the role of the PIE committee in resource allocation, further discussion touched upon how things are/were typically done at West, and how things were done elsewhere. R. Tillberg responded that, in the past, after each Vice President made a priority list for their areas, they convened and compiled a merged list, condensing it to about ten items, though how they were prioritized was never discussed. In the future, R. Tillberg stated, this committee will do that prioritization. M. Lee recommended that now was not the time to initialize a new process for prioritizing classified staff requests parallel to the FPIP process, and that for this cycle, prioritizing such requests should be done within the PIE committee, which would then use the process evaluation to determine whether that approach worked well or not.

Given the state of the conversation, since there was no recommendation for changes to the prioritization principles, it was resolved to present the current document to College Council and ask for guidance rather than making a specific recommendation.

V. **Campus Climate Survey, Spring 2013**

R. Tillberg distributed a revised Campus Climate Survey for 2013 for discussion.

M. Lee was concerned about the timing of the survey in relation to the accreditation follow-up visit. R. Tillberg felt it could be sent in February. She noted that the SLO committee wanted to get a survey out as soon as possible, since there was some discussion of Student Services and Administrative Services including questions that would satisfy service outcome evaluation requirements, although the length of the existing survey was already a concern. M. Lee recommended not administering too many different surveys if there was already an established survey.

Running out of time, the committee decided to review the survey in two weeks to accommodate any possible edits in preparation for a January/February launch.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:10 pm
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SUPPLEMENTAL

Corrections to PIE 11/4/12 meeting minutes

At the Dec 5, 2012 PIE meeting, M. Lee suggested the following corrections:

- Page Two:
  - Topmost paragraph:
    - Remove "likely" from: "the discussion would likely"
    - At “functional areas of the college”, add "as well as from all constituencies"
  - Second full paragraph:
    - Delete “What that implies is a pace to the work.”
    - Replace "but maybe not intensely enough" with "and need to maintain that intensity"
    - Replace “implies a need for an urgency” with “We need"

- Third full paragraph:
  - Replace “review for course” with "review for courses"
  - Replace "evaluation could" with "relevance, appropriateness, and currency should"
  - Replace “— that it is intended” with "— that the environmental scan is intended"

- Page Three:
  - Last paragraph (Measurable Outcomes):
    - After "will review the matrix" insert "of Facilities Master Plan goals and Educational Master Plan goals"
    - Create a new paragraph between "College Council." And "The committee went"
    - After "discussed. Dr. Lee reported", insert, "that the second half of the document came out of the interviews"
    - Replace “Dr. Lee stated his purpose" with "Dr. Lee stated his initial purpose"
    - Delete “Sound practices lead to a level of practice"