Minutes
Wednesday, November 14, 2012
1:00 pm-3:00 pm
Winlock

Guests: Dr. Matthew Lee, Peter Mitsakos

1. **Approve Minutes, 10/3/2012.** The minutes were approved as submitted.

2. **Approve Agenda, 11/14/2012.** The agenda was approved.

3. **Introduce Matthew Lee and his initial analysis.** Rebecca Tillberg introduced Dr. Matthew Lee, the consultant who is working with the college to address accreditation recommendations related to institutional effectiveness, planning, program review, and SLO definition and assessment. A draft document of the initial analysis of the program review process and materials were distributed to the committee. Dr. Lee presented his findings and reviewed the draft.

Matthew observed that the strategic plan as currently constructed is an artificial construct. One option is to write an Educational Master Plan that serves as an institutional plan with goals that are broad enough to encompass facilities and technology. Student services is often integrated into the Educational Master Plan (although there are many ways of doing things). Integrating the Student Services Plan and Educational Master Plan...
can help integrate Student Services and Academic Affairs. This discussion is something the college would engage in to shape the Educational Master Plan over the next year. The discussion would include the Senate, PIEC and College Council. This process depends on how the shared governance processes actually works here at West. Matthew’s recommendation would be have representation from all major functional areas of the college, as well as from all constituencies, in the development of the plan.

Matthew highlighted the major items to focus on for program review. Crucial to success of program review is systematic coordination, process and training. Without documentation, the activity didn’t occur. The documentation is needed not just for accreditation, but also for college understanding of what is happening. In the past, for many institutions, program review became a process to request resources. Instead it needs to focus on program improvement and planning. We need to identify needs that do not require additional resources.

Matthew observed that there is a lot of work that needs to be done. It is unlikely for West to gain reaffirmation based on the March report, most likely to be continued on warning. We have been working intensely, and need to maintain that intensity. PIEC should be meeting twice a month. We need to get done what needs to be done due to importance of program review and integration.

Matthew highlighted his item 6.c. This item is important, is in Recommendation 3, and focuses on the relevance, appropriateness and currency of courses and programs. The observation was made that the Curriculum Committee does this review for courses. The program relevance, appropriateness, and currency should be part of program review. The Environmental Scan section sort of gets at this, but we don’t use the terminology of accreditation. If our contention is that the Environmental Scan meets this recommendation, then we need use the terminology in the follow up report – that the environmental scan is intended to explicitly address relevance, appropriateness and currency, and this connection will be made more explicit in the next iteration. From past program review, the conclusion has not been drawn. This point can be picked up during the Validation phase.

4. **Purpose and membership of PIE Committee.** The committee reviewed the charge and membership of the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIE). It was agreed that the following will be added to the purpose: The purpose of the (PIEC) is to ensure that the college maintains a set of ongoing and systematic institutional processes and practices that include planning and initial resource request prioritization, the evaluation
of programs and services, etc. The group agreed that Rebecca would email the final draft to the committee for any additional comments, and if none are received that the draft will be considered approved, and presented to the College Council for their approval.


Peter Mitsakos, architect who is working on the plans for the new buildings stated he plans to tie the current Facilities Plan to the Educational Master Plan and the stated goals from the supplemental EIR. Peter stated that he expects to have a report by March 2013. There is a time limit for everything to be under construction on campus by the end of 2013. The college is going to have to amend the EIR in some way in order for the time limit to be extended. Because we have evaluated the amount of building area on campus, and we don’t have sufficient funds to build all the needs, they will need to be prioritized. The new Facilities Master Plan will address these priorities. There was discussion regarding the Academic Senate not receiving monthly reports from the Facilities Committee. Senate meetings have not included findings from Facilities Committee which includes classroom space usage. Rebecca stated that space assessment reports need to be integrated into program review because this fall’s program review has questions in it that include space needs. She will send reports about facilities needs and plans based on division comments in program review to Ken and Peter for sharing with the Facilities Committee. This needs to be reviewed in the context of the Facilities Master Plan. The Educational Master Plan drives all other plans including the Facilities Plan. There is a breakdown of information being disseminated to the college campus. Peter will bring this concern to Ken Takeda, Co-Chair of the Facilities Committee.

6. Measurable Outcomes. Matthew will review the matrix of Facilities Maser Plan goals and Educational Master Plan goals for this. The report has to be done by January 2013 to present to the Board. The Facilities Committee will present to the PIE Committee and the PIE Committee will present to College Council.

The committee went over a summary of planning process needs. Essential characteristics were discussed. Dr. Lee reported that the second half of the document came from campus interviews. Dr. Lee stated his initial purpose in being at West is to follow up on outcomes and help departments develop and work on their outcomes. The college should develop an Educational Master Plan that will serve as the college’s strategic plan and be constructed...
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in such a way that they provide guidance to facilities and student services. The college can integrate Student Services into the Educational Master Plan. There was discussion of the Educational Policies & Standards Committee which is comprised of faculty, Senate, and Student Services.

There was discussion of the current program review handbook. Dr. Lee stated that whatever actions the college performs in program review need to be documented in this handbook. That includes whatever training that takes place. The college needs to focus on program improvement which includes resources. Participants need to look at what do we need to improve our programs and need to include a systematic evaluation of the program review process.

Dr. Lee noticed that the committee self-evaluation reports seem to be a duplication of summary of meetings for every month along with actions taken & accomplishments. These reports needs to be revised to reflect only the actions taken along with the goals and accomplishments completed.

Discussion of programs – academic divisions should include assessment and documentation of program and course relevance, appropriateness, relevance, and currency.

The following items will be reported to Alice Taylor this week:

1. The follow-up report should make the point that the environmental scan addresses currency, relevance & appropriateness and that connection will be made more explicit in the next iteration of the program review cycle.

2. The currency, relevance and appropriateness of all courses is reviewed and confirmed through the curriculum review cycle.

7. Program Review Update. The due date for all program reviews to be completed is Tuesday, November 27, 2012.

Effectiveness / process assessment proposal. Rebecca distributed the draft proposal to establish twice-yearly joint meetings of the Budget Committee and PIE Committee. The purposes of the joint meetings include: a. Assess effective use of financial resources over the prior and into the current year; b. Improve the effective distribution of financial resources in the coming year; and c. Connect student learning outcomes assessment with program review and budgeting/resource allocation. The joint meeting in January is to conduct an evaluation of the effective allocation of financial resources, and the joint meeting in July is to conduct an evaluation of the planning/budgeting processes. There was discussion of disaggregated data. Several wording suggestions were made and implemented. The proposal
will be presented to the Budget Committee for their approval, and then to the College Council for their approval.

8. *PIE meeting schedule.* The committee meeting schedule was discussed. There has been a problem of low attendance in the past. Dr. Lee recommended this committee meet twice a month.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.