MINUTES
Meeting of Wednesday, January 8, 2014
12:45 pm-2:45 pm
SSB-414

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate, Faculty Co-Chair</td>
<td>Carmen Dones</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Norma Jacinto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Judy Chow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Joyce Sweeney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate (alternate)</td>
<td>Adrienne Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT Guild</td>
<td>Olga Shewfelt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT Guild</td>
<td>Bonnie Blustein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT Guild</td>
<td>Alice Taylor</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Bob Sprague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP, Administrative Services</td>
<td>Ken Takeda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP, Student Services (Interim)</td>
<td>Phyllis Braxton</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Research and Planning, Administrative Co-Chair</td>
<td>Rebecca Tillberg</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT Classified</td>
<td>Dianne Morissette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT Classified</td>
<td>Ashanti Lyles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Classified Bargaining Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamsters Representative</td>
<td>Ara Aguiar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASO Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Resource
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A Vision for the Future
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Approval of Minutes, December 4, 2013
There were a few corrections to the minutes which were approved as amended.

Program Review Update

Status Update
The discussion began with a question about the process for submitting suggestions for improvements in the next cycle. R. Tillberg responded, saying that there will be opportunities to provide such suggestions including the survey and the joint meeting with budget to evaluate

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meetings 2013-2014
First Wednesday of each month; 12:45 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.
9/4/13; 10/2/13; 11/6/13; 12/4/13; 01/8/14; 02/05/14; 03/05/14; 04/02/14; 05/07/14; 06/04/14; 07/02/14; 08/06/14

Prioritization Retreat: Friday, March 14, 2014
Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Effectiveness Evaluation:
Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Process Evaluation: Thursday, March 6, 2014
processes. She added that reviewing the questions to be asked is also something this committee does and can be on next meeting’s agenda.

The specific issue that prompted this question was the suitability of grants to the current program review process. Some managers of grant program reviews felt the questions did not suit their programs and found themselves typing in n/a for many of the responses. An idea was floated to have the grants’ annual performance reviews stand in for the program review form since the work of yearly evaluation and planning typically is encapsulated in these documents. As discussion continued, the group coalesced around an idea to create a shorter program review form tailored to grants.

Survey Results
R. Tillberg distributed a draft summary of the survey results. There were 30 responses so far, in the previous year there were 45. The group agreed to send out a survey reminder in hopes of collecting more responses.

Evaluation and IES Changes
Between discussion of the responses to the survey and the upcoming IES meeting a few suggestions were proposed to consider changing for the next cycle. Among those suggestions (in addition to the previous discussion’s suggestion of creating a short form for grants) were:

- Change the planning area so that it is easier to navigate
- Have the rollover of past responses work properly
- The ability to attach or upload documents
- Improve reports and automatically send reports upon completion of steps
- Improve the validation section

There was some discussion what could be done to improve the validation portion of the cycle. One criticism was that when the program review is reopened after rejection, the validation comments are not readily apparent to the user.

One participant questioned the necessity of validation teams, since in this cycle, most validators worked on their own to complete the work of validation due to the difficulty of getting groups together to do the validation. A. Taylor commented that as a college we were aiming for teams. She argued that having validation teams would help with overall awareness of program review—we just needed to execute the process in a way that made it easier rather than harder for administrators. P. Braxton shared that at Pierce teams were used, but were scheduled for specific dates to meet, and departments would come to present and/or ask questions about their program reviews in dialogue with the validation team. Further along in the discussion R. Tillberg expressed that reinvigorating validation in this way also presented an opportunity to deepen the involvement of classified staff into Program Review.

The conversation continued along several threads. Following a comment by A. Taylor about the interest faculty seemed to express in the work of colleagues in other disciplines, A. Foster suggested that information relevant to various committees (e.g. SLO, student success) be extracted from Program Review and distributed. While some of this was already occurring, she felt the practice could be broadened (for instance, she did not recall the Curriculum committee receiving a report).

Ideas were also floated for ways to tie into the Tech Fair Program Review related topics such as “how do I link things in the Planning section”, or “the SLO – Program Review connection.” There was also discussion about increasing the participation of classified staff and adjuncts.
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The conversation ended with a few more suggestions for practical improvements to the process.

- Given the problem of variability in the quality of program reviews, F. Leonard suggested tapping validators to: i) cull and identify “good responses” and ii) provide explanations of why they returned program reviews. Samples of their responses could be included in the next program review handbook.
- It was also suggested that at the start of program review a Word document with the questions could be distributed in case departments wanted to work on the questions outside of IES then enter them in when they arrived at their final answers.
- Training
  - While training was scheduled and available every week, some committee members felt it may have focused too much on the technical aspects of the program review interface. The trainings were initially intended to focus on particular content-related aspects of the program review process, but for a number of reasons, often devolved into the technical aspects.
    - One cause of this was that various programs visiting the training were at different stages in program review and the present need seemed to be to get them started and going.
  - Committee members saw value in the way FPIP handled training this year. In particular, the idea of bringing a draft to the training to get eyes on it before it was official.
    - Getting more of the PIE committee and/or validators to the trainings was suggested as a way to better provide similar feedback.

R. Tillberg, A. Boateng, MJ Apigo, and C. Dones volunteered to meet with District IT on IES improvements. They chose the afternoon of Thursday, January 30 among the available times for the meeting.

**Prioritization Retreat Planning**

Given numerous PIE committee member commitments in the coming months, there was a discussion about the timing for the Prioritization Retreat. Despite a Joint CSSO conference on the 14th that would occupy the Vice Presidents, the committee decided March 14th was the best date for the Prioritization Retreat.

R. Tillberg distributed sample reports outlining some of the resource requests from Fall 2013 Program Review. She suggested that for this cycle, personnel requests and non-personnel requests should be prioritized separately.

There was a question regarding a discussion at the previous Budget committee meeting about an enhanced office supply fund to prevent the situation of any program’s basic office supply needs not being met due to being positioned low on the prioritized list of requests. Committee members who would be in attendance at the upcoming President’s Cabinet meeting resolved to bring this issue up there.

**Joint Meeting with Budget Committee**

A. Taylor raised the concern that with the receipt of the instructional equipment grant, there may be the possibility that the current prioritized list could be ignored, and proceed to distribute funds in the way before our current process was established. After discussion:
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MSP the following motion: P.I.E. Recommends that the college adhere to the policy of consulting the prioritized list of resource requests through each fiscal year, effective 2013-14. This applies to such funds as IELM, VTEA, and Basic Skills.

Educational Master Plan Workgroup Update
The EMP Workgroup will hold its “Strategic Directions” retreat on Tuesday, January 21. The EMP plans to present the draft directions generated there at Spring Flex Day.

Accreditation Workgroup Update
There is a district training March 7 regarding the new accreditation standards. Other Accreditation Workgroup news includes the establishment of homework between meetings in preparation for the draft midterm report, and the development of an accreditation newsletter to greet the faculty when they return in February.

Meeting adjourned 2:45pm