MINUTES

Wednesday, March 5, 2014
12:45 pm-2:45 pm
SSB-414

Meeting called to order at 12:55 pm by Carmen Dones

Accreditation Update

Alice Taylor announced an accreditation training that several West Administrators would be attending on Friday the 7th. She also presented her “Accreditation Matters” newsletter. The purpose of the newsletter was to get the campus to focus on what is being done to prepare for the 2015 midterm report. One highlight of the newsletter is a checklist of where the campus is in the planning cycle. The next newsletter is planned to focus on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and will also feature reports on participation from A. Foster, catalog production from A. Aguiar, and library services from either K. Walton or J. Chow.
**PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE**

**President’s Remarks**

The President described an idea that is developing to have a venue to create more statewide dialogue with the ACCJC – a place where the membership can talk to the commission on terms that can be collegial. He also mentioned that the college would have to have a discussion regarding the relationship between SSSP and planning, contextualizing this in the broader gaps in our inter-area relationships, specifically between student services and instruction.

F. Leonard remarked about ideas percolating in Academic Affairs considering “doubling down” on resource development efforts and branching out and expanding to workforce development as well as other current revenue generating efforts so that in the event of a downturn the college is well positioned. The president commented that developing resources is one thing, but developing them so that they’re not permanently committed is another. Institutional continuity means having a plan for retracting some of these commitments.

**Prioritization Retreat Preparation**

A number of materials were distributed related to preparation for the prioritization retreat scheduled for Friday, March 14, including notes and prioritized list from last year’s meeting, the “parking lot” issues from last year’s meeting, and the list of resource requests for this year. The meeting will begin at 9:00am with breakfast to be available at 8:30am. Lunch will also be provided. The group decided to schedule the Retreat to end at 5:00pm, rather than announcing a 3:00pm ending time and extending the time, if needed.

The first issue discussed was how to handle the Vice Presidents’ lists of priorities. Based on the process used last year, the VP lists are not part of the rubric, but provide additional information used in order to assess requests using the rubrics. Another idea was to look at the presence or lack of alignment between the VP priorities and the prioritization group’s top half priorities.

The next issue discussed was the distinction between different resource request types. At the moment, the plan would be to manage personnel requests and non-personnel requests in two separate lists. Ken Takeda helped to clarify this distinction for some attendees as between recurring and one-time. While permanent personnel is considered recurring, any non-personnel request, including temporary hires such as student workers or hourly counselors, as well as subscriptions or licenses are one-time. After discussion, there was agreement that there should be two lists, one for permanent personnel, and one for everything else.

The conversation then began to head into the direction of re-establishing base budget for the sake of non-personnel purchases that had been depleted during the economic downturn. K. Takeda commented that principle he agrees, and any solution would have to be done in conjunction with the budget sheets that are due back. However the issue is complex because adding up the requests for units across the campus amounts to millions more in expenditures for the college, and the data that results from these requests is unmanageable because the requests are so disparate. R. Tillberg noted that this issue can be discussed further at the joint PIE/Budget meeting scheduled for Thursday, March 6.
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Other issues pertaining to prioritization were also discussed. R. Tillberg asked for committee members to look through the list of requests for this year to see if there were any mistakes. West has an auto-fill policy for classified vacancies. K. Takeda explained that if there is a position that is budgeted that becomes vacant but can be filled in the same year, then the policy is that it should be filled.

The group also decided to not consider possible funding sources when doing the prioritizations. Furthermore, whereas in 2013, during the prioritization retreat, knowledgeable participants provided information about the possibilities of one or another request being fulfilled by a grant, it was decided that for this year the committee should not seek out such information since a) such information was difficult to verify, b) if the information is acted upon but turns out to be mistaken, the particular request in question will end up not being prioritized, and c) this practice leans in the direction of budget-driven planning rather than the reverse.

In sum, committee members agreed that for this cycle all eligible items (given the constraints of the process, most pertinently, that the list will be shortened during the meeting to manage the workload of the participants) should be prioritized with respect to college need as expressed in the rubric, regardless of possible funding source. The prioritized list will represent a recommendation from PIE about which resource acquisitions will forward the college in alignment with its mission and master plans. From there, the Budget Committee, College Council, and ultimately the president will determine which of those recommendations are funded.

There was an additional conversation regarding the relationship of the list to new monies coming into the college. The specific issue involved instructional equipment funds and the question as to whether the prioritized list had been considered in the allocation of these funds. K. Takeda suggested that the instructional support funds be rolled over to the next year (we are not forced to use them and they can be rolled over, he explained). Bob Sprague suggested that communication was key – when a decision is made, an explanation for the decision would protect the integrity of either side of an issue.

Institution Set Standards

The ACCJC has an annual report due every year. In this report, every institution has to report the standards it has set. Last year there was a conversation about whether these “standards” mean aspirational targets or numbers beneath which we don’t want to fall. While up front the answer was not obvious, the consensus among institutions statewide was that the ACCJC institution-set standards represent a “floor” rather than a “ceiling”. For this year, a few of the standard metrics have been modified based on new definitions, and new vocational standards have been added.

The Committee reviewed 10 years of data, and discussed progress on the standards over the last year. As a result, for the successful course completion rate, the committee agreed to keep the standard of 60% institution-wide and explore carrying out standards to the discipline level and integration with the Equity Plan.

For degrees and certificates (not including skills certificates) ACCJC modified the metric calculation; now students earning an award should not be counted more than once. This required a recalibration of the standard. The PIE members generated a good deal of conversation about this standard because the number of degrees the college has awarded (using the new calculation) has fallen beneath the current standard (arrived at using the old calculation) for six of the past ten years. Despite the incongruence in last year’s required method of calculation when compared to this year, the committee saw this as an
area of concern, ultimately choosing a standard of 330 for annual number of degrees awarded. West falls below this threshold for four of the past ten years. In the discussion B. Sprague made the point that the commission is going to begin looking at how colleges address the differences between what they’re doing and what their standards are. Part of the argument for setting the degrees awarded standard at 330 was to signal that this is an issue on which the college should take action to improve. The standards for certificate completion (116) and combined degree and certificate completion (445) were left unchanged.

The standard for transfers was also left unchanged at 175. R. Tillberg specified that the most reliable data was for CSU and UC transfers and that other data at this point were unreliable. The College also falls below this standard in 2012-13, with a total of 174 transfers to UC and CSU. The group discussed possible reasons for this decline, and identified ways to further pursue the issue so that West can actually meet its institution-set standard in this area.

Meeting adjourned at 3:01pm