MINUTES

Meeting of Wednesday, November 6, 2013
1:00 pm-3:00 pm
SSB-414

Title/Role                           Name                  Present
Academic Senate, Faculty Co-Chair   Carmen Dones           X
Academic Senate                     Norma Jacinto          X
Academic Senate                     Judy Chow              
Academic Senate                     Joyce Sweeney          
Academic Senate (alternate)         Adrienne Foster
AFT Guild                           Olga Shewfelt          
AFT Guild                           Bonnie Blustein
AFT Guild                           Alice Taylor            
VP, Academic Affairs                Bob Sprague            
VP, Administrative Services        Ken Takeda              
VP, Student Services (Interim)     Phyllis Braxton
Dean, Research and Planning, Admin Co-Chair  Rebecca Tillberg  X
AFT Classified                      Dionne Morrissette
AFT Classified                      Ashanti Lyles
Dean, Research and Planning, Admin Co-Chair  Rebecca Tillberg  X
AFT Classified                      Dionne Morrissette
AFT Classified                      Ashanti Lyles
Teamsters Representative            Ara Aguiar             
ASO Representative                  
Ex Officio                          Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh    
Chair, College Council              Fran Leonard           
Faculty Chair, Educational Master Plan Workgroup Holly Bailey-Hofmann X
Resource                            
Division Chair Representative       
Student Services Representative     Celena Alcala          
SLO Representative                  Mary-Jo Apigo         
Budget Manager                      Maureen O’Brien       X
Research Analyst                    Agyeman Boateng       X

Approval of Minutes, October 5, 2013
The previous meeting’s minutes were accepted.

Program Review Update

R. Tillberg reports that while the return rate is not 100%, for the most part there is contact with the outstanding programs.

P. Braxton noted that at senior staff, the Program Review module of Curricu-net came up. R. Tillberg reported that the district seems set on going with Curricu-net (the state contract with Curricu-net
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facilitates the district using the software). She describes the demonstration meeting several weeks prior where attendees were shown the planning and program review modules of Curricu-net. According to R. Tillberg, the planning module is not well-developed, however the program review module shows promise. The IES system used currently by West integrates both planning and program review. In any event, R. Tillberg explains, even if we did go with Curricu-net, it would not be for several years. While she liked the program review module, she didn’t necessarily like it better than IES. There was a question from the PIE members about the flexibility of the Curricu-net program review module in comparison to IES. R. Tillberg responded that a) she would have to check to see if the flexibility was any better than IES, and b) would prefer for someone else to try it before West to avoid being the pilot for a new technology.

Planning Report
RT presented the Summary of Division and Program Goals, Planned Actions and Resource Request document (also presented at Divisional Council and emailed this morning). Some areas, she noted, still don’t have a good idea about goals, planned actions, and resource requests (e.g. “hiring someone” is a goal, action, and request).

The group began a discussion of the process of understanding the differences and nuances of goals, objectives and planned actions during which several ideas for improving the process were voiced. One conversant noted the FPIP workshop this year delved down and gave more instruction about how applicants should respond when completing their applications. Another conversant mentioned that it would have been good to go through the content of Program Review in the workshop. Another suggested having examples of goals in the handbook. Another thought that they could do a better job of preparing their group before their specialized workshop so that they were prepared to work.

Not everyone agreed with another suggestion that program review be opened for a longer period of time, perhaps several months. The suggestion came from the experience of difficulty for instructors to participate and get program review done given there are so many things to do during the semester. Those opposed felt that too long of a period would make program review drag out.

One suggestion that served as a middle ground came from the experience of several reviewers who did not know how to look up their old reports. The suggestion was that, giving programs their old reports earlier in a format that was easily editable (e.g. Microsoft Word) might allow more time to work on the program reviews. One wrinkle with the desire to extend the time for program review is that while “early September” was the timing suggested, this year program review was launched September 3rd, within a week of the first day of Fall Term. Some conversants noted this observation, with one pointing out that some of these difficulties highlight the differential levels of cooperation within divisions. Next year, the process will still be painful for those with poor cooperation, however, going through it annually provides the opportunity to work together.

Recap:
In addition to the suggestions from above...

- Some workshop or trainings oriented to content / answering questions in addition to technical issues
- Remembering to advise participants in special workshops beforehand to come prepared to work
- Providing examples/models of goals, objectives, action items in the handbook
- Continuing to grow awareness of program review and the importance of starting early since the timeline is arguably as long as it can be made
- Providing last years program review in Word format

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meetings 2013-2014
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...were other suggestions raised during this conversation throughout the remainder of the meeting:

- To reinforce that the portal is available off campus.
- One-button validation rejection
- Continuing to work on achieving “rollover”
- Check with Olga about opportunities to get word out about program review to adjuncts.

**Survey**

R. Tillberg passed out the results from last year’s Program Review Evaluation survey to engage the committee in thinking about the survey for this year. Last year, the survey was administered to the whole college after the validation process; one question is whether to do it now or at the beginning of December. A popular suggestion was to open it now but leaving it open, giving respondents a choice as to whether to complete it before or after validation (it was suggested that a note that the validation began at such a date and concludes December 2nd would make this more clear).

The committee then had a conversation about the survey. One question was about the inclusion of part-timers and adjuncts participating in program review, which generated the suggestion of working with the AFT Guild president to arrange a program review awareness workshop with adjuncts next year. It was also suggested that questions be included about the program review handbook.

The items the committee decided in this meeting to revise were:

- 10 – Issue – what if a program asked to be rejected in the validation stage – the question needs to be reworded or to have another option added - - “yes the program requested”, “yes, the validator”, “no”
- 2 – IES is not “new” anymore – “are you the person or one of the people who used IES to input your RT reworded
- Add Handbook Questions

It was resolved that R. Tillberg and A. Boateng would put more thought in the questions and send out another draft to those committee members present for feedback.

**Educational Master Plan Workgroup Update**

H. Bailey-Hofmann began her update on providing some background on the EMP Workgroup. The group is working toward the goal of having a finished product by Spring. They have started out by analyzing a variety of inputs – student achievement, inputs, other relevant plans – in homeworks assigned and reported on every meeting. The activities of the group are posted on the EMP website.

H. Bailey-Hofmann also mentioned the Equity Plan, intended as a plan to ensure that opportunity is afforded to all groups, which was created in 2005. She reports that the state is working on an equity plan expected to be completed next year, which will have a lot of significance for colleges. The equity plan is. In this vein, R. Tillberg mentions that this year data on successful course completion rate by race/ethnicity has been included in Program Review and is among the data being reviewed by the EMP Workgroup. The inclusion of this data is due in part to accreditation bodies requesting more data and conversation on this issue.

H. Bailey-Hofmann continued, stating that the EMP Workgroup will discuss these analyses, and when they are finished, formulate strategic directions, which will form the spine of the new EMP. These will be developed at a strategic directions forum held in January. In addition, sometime in the spring there
will be a half-day leadership retreat in relation to the EMP. At every available moment the work of the workgroup will be shared.

R. Tillberg notes that while the EMP can have visitors, it is a working group. There is some discussion as to what venue is best for inquiries. At the moment, it is agreed that any questions or comments can be directed to H. Bailey-Hofmann or R. Tillberg via email.

Accreditation Update: Timeline and Planning agenda

R. Tillberg reported that the accreditation standards have changed. The handout: “Receiving Broad Input, Commission Continues review of Standards,” an excerpt from the ACCJC summer newsletter, outlining some of the changes was distributed.

One of the changes discussed is a new subsection, “Institutional Integrity.” Some language in this section refers to “relevant information,” which could be interpreted as things like the catalog, website, etc. It will take more study to determine what exactly they mean. This and some others of the changes will take a lot of thought.

So far, the college has received nothing in writing about when our visit will be. The current best guess is that the comprehensive visit will be in Spring 16. We do have in writing that our midterm report will be in Spring 15.

Recommendations from the 2013 follow up report were also distributed. The college earned full accreditation based on the basis of this follow-up report. PIE will be focusing on accreditation issues in the months to come.

Confirmation of future meeting dates

The Prioritization Retreat is scheduled for March 7, with March 14 identified as a backup date. The joint meetings are planned to be held on budget committee days. The second joint meeting is set for Thursday April 24, 2014. There is a discussion about the timing of the first joint meeting as the tentative date (February 27, 2014) conflicts with the Achieving the Dream conference (the Interim VP of Student Services may thus be absent). It is suggested that Budget meetings are typically timed to follow DBC meetings, so the Budget meeting could be moved up one week in February to accommodate the conflict.

Meeting adjourned 2:15