

PIE Meeting Notes

5/29/19

1:00pm - 2:25pm

Notes taken by Lydia Dong

Quorum was not met. These are informal meeting notes and not minutes.

Attendees: Meric, Olga, Bonnie, Carlos, Helen, Iris, Lydia

Contents

- TOPIC: Need to review the charge of PIE as stated on the minutes.2
- TOPIC: We need to establish what quorum is for all the standing committees of the college.2
- TOPIC: Implementation of multiple measures placement3
- TOPIC: Status of IEPI grant.....3
- TOPIC: Extending the EMP.....3
- TOPIC: ISA process clarification, modification, and communication4
- TOPIC: Program review validation5
- TOPIC: PIE meeting schedule.....7
- TOPIC: Correction to minutes/agenda template.....7

TOPIC: Need to review the charge of PIE as stated on the minutes.

- There are concerns that the “charge” listed on the PIE meeting notes is not accurate. Where did it originate from? Does it represent a recent change from administration? If so, why were members not informed of that change?
 - PIE should be involved in more than the discretionary budget. Discretionary funds are at best 5-6% of the budget (approximately \$200K out of \$44 million).
 - If the language of the charge is correct, then PIE does not need to meet as often as it does.
 - Accreditation is predicated on among other things that planning drives budget and not the other way around.
 - Several members stated they have never seen the language in the charge or responsibilities before.
 - What does it mean that PIE monitors? Monitors means you just sit there and watch. PIE establishes and evaluates. It has major functions in planning and judging allocation. There’s a lot more to planning than just allocation of resources. The accreditation standards listed don’t correspond to the charge.
 - Develop and enforce is not the appropriate wording. Enforce is a responsibility of administration and not a committee. We develop but not enforce. Even then develop might be better ascribed to College Council.
 - The mission of the college drives the institution. Educational Master Plan (EMP) is another driver based on that mission of the college. Again, when accreditation says establishes the link between planning and budget they are not talking about a small amount of the budget. They want to know if your institution is following what you said you’re going to do in your mission/EMP.
 - Iris explains that the charge and responsibilities of PIE is supposed to come out of the governance handbook. The charge can be changed without going to district. It is updated every few years. Usually the changes are minor. The document is reviewed through PIE and College Council. It has been reviewed at least once while Iris has been at WLAC. The review is usually done in coordination with the committee evaluation surveys we do at the end of the year. Those evaluations are managed through PIE and College Council. That’s when typically we go back and ask what our goals were, did we achieve them, what new goals need to be established for the coming year. Does the charge match what is in the governance manual.

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS:

- Confirm if the PIE charge on the minutes came from a prior version of the minutes template.
- Add review of the PIE charge to the next fall meeting agenda.
- Check if the PIE charge is aligned to the college’s governance document.
- Dean of IE needs to send out year-end committee evaluation surveys.

TOPIC: We need to establish what quorum is for all the standing committees of the college.

- We can’t take any action today because there is no quorum.

- How is it defined? Is it 50% + 1? Some places, not necessarily at this college, use 1/3. Need to specify that the percentage does or does not include ex officio and resource. Sometimes like for the guild's district meetings quorum is by constituency (5 out of 9 colleges).
- District math reps are allowed to make a decision with 4 out of 9 as long as all 4 agree.
- The other thing to know about quorum is that once you have it you can keep conducting business even if everyone leaves as long as nobody makes a quorum call. The moment the quorum call determines there is less than quorum you need to stop. But this in practice is not often done because if you make decisions that way with no participation, when that is made known there will be a lot of push back and no one wants to be in that situation.
- Some committees struggle every month to make sure we have quorum. Having it clearly defined would be helpful.

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS:

- Check governance manual to see if quorum is defined there
- College should institutionalize
- Ask what are the committees' preferences, and then submit that info to College Council.
- Add question to year-end committee evaluation survey that if the respondent could not attend meetings, why? Is it because of scheduling? Amount of time? That it seems pointless? That you don't feel like your presence will make a difference? All of the above?

TOPIC: Implementation of multiple measures placement

- District botched transition to multiple measures. Counselors cancelled intermediate algebra. Only 10% of students have done multiple measures reassessment. The other 90% are in confusion of what they're supposed to do; they are not getting any advice or direction. Across the board math enrollment is plummeting.

TOPIC: Status of IEPI grant

- Did we get the IEPI grant for program review? Yes. We were notified we will be awarded but the money is not here yet.
- Who will get stipends? Since the money is not here yet, that hasn't been determined.

TOPIC: Extending the EMP

- We need to follow up with Academic Senate about extending the EMP
- Consensus there was we do want to extend the EMP to 2021 so that there can be more faculty input and a comprehensive workgroup. Also because WLAC was without an institutional research Dean for quite a long time so the process of updating the EMP got deferred. Nothing happened on it while we had an acting Dean of IE. Patty attended the Academic Senate meeting so she knows that Academic Senate supports extending the EMP.

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS:

- Who is responsible for taking action to extend the EMP?

TOPIC: ISA process clarification, modification, and communication

- Looking at the minutes on page 4 there are a lot of questions about how the ISA process works. It is not FPIP. Some people put ISA in program review but not everybody does.
 - Iris answers. ISA are at the recommendation of the Dean and VP to the president. Unless there is some contractual issue or obligation or something written into a specific grant. Again in terms of who the actual individual is you need to create an actual job description first and a job post. It needs to be a competitive process. Then a selection process. Then the dean over a specific program or the VP or usually both makes a recommendation to the president. Almost like hiring somebody. Then there are written deliverables evaluated and reviewed at the end of the particular period in a year or two years to monitor progress, and also when the deliverable is due.
- The questions came up in the context of program review which sometimes includes ISA and how they are prioritized. Clearly they are not prioritized through FPIP. So the question is-- we created a classified version of FPIP—whether there should be a faculty or college-wide role for prioritization requests for ISA assignments. No reason why there couldn't be. I think that's where all those questions came up. Something to note for next year's agenda. We should try to have some kind of discussion.
 - Iris states that whatever decision it ends up being there has to be some level of flexibility that people understand ISA is not an entitlement. It comes up as needed and is handled in a specific way.
- And the question of how to interpret "as needed" is tied to whether to put it into program review. People need to know for the next program review that they should put ISA in there. We know that sometimes things come up, a grant comes up, but the ISA is not in program review. FPIP has allowances for a situation like that and you can submit indicating that it's not in program review and why it wasn't.
 - Iris agrees that all requests for resources should be part of program review. We're talking about a process for prioritization of ISA positions.
- The other question that comes up frequently is the duration of these things and the release assignments.
 - Iris explains that this has come up. WLAC is ahead of the curve. Ours have a specific duration and is tied to a specific deliverable. When you get an ISA you're supposed to do something and deliver a product to the a person the ISA is assigned to the dean, VP or president. There should be regular progress reports to monitor your progress. You don't just get ISA and keep it until you die.
 - Iris explains there was. We are the only college who tightened up our ISA processes out of the 9.
- In the situation where someone has a 2-year assignment and they have something accomplished at the end of 2 years but it appears there is a continuing need for something to write the next report or whatever does the position have to be reopened and re-advertised? It probably should.
 - Iris confirms yes. What we do is we put the ISA into a system with a specific code for duration. I think they should all sunset. Whether or not it is specifically written into procedures I'm not sure.

- If people in general seem to think it would be a good idea to clarify and publicize this process what would be the best way to proceed with that?
 - Iris says PIE would recommend that there be a campus-wide published process and procedure for ISAs including campus-wide prioritization and selection.
 - If we're going to do that we should recommend a kind of process and not just say there should be a process.
 - Iris suggests or ask for a report of what is the process now. One exists but is it written down in a document I'm not sure. I know there is one because I've seen it. To say how widely known is it I don't know. As a VP I know but the average faculty does not know. [others indicate agreement]

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS

- Add to fall agenda: question of whether there should be a faculty or college-wide role in prioritization of requests for ISA assignments.
- Discuss whether PIE wants to recommend that there be a campus-wide published process and procedure for ISAs including campus-wide prioritization and selection. PIE should offer a recommended process.
- PIE should request a copy of any documentation defining the ISA process, or ask for a report of what the process is now so that it is written down in a document in advance of the next fall meeting.

TOPIC: Program review validation

- Does someone know how we are doing with program review validation? What percentage are submitted and validated?
 - Once program review is submitted it is supposed to be reviewed by a VP, or deans.
 - Dean of IE could provide that info.
- Validation is always a problem with program review. Getting them in and the software is also a problem. Validation is supposed to be where you could get into dialogue. Supposedly Ara or a designee like Walter would review the math division program review and flag you didn't ask for this. That broke down. Those program review validations by the supervisors and administrators mostly didn't get done with Iris being the big exception.
 - Validation also helps so that questions are clarified before the validation retreat and we're not going what the heck is this? There's another pair of eyes that knows the program better that says ah it doesn't mean this.
 - The point is the validation process is still not happening. Then we as a committee running program review needs to find out why. Is it unreasonable? Is it too much work? Should we be looking into peer evaluation if it is too much work for the deans? And certainly reducing the frequency of the things. Should enable us to extend the calendar in such a way it can get done. I just think in terms of how things are going that that is a big question.
 - Program review may have been pushed back to spring, which is not ideal, because the fall is when chairs are doing tenure review, evaluation. It may have also been considering the hiring cycle and evaluation process, and the SLO process as it existed at the time.
 - An option is to have program review in the spring and not have it due until mid-Fall.

- There is a question of how this articulates with other work people have to do and the budget process. And that is why Rebecca and (it is characterized) Iris wanted program review annually because the budget is annual.
- Iris explains she and I agreed resource allocation is an annual process and we have to link it to planning that therefore program review in some form or another needs to be an annual process too.
- I think when we talked annual update mainly for the purpose of the resource requests that was a way to accommodate a multiple year program review cycle with annual budget cycle. Because it is as you said only a very small percentage of the budget that actually hinges on what is or is not in the program review.
- Iris explains well it's going to get bigger with the student centered funding formula (SCFF). We are now tying all of our fund sources together which is what we should have been doing all along. Three budgets: access, equity, and success in terms of how we are going to be funded as a district and college. Can't tease out equity funds from general funds and specially funded programs. Yes they all have revenue streams but they are all measuring similar if not identical things. One of the things Dean of IE and I talked about are what might be a better system for program review is scrapping the whole thing, our program plans and therefore our review, and basing it on the SCFF elements. How we are meeting metrics for student success, equity, access. Those are the measures by which we allocate resources cause you're supposed to allocated based on what the strategic goals are. So it matters how you align those. Blowing up the existing system which is cumbersome. It is difficult to make changes; it requires her to follow breadcrumbs back to the original plan and how it fits into my office's plan. She may end up having to redo several plans in order to fit it together
- Since chairs work year-round program review could also be year round.
 - Not everyone who works on program review is a chair.
- Could program review be timed differently than at present?
 - Iris explains at her previous college the bulk of the work was done in Spring. Finished in terms of due to research in mid-Fall. February/March we reviewed it. It was a face to face meeting with every program and VPs. Dept chairs did program plan but it didn't mean they didn't get help from faculty. They got it from faculty before they left. Not saying it has to be the same. This is just what she experienced differently at another college.
- Depends on the division and discipline. For Carlos's division our biggest issue is the equipment. And that's issue we can gather beforehand. It could work in the way you suggest.
 - Maybe two different sliding calendars. One for certain disciplines and another for other disciplines.
 - SLO's are handled on two separate calendars. We could also stagger program review. I don't know how that works in terms of budget and prioritization.

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS

- Dean of IE should provide an update on completion of validation
- PIE should look into why validation is not occurring and ensure that it will occur
- Look into alternative program review structures that will improve the completion of validation
- Recommend that the senior staff consider and respond to what they think is a realistic length of a cycle for the validation process to occur
- Consider whether program review should be timed differently for different divisions

TOPIC: PIE meeting schedule

- How did PIE end up being last wed as opposed to the first wed?
 - Does Dean of IE have a strong preference?
 - Someone may have told Dean of IE it was the last wed.
 - The problem with last wed is that it often has a schedule conflict with district budget meeting which Iris is required to attend. Iris has not been able to attend most PIE meetings.
- Changes to the schedule cannot be done unilaterally. College Council must agree.
- We don't have a master college calendar and we need one to show all the committees not just governance. I don't know all those. Like the new enrollment management committee.
 - Not every committee needs to be in the master calendar.
 - Some committees do not have a fixed meeting time and cannot be derived from governance document
 - Ex of need: academic senate rep was not able to attend most graduation planning meetings. But apparently there was a lot of phone contact.
- We could improve our governance structure by actually looking at who attends which meetings. Many of us have experience of being with the same people hearing the same reports from the same people. Very likely in the same room 3 or 4 times.
- Iris reports I'm empowered to make a recommendation from the other 2 committees I co-chair I think they would agree and not object that I share we recommend combining facilities and technology. That would free up a meeting date and help with quorum. And given that facilities now you can't build anything without tech so literally we're hearing the same thing twice. Or rather different committees. This has to come through planning. I gave the rationale. I have discussed this at the two committees but since there was no quorum they could not put to a vote. This would help with people being overtaxed.

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS

- Send notes to PIE meeting members
- Poll PIE meeting members via outlook whether they want to change to the 1st wed of the month. Otherwise there will not be time for PIE members to debate. Iris thinks it should be ok for 1 or 2 decisions, and also since the discussion is clearly indicated in these notes for members to review.
- Bring request to college council in September to change PIE meeting date
- Recommend College Council input committee dates from the governance document onto a shared calendar
- Examine who attends which committee meetings
- Recommend that facilities and technology are combined

TOPIC: Correction to minutes/agenda template

- Correct spelling of names
- Question of why the accreditation rep is Kim instead of Amy.

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS

- IE will make corrections to the template

- Chairs should confirm whether accreditation rep is correct