PRIE Committee Minutes
March 12, 2010, 9:00-10:30am City Café #1

Committee Chairs:
- Manager: Marybeth Buechner, PRIE
- Faculty: Dena Chubbic, Chemistry
- Classified: Anne Danenberg, PRIE

Administrative Members:
- Thomas Greene, Enrollment & Student Success
- Anne Licciardi, Math, Statistics & Engineering
- Don Palm, Davis Outreach (absent)

Classified Members:
- Amanda Hamilton, Public Information Office (absent)
- Tracey Valverde, Learning Resources (absent)

Faculty Members:
- Mel Duvall, Electronics Technology
- Ginnie Gessford, Learning Resources (absent)
- Lori Delappe-Grondin, Theatre Arts & Film (absent)

Student Members:
- Jennifer Myers
- Peter (PJ) Velazquez (absent)

1. **Minutes** from Feb. 26, 2010 approved by consensus

2. **Welcome** new student member Jennifer Myers… she’s a single mom, an ASG senator, and a business major

3. **Quick CCSSE update** (Anne D)—all randomly selected instructors have been notified and the PRIE office is getting ready to make survey appointments.

4. **PRIE research updates** (Anne D and MB)—nursing study, math recency, athletics, academic support services, math lab use and success rates. Mel asked about assessment, someone (Anne L?) said that STAT is piloting a study to see if the new pre-req checker will really do the job, given all of the possible course-taking patterns.

5. **PRIE planning updates** (MB)—Unit plan analysis (e.g. sent info on objectives affecting curriculum to the curriculum chair). Work on planning agenda items: ongoing training, academic support services survey, evaluating shared governance processes, SLO assessment. Anne L mentioned that Math hopes to have a written SLO assessment plan soon.

6. **Discussion of CSPC data updates**: all Fall-Fall metrics can be updated now, but we need to take a look at the critical Spring-Spring metrics. Adding some SLO data would be good (what measures?).

   Anne L suggested that it would be good to have enrollment growth compared to FTE reductions—this might lead to modifying one or more goals. Also, it’s not clear to many what the relationship between WSCH, FTE, and Productivity is.

   MB suggested that some of the results from the survey of “classroom impact of increased enrollment” could be summarized in a section.

   Thomas G said that student services doesn’t have any particular data elements that should be included in CSPC data

   Mel D suggested that the goals are the most important issue—CTE wants to be recognized—*in writing*—in the goals. Clarifying the language in the goals is very important. Linking the goals to SLOs is also important. Maybe a Flex tour of the campus could be used as a model for getting people familiar with the goals and how they relate to unit plans, program review, SLOs, etc.

   Dena C suggested that the CSPC should be informed that there may be a lack of understanding across campus about the connection from employees’ daily activities and the college goals and that maybe we should survey the campus about the goals.

   MB shared something that she learned on her recent accreditation visit—that our recommendation was assigned a new meaning (level of seriousness) in a policy change statement that came out a few weeks after our report came out from ACCJC—a follow up report is now a more serious recommendation, however the old policy language was in effect when our accrediting team made their recommendations to the commission. She also suggested that in terms of SLO data being
included in CSPC data, the ACCJC report is due in May 2010 anyway, so we could use some of that data for the fall CSPC meetings. There is now a place on Unit Plans for folks to indicate whether they are using SLOs to write or evaluate their unit plan objectives, and where they are on SLOs overall.

Mel D. reiterated a request to change the structure of the Unit Plan form – it’s cumbersome to work with as it is now…

Maybe in the CSPC data report we could have a “what’s new” page – the stuff that would be on it right away would be the enrollment—FTE impact and SLO data.

Anne L said that student success seemed to be an issue at the recent board retreat (?)

**CSPC report structure and distribution** Mel D suggested grouping of data for specific purposes might be a good way to organize it… MB wondered if there should be a set of separate reports focused on areas of interest to the college and including a critical issues summary page … Anne L wondered if information in the planning report should go to all constituency groups including dept. chairs, senates, ASG, SLT, etc. She suggested that it has to be a repeated message…how about putting a link to the report on the public home page?

Jennifer suggested that web access should be “facebook-friendly” and that the current website is not very user-friendly. She also suggested that any focus groups should include students.

MB wondered if there should be a campus-wide data outreach campaign.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30