Present: Diane Caulfield, Ross Egloria, Pat Patterson, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Lara Sugimoto, Cynthia Smith

I. Call to Order/Approval of Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 am by Chair Marcia Roberts-Deutsch. The minutes of the February 20, 2015 meeting were approved as distributed.

II. Status Update on Annual Reports to ACCJC

Last year some changes were made to the annual report due to ACCJC. The report is now more inclusive of narratives and items such as enrollment completion and a separate financial report. The report is due on or before March 31.

III. Status Update on Midterm Report and AIP

The ARPD is finished. Marcia will send out a draft of the midterm to the committee members. AIP is part of the midterm report and the currency of what is posted will be checked.

IV. Report on Academic Support Pilot Survey

Ross distributed the results of the pilot survey that he conducted with the Academic Support unit. He noted that the survey was done on a four point scale rather than the normal five point scale as he wanted the group to indicate an opinion rather using “neutral” as a response. Ross also shared some of the comments but withheld a comment that would have identified an individual due to the nature of the response.

V. Campus Survey

Ross confirmed that he would work with Cynthia and Marcia to format and distribute the survey using Survey Monkey. The survey is targeted to be sent out to
the campus around mid-April. The administrative team had an opportunity to review the draft survey and expressed concern about the item regarding administrative decisions that are made contrary to the majority of faculty. After some discussion, the committee decided to retain the question since it is a follow up evaluation of the same question asked previously, and felt that the results may indicate a positive movement, which would reflect well on the campus.

The question of the need for demographics on the survey arose. It was felt that the elimination of questions 1 - 3 (position, hiring status, and administrative division) might encourage more people to participate in the survey and honestly respond to the questions since it would be anonymous. Ross indicated that he could code faculty or staff or administration based on the list before sending out the survey. While individuals will not be identified, the grouping can be pulled out if needed. The committee members agreed to eliminate questions 1 -3 and ONLY if it is deemed necessary for us to know how faculty vs. staff for example responded (i.e., if there was a real use for it) will we pull out the information. This may not be necessary as a separate survey for staff regarding staff development will be conducted.

The issue of including items regarding screening committees was raised. Several questions were suggested. Marcia agreed to work with Monique to develop 2 -3 questions for our general survey on the efficiency and effectiveness of the process. These questions will be added at the end of section I. Governance, Inclusion, and Transparency. Marcia will share the questions developed via email to the rest of the committee.

The committee felt that an introduction/preamble was needed at the beginning of the survey to explain why the survey was being conducted and the reasons for particular questions asked (e.g., to see how we’ve dealt with various issues, etc. or to see if there has been improvement since the last survey) and that the survey will be anonymous. Marcia agreed to write the introduction.

Ross noted that he needed to understand the logic of the questions. He will need to get a list of everyone’s email so that they can receive the survey and reminders to complete the survey. He will structure the survey so that people can save and return to the survey to complete it. Ross noted that everyone is given a unique link that lets Survey Monkey know if the person responded but not what the response was so that reminders to complete the survey can be sent out. Marcia will assist with getting the email list from Clara. Cynthia will send out the latest revision of the survey to the committee members based on the discussion from our meeting.
VI. Other Items

Pat shared that there were some changes happening for Sharepoint and asked the group not to put anything new on Sharepoint for the time being. Vern is working to minimize data and not have loose documents by creating a test bed. Mike M. has imported a term store which will enable the site to be more functional and allow the Assessment Task Force to make it more demonstrable for the Assessment showcase. Sharepoint will eventually automatically distribute data to the right place.

Marcia noted that Barbara Beno had done a cross-walk between the old and new standards. Additionally, several individuals had confirmed that the new standards are available in response to that question. Pat will use the new standards to populate fields for the Assessment site.

Pat mentioned at the Planning Council meeting that the Assessment Task Force needed to work together with individuals involved in STEM to develop search terms. If close cooperation between the two groups does not occur, it can result in a more costly fix later on. Faculty identified for pre-engineering math/science is Mike Ferguson. Other CTE faculty from AEC, CENT, and ICS may become involved with STEM.

Cynthia will work on putting together the requirements for the FSEC self review report and send out to the committee members. There are four parts to the report. If four individuals volunteer to write a part, the report is manageable.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair at 11:56 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Caulfield