**Peralta Community College District**
**District Education Committee**
**November 15, 2013**
**8:30-10:30**

**Attendance:** PArmstead, DBajrami, JBielanski, JBlake, DBudd, Ebugg, LCelhay, MChen, CCortez, AEsquivel-Swinson, DHankins, ELord, JLowood, AMcMurdo, AMontevirgen, MOrkin, TPark, FShah, CSmith, IStark, SThompson, TThompson, KvanPutten, MWilson

**Co-Chairs:** Mike Orkin, Joseph Bielanski

**Facilitator:** Stacy Thompson

**Recorder:** MaryBeth Benvenutti

**Note Taker:** Laura Leon-Maurice

**Guests:** MFossum, CMadlock, LQuindlen, AWilliams, DMitchell, JShanoski

**Absent:** MBenvenutti, RGarcia, MGoldstein, BLove, CMcLean, ROlive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Follow-up Action</th>
<th>DECISIONS (Shared Agreement/Resolved or Unresolved?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Called to Order-Dr. Orkin</td>
<td>9:06 Meeting began. Welcome by Dr. Thompson, Facilitator. Meeting minutes discussed. JBlake noted that Dr. Love had expressed a concern as to how instructional faculty would be involved in the SSSP process. JBlake requested adding this to the minutes. Voted and passed as amended.</td>
<td>Minutes passed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. APU template addendum SLO’s and budget planning-Dr. Orkin</td>
<td>A presentation was made by the College Learning Assessment Coordinators: Jenny Lowood (BCC), Diana Bajrami (COA); Cheli Fossum &amp; David Mitchell (Laney); and Jennifer Shanoski (Merritt). The following represents issues and topics presented: MOrkin- This will be a broader report about SLO assessment concerns as it relates to the APUs but not just about APUs. DBajrami- Tremendous work in assessment has happened at the colleges. How do we move forward? How do we fine tune resource allocation and use assessment feedback? This is our Institutional Self-Evaluation year. Assessment must continue to be a priority. How are the results of assessment driving budgeting and planning? There must be a professional development focus and assessment of learning as it pertains to student success. We must provide the needed feedback. JLowood- The discussion of assessment and assessment result must be pervasive. It goes into all decision making processes. Does the APU template adequately discuss assessment outcomes? We need to remember that the district’s strategic goals are what inform our college goals, and that informs are planning processes. Assessment has to be one of our strategic goals. In the DropBox is the accreditation standards highlighted by ACCJC to show where assessment needs to be included in responding to the Standards. (Handouts were provided.) We’ve been able to work at BCC because a Title 3 Grant has provided needed resources. We do need program assessments; gaps should be driving are resource allocations. BCC English faculty did a program review. It changed the way the English</td>
<td>Motion: Encourage administration to use SLO assessment in the faculty evaluation. Approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion: A Task Force composed of the college Learning Assessment Coordinators, two Vice Presidents of Instruction, and two Vice Presidents of Student
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>department does its work today. Resources are needed for SLO assessment work. BCC is now in the process of institutionalizing the assessment work. Instructors do have professional responsibilities. That is not enough; we need resources to have people make the work meaningful and authentic. A Scantron test is not going to work. What areas need resources, and what areas we can take on through our professional responsibility always has to be addressed. DMitchell - Administrative support services. We would like to keep adequate release time for assessment coordinators. A budget for events that we put on at Laney. Global awareness event, we would like a budget for food. We are thinking of doing signage around the campus. To be creative we need money. We need a budget for part-timers. MFossum - With administrative support is money, advocacy. We need administrators to speak positively about the value and importance SLO assessment and the need for resources to support assessment. Encourage faculty and staff to go to workshops and events and keep reminding people to do their assessments. When administrators say negative things about it, it undermines are efforts. DMitchell- Need to understand the consequences of not participating in assessments. Maybe taking away a budget. If a course hasn’t been assessed in years, take it off the schedule. Assessment should drive resource allocations. JLowood-We can’t just look the other way when assessments are not happening. We need to get serious about assessments, unless we can find another way. It is an ACCJC requirement; it is a USDE requirement. JShanoski- Doing the administrative evaluation form must be taken seriously. Faculty evaluation and faculty involvement in assessment work must be taken seriously. JLowood- It may be that it needs to be added during negotiations. MFolsom- We can do a lot. However, if administration isn’t behind us and working with us, we cannot be that effective. We need to use some of the professional development time to do this work. It is hard to get people and part-timers together to plan. I would like us to use more of the professional development time for planning, collaboration, discussion. DBajrami- We had meeting with Student Services a couple of years ago, because we saw a major need to provide some push because in some instances Student Services were falling behind and needed some time together to have a district-wide discussion and to present possible approaches to assessment in Student Services. Assessment is faculty driven and classified professional driven. We get the best results by working together, empowering people. It’s about how do we work together and keep our focus on the students? Empowering people: faculty have to do the work. JLowood- APU addendum from BCC put in the DropBox. Motion: Encourage administration to use SLO assessment in the faculty evaluation. Approved MOrkin-Last time we decided that we work on developing an addendum to the current APU that talked more about SLO assessment and that was placed in the current APU. There are some things about program learning outcomes and assessment in the current APU. JLowood- We embedded other parts for SLO assessment results. MOrkin- So there is some confusion because there is more than one APU template floating around; a BCC one and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the district one. That is not to say that is bad. It is up to the colleges to do their program reviews. There is this confusion, because there is more than one APU. The Merritt addendum to the district APU also is important to bring into the discussion.

KvanPutten- We need a standardized method to aggregate SLO assessment information to make a recommendation about needed resources.

ELord- Made a motion to establish a task force composed of the SLO coordinators and administrators to integrate SLO assessment data into Program Review and APUs tied to resource allocation and this task force will accomplish this by May 2014. That this will then be available to be used starting in the 2014-2105 academic year.

MOrkin- Our VPIs are already working on this; it is the colleges who are leading this and the VIPs are already working on this and collaborating in an impressive way. This needs to be done in conjunction with the VIPs work.

DBudd- Each college has its own unique way of doing assessments. The VIPs must be included in that motion.

IStark- Four assessment coordinators, two VIPs, that group could bring to this body their recommendation. It needs to be a small group that talks to other people that carry the burden of a workable proposal.

LCelhay- We need to include a mechanism to aggregate information on resource needs in terms of what it will cost. That will allow us to start thinking about the cost. Making people aware that there is a cost associated with all resource requests.

Inger’s amended resolution:

“That a Task Force composed of the college Learning Assessment Coordinators, two Vice Presidents of Instruction, and two Vice Presidents of Student Services be established to create standard templates for Program Review and Annual Program Updates (APU) that integrate assessment results/data and aggregate information so that assessment drives resource allocation. The request is to complete this work by May 2014.” (Approved)

The presentation and discussion continued to focus on the importance of learning outcomes assessment; the review of assessment results to drive decision making and resource allocation; the need to include involvement in assessment in administrative evaluations of faculty; the need for funding for the assessment process as once provided in the district; and the need to keep our focus on learning outcomes assessment.

II. DAS recommendations SSSP Committee membership & APU’s

The DAS supported the recommended membership for the SSSP Committee. The memo the DAS forwarded listed committee membership by position – Administrators, Faculty, and Classified Staff- to provide some clarity. DAS recommended that the four faculty be from English, ESL, Mathematics and a CTE faculty member.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Follow-up Action</th>
<th>DECISIONS (Shared Agreement /Resolved or Unresolved?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III. SSSP update: -student planner -SARS Early alert</td>
<td>The Associate Vice Chancellor, Calvin Madlock, provided a Power Point presentation which will be in the DEC DropBox. Student financial aid module will be finished in January. This is for 2014-15. Academic advisement module is a snapshot of student’s academic progress. Educational planner. There is need for a Student Educational Planner. In PeopleSoft it is called My Planner and is student driven. The requirement is that it should be driven by the counselor. The delivered product does not meet this requirement currently. It will require customization to meet the criteria. Customization will require more funding. We have funding to complete the financial aid module. We have to get together to meet this requirement by June 2014. There is also a need to have the Academic Advising module updated and improved for use; it needs fixed. Currently My Planner may not meet the Student Ed Plan requirement. Needs to be customized to meet the requirements. Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Adela Esquivel-Swinson also provided an update on SSSP. She reported that we have a development a timeline for SSSP Implementation. She and the SSSP Committee started with April 30, 2014 and worked backwards. Phase four developing and testing will be presented at CFT (Counseling Functionality Team) next week. The SSSP group has been doing a lot. Priority registration appeal has been implemented. There were other suggestions that the group will review. An SSSP Website should be up in the next couple weeks including the minutes and agendas to document publicly the work Peralta is doing. Various aspects of SARS were talked about and that we will continue to look at making full use of SARS. One particular point to note is that we use SARS data for MIS reporting and need to update SARS codes for MIS purposes. Early Alert also talked about and the need for an effective method of Early Alert. How faculty will provide Early Alert and how students will be notified and worked with is key.</td>
<td>Meet financial aid requirement by June 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. District CTE Committee Update</td>
<td>Louis Quindlen provided the update. CTE committee reviewed the proposal and agreed with the initiative. They have proceeded with administrators and faculty meeting to establish a committee. COA did not have any rep there. Mike Orkin will talk with Dean Crabtree and try to find a date to convene and proceed with the process. It was noted that the CTE advisory committee needs to get involved immediately with SB 1070; a proposal is due in December. At the district level we are in the dark around these initiatives. This is setting CTE policy and funding for the next 3-5 years in the state of California. SB 1070 requires a consortium, so it has to be developed and sent as a district and December is short notice. CTE is now regional consortium driven, sector driven, rather than college by college. Understanding the changes, the new pathways initiatives is critical. At one point we had someone at the district office responsible for all of the grants. This person led the formal approval process that we went through as a district. It was noted that Foothill and Contra Costa currently are driving CTE in the region and yet we also need to have the opportunity to administer a grant. It was noted that Peralta needs to take a more proactive role. We have to become assertive about what we want to do for our community as we move forward. That is one of the purposes of the CTE committee. Clearly what Foothill and Contra Costa are doing is to position</td>
<td>Motion – To begin to use the administrativ e parts of these grants as a way of funding a full time resource development person to support career and technical education…t o support the colleges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item | Discussion
--- | ---

themselves for grants that are coming. You want to be in a position to control what is coming next. Having a resources development person, who is targeted, dedicated to getting grant money/funds to support the colleges, is critical. We have to get in the game and we need someone to coordinate the effort.

*Motion – To begin to use the administrative parts of these grants as a way of funding a full time resource development person to support career and technical education...to support the colleges. Approved.

Memo to be forwarded to the PBC for support and endorsement.

It was stated that AB86 is 250 million dollars and we need to pay attention to that. DEC might have a standing agenda item at this committee regarding grants which are being proposed and grants available. Getting ahead and finding the one where we can be the fiscal agent and lead is what we need to do.

During this discussion the Chancellor joined the meeting and he stated-- The CTE initiatives and grants around the district is a huge concern for me. I believe Louis Quindlen has put it accurately. I’m concerned that we don’t have a coherent vision and approach at the district level. The colleges have a better handle of the vision. I’m in the middle of pursuing this issue at the district. We need grants coordination at the district; we do not have it now. The grants have indirect funds and I’ve talk to the college presidents splitting 50/50 with the district and the college. A portion of that I want to assign for a grants coordinator at the district level. I want to invest resources. I’m moving in that direction, I hope you approve.

MOarkin- I’m going to have to report to the PBC and I will mention in my report that the Chancellor came in and gave his support.

**VI. College Accreditation update**

Each college provided a brief report on their work to date on where they are in preparing the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report which must be finalized by January 2015. Each college is moving ahead. There is also a group which meets at the district-level. It was noted that in time various departments at the district level will need to be involved particularly when the Standards address topics and “services” provided at district office.

**VII. New Business**

The question was raised as to the status of upgrading CurricUNET to CurricUNET Meta. It was stated that the price has almost doubled and the district needs to find the funding and have a plan for moving ahead.

**IX. Announcements**

AEsquivel-Swinson- Attendance rosters available tomorrow to submit.
Strategic planning, more reps from the colleges.

**Future items**

Move to adjourn. Next meeting December 13, 2013

Minutes taken by Laura Leon-Maurice