

Standard I Accreditation Self Study Team
Institutional Missions and Effectiveness
10-25-04 revised 11-05-04

Members Present:

Andrew LaManque, Chair, Carleen Bruins, Cindy Castillo, Mayra Cruz,
Rich Hansen, Lydia Hearn, Carolyn Keen, Duane Kubo, Carolyn Wilkins-Green,
Kevin Glapion, Carmen Pereida, Karl Schaffer, Pat Fifield

Corrections to Minutes of 10-18-04

Carolyn Wilkins-Green not noted as present

**The first part of Master Plan typically looks at the Mission Statement
(not the first part of the process is to look at the mission statement
and see if it needs to be revised or not)**

The Master Plan might be seen as a more abstract document

The Strategic Plan might be seen as how we will get there

**President Brian Murphy indicated that we might need more
Community involvement in the planning process**

Handouts

Andrew presented demographic data from the De Anza Institutional Research site. There was a lengthy discussion and explanation of the Demographic page which includes numerical information on Gender, Ethnicity, Enroll Status, Day-Eve Status, Full-Part Time Status, Highest Education, Educational Goal, and Age Group, etc.

Question: Is there a category for a student who might belong to more than one ethnic background. Not at this time. High rate of numbers in those students who “decline to state”. Currently a student can select only one category. The Federal Government has proposed rules where applicants could select as many categories as might be applicable, but there was never agreement on how the numbers should be reported.

Institution Research has many links. If you need URL’s to any link, please let us know and we will provide it for you.

Discussion on handout of Cindy Castillo. Standard I-B.5

The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies. A lot of data is generated, however, there is much more to be done. Lots of departments and divisions utilize their own database but information is not directed to a central repository for use by any interested party on the campus.

Our current database is limited (nearly 20 years old – it is not relational).

Some students are not easily identified or they may be associated to numerous programs.

Some information is not included in program reviews.

Question from instructional side: Would like to know if more information is available to instructors on students in their classes. Would data such as test scores, prerequisite classes, high school attended etc. be helpful to increasing student learning and success? The committee discussed its frustration that such data, along with the appropriate training was not readily available to instructors. Although there has been a huge improvement in the amount of information available through the research office and individual offices, systems still have not been put in place to allow a wider access to data about our students. Projects are in place, from the data warehouse to the portal but it may be a long time before they are fully implemented.

Question: Does every program require a program review?

The program review process has not done much in the past few years.

The Student Services side is more Ad Hoc.

Several people talked about a goal in the equity plan that called for not more than a five percentage point variance in the success of our students across ethnic groups. To-date, success has been measured in terms of course success rates based on grades. Analyses have shown considerable variance between ethnic groups. Presumably, this definition could also be applied to learning outcomes associated with the course outlines. One Dean indicated that she presents data on course success rates each quarter but does not feel there is much institutional support to motivate faculty. At this point there was a lengthy discussion of institutional support for stated goals and targets. Does the institution provide incentives for the achievement of institutional goals – does it tie data to resource allocations and does it then track (using data) to see progress towards the goals. It was agreed that more discussion was needed on this topic. What would be the committee's suggestions for changed in process?

5 or 6 years ago program reviews were in a narrative form; Programs had to justify themselves

We need to maximize the use of the tutorial programs, LINC classes and offer classes to respond the language needs of students.

Observation: What if the college or district had an employee who oversees student equity Response We do in the position of Marion Winters but she is spread too thin. The team thought that there was not enough funding in this area. There has been reduced support (in terms of B budgets and release time) for this year in the last two years.

When we have a goal or objective we have to put resources behind it

Programs are led by the masters they report to. Example Financial Aid must answer to Federal Government.

Accountability track who you are serving. What is working . What is not working