

## De Anza College Office of Institutional Research and Planning

**To:** College Planning Committee

**From:** Mallory Newell, De Anza Researcher

**Date:** 6/27/2014

**Subject:** Governance Assessment - Annual Update Survey – 2013-14

---

In an effort to assess the 6-year Integrated Planning, Assessment and Resource Allocation Model, the College Planning Committee developed and piloted the Annual Governance Assessment survey in the Planning and Budget Teams in spring 2014. In spring 2014, the survey was sent to 20 shared governance groups listed in the [Governance Handbook](#). 6 governance groups participated in the survey.

Highlights from the 2014 survey include:

- 67% of respondents provided an orientation to the new members and 60% of respondents updated or changed the website.
- 100% of respondents collaborated with other groups to inform their processes and or decisions this year. This was largely done through presentations by other groups at meetings, informal collaboration and updates at Senate or College Council meetings.
- 100% of respondents stated they disseminated information to constituents, largely through posting of meeting agendas and minutes on a public website, periodically asking members if they were sharing information with their constituency, holding periodic public meetings with their constituency group, and sending periodic emails to constituents.
- 50% of respondents stated they effectively improved a program, a service or student learning this year.
- 83% of respondents reported their processes were adequate to achieve their intended outcomes.
- 67% of respondents stated they used data to effectively improve a program, a service or student learning this year.
- 67% of respondents reported they used data collected through the program review process to improve a program, a service, or student learning this year. 50% of respondents used the following methods: data collected and assessed by an instructional or student services program and for program level outcomes, and data provided by the Research and Planning Office.

- 83% of respondents stated they are responsible for completing a planning agenda or agendas.

**I. Please indicate whether the committee updated or changed any of the following:**

	Yes	No
Charge of the committee	1	5
Constituency representation	1	5
Member terms of service		6
Meeting schedule	3	3
Website	3	2
Committee's profile in the Governance Handbook ( <a href="http://www.deanza.edu/gov/gov_eHandbook_rev3-31.pdf">http://www.deanza.edu/gov/gov_eHandbook_rev3-31.pdf</a> )	1	5
Appointed new members in the case of vacancies	3	3
Orientation of new members	4	2

**2a. Did the committee collaborate with other groups to inform their processes and/or decisions this year?**

	Yes	No	N/A
Respondents	6	0	0

**2b. If yes, what was the process for collaboration? Please choose from the following options: (select all that apply)**

	Respondents
Periodic joint meetings	2
Presentations by other groups at meetings	6
Informal collaboration (consulting with committee members from other groups)	5
Providing updates at Academic Senate, Classified Senate or College Council meetings	5
Other	0

**3a. Did committee members disseminate information to constituents?**

	Yes	No	N/A
Respondents	6	0	0

**3b. If yes, how did committee members share information with constituents? Please choose from the following options (select all that apply):**

	Respondents
Meeting agendas and minutes were posted on the public website	5
Members were periodically asked if they were sharing information with their constituency	4
Members held periodic public meetings with their constituency group	4
Members sent periodic email updates to their constituency group	4
Periodic campus town hall meetings were held	2
Other	0

**3c. Did the sharing of information elicit feedback or discussion from constituents? If yes, please explain.**

Feedback through voting. Discussion through joint meetings and other groups. input into improvements for curriculum submissions; input on GE criteria and philosophy plus core competencies

Nominations for Technology Enhanced Teaching and Learning subcommittee and recommendations for TTF agenda topics

The sharing of information generated a Printing Survey request, discussions on printing needs, the mission statement review, and the CPR review. We received feedback from Part time Senate Representatives on their issues and concerns, such as Part time Office Space. The Senate and divisions have undertaken Equity dialogues and discussions. We also had an opportunity to review the proposed ACCJC revised accreditation standards.

Yes, examples feedback occurred in discussions related to Program Review, 3 SP Planning, and Student Equity Planning.

**4a. Did the committee effectively improve a program, a service or student learning this year?**

	Yes	No	N/A
Respondents	3	1	2

**4b. If yes, what program, service or student learning improvement was made? Please choose from the following list (select all that apply):**

	Respondents
Improvement in a program (e.g. curricular)	1
Improvement in a service provided to students	2
Improvement in student learning (e.g. addressing the equity	2

**4c. If yes, please provide an example of an improvement that was made.**

Allocating additional funding and setting up new process for materials fees.

e.g., Provided veteran registration workshops, stronger linkages between Outreach and Counseling, using technology to apply integrated approach to addressing student concerns

The 2014 Convocation was an opportunity to discuss ideas related to the development of equity plans and assessment. Increased number of SLOs and PLOs assessed.

**5a. Were the committee's processes adequate to achieve its intended outcomes this year?**

	Yes	No	N/A
Respondents	5	0	1

**5b. If no, what process alterations or modifications do you plan to implement next year? Please choose from the following list (select all that apply):**

	Respondents
Decision making	0
Resource allocation	0
Financial planning	0
Human resource planning	0
Physical resource planning	0
Technology planning	0
Program and/or service improvements	0
Student learning outcomes	0
Program level outcomes	0
Other	0

**6. Did the committee use data to effectively improve a program, a service or student learning this year?**

	Yes	No	N/A
Respondents	4	0	2

**6a. If yes, please choose from the following list of qualitative and quantitative data that was used (select all that apply):**

	Respondents
Data collected and assessed by an instructional or student services program	3
Data collected and assessed by a campus program or service	2
Data collected and assessed for student learning outcomes	2
Data collected and assessed for program level outcomes	3
Data collected through the program review process	4
A survey of students and/or employees	2
Data provided by the Research and Planning Office	3
Other	0

**7. Is the committee responsible for completing a planning agenda(s)?**

	Yes	No
Respondents	5	1

**7a. If yes, please briefly explain the progress made towards completing the planning agenda(s) by the Midterm Assessment (August, 2015) or Self-Study Assessment (May, 2017).**

---

II.A.1 Working with other Planning and Budgeting Teams and College Council, the Instructional Planning and Budget Team (IPBT) will review and modify the Annual Program Review Update and Comprehensive Program Review processes on a regular basis. This was successfully completed. Equity questions were included on the 2014 CPR form. II.A.1.b Develop a Distance Learning course student evaluation, based on the Foothill-De Anza Faculty Agreement Article 6 and Appendix J2W. As per a report provided by April Qian to Christina Espinosa-Pieb on January 2014, "The administrative process was piloted in 2009, and the evaluation verbiage is in the faculty contract. After the Summer 2013 Catalyst upgrade, now there is the new conditioned release function in the system that would potentially raise the response rate to over 50%, which was what held us up for being able to conduct evaluations for formal use. I reported this to our faculty members on the Distance Learning/Catalyst committee as well as Rowena in Fall. Rowena told me that senior staff would discuss with appropriate parties then let me know what to do next. Alan Simes, the online faculty rep was updated of this status." II.A.3.a Develop a plan to assess General Education outcomes. Implement revised GE Philosophy and Area Descriptors for inclusion in 2013-2014 catalog. II.A.3.c Assess student achievement of the GE outcomes and Institutional Core Competencies. The Summary of Mapping to ICCs document shows that all are ICCs, and also each bullet point of each ICC is being assessed by multiple courses. The GE SLOAC work excel spreadsheet contains the assessment results for GE courses only. There are 441 GE courses that have a total of 1184 SLO statements. Of these 1184 outcomes, 793 have assessment methods, 609 data summaries, and 592 have reflections and analysis. There is no adding in of ECMS assessments to the output or these numbers. I will put in place a process to request assessment/approval of grants. Utilizing a standardized form for review and approval purposes.

---

See Attached Planning Agendas

---

the committee jointly works with Academic Senate and SLO Core Team on GE assessments; the SLO core team has submitted progress towards this planning agenda.

---

The committee reviewed and discussed the planning agendas, and will address them during 2014-15 as part of technology plan development.

---

**8. Please provide any additional feedback on your processes and/or this assessment form.**

---

For item 4a, the committee decided that no direct improvement was made during this academic year. However, there are plans in progress, including the formation of the subcommittee and technology plan development, that will directly impact student learning.

---

Worked collaboratively on the process. Set clear approval process. Captured relevant information on the request form. Standardized request and review information for analysis / approval purposes.

---