West Los Angeles College
Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

COMMITTEE
Patricia Quiñones, Co-Chair
Faculty Co-Chair (Vacant)

Academic Senate (4)
Holly Bailey-Hoffman
Marguet Miller
Laura Peterson
Leslie Tejada

AFT Guild (4)
Bonnie Blustein
Ricardo Hooper
Olga Shewfelt
Vacant

Vice Presidents (3)
Aracely Aguiar
Roberto Gonzalez
Iris Ingram

AFT Classified (2)
Allison Castillo
Dionne Morrissette

Other Classified
Bargaining Unit (1)
Helen Lin

Teamsters (1)
Carmen Dones

ASO (1)
Vacant
_____

EX OFFICIO
President
James Limbaugh

College Council, Chair
Carlos Sermeño
_____

RESOURCE
Accreditation Rep.
Kimberly Manner

SLO Rep.
Mary-Jo Apigo

Budget Manager
Rasel Menendez

Researchers
Sarah Doerrer
Moon Ko
_____

MEETING SCHEDULE 2018-19
2018 Last Wednesday of each month; 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM:
Dec. 5, 2018 (alternate combination date for Nov/Dec)

2019 Last Wednesday of each month, 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM:
Jan. 30; Feb. 27; Mar. 27; April 24; May 29

A VISION FOR THE FUTURE
Through innovative programs and responsive community services, West Los Angeles College empowers students to succeed.

Minutes
Wednesday, February 27, 2019
1:00-2:30pm – Winlock

Attendees: Helen Lin, Marguet Miller, Carlos Sermeno, Carmen Dones, Bonnie Blustein, Olga Shewfelt, Leslie Tejada, Raquel Medina, Aracely Aguilar, Dionne Morrissette, Ricardo Hooper, Laura Peterson, Patricia Quinones, Lydia Dong

Meeting called to order: 1:03pm

Meeting Logistics:
- Most recent meeting minutes: Minutes were reviewed.
  - Typos were corrected.
  - Clarification of wishlist question on the chart of action items. Do the committee members want OIE to produce # of students declared in a particular major or # of students enrolled in particular classes
  - Feedback to add FPIP meeting date scheduled
- Change meeting notes template so that font is not so small, and footer only appears on the first page. Also interest in adding line numbers.
- With the changes mentioned above, meeting notes were approved.

This committee is a standing committee of the College Council.

Charge: The committee's charge is to link the college's existing planning to the college's budgeting of discretionary resources.

Responsibilities:
1. Make allocation recommendations to the College Council. PIE does not itself do planning, but rather uses existing plans to establish criteria by which it makes allocation recommendations against funds identified by the Budget Committee as discretionary.
2. Monitor the policies and procedures by which program reviews and unit plans are produced and submitted to the Committee. It is PIE's responsibility to see to it that all program reviews and unit plans are submitted in a timely manner so that it can perform its major function of using these existing plans to make judgments regarding college priorities for the allocation of resources.
3. Develop and enforce policies that qualify a program or unit to apply for funding against identified discretionary resources.

Primary and Secondary Responsibility for Accreditation Standards:
I.A.   Mission
I.B.   Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness
II.A. Instructional Programs
II.B. Library and Learning Support Services
III.D. Financial Resources Planning

Quality Focus Essay Action Project 2.2.3
Establish a systematic, evidence-based process for evaluation and improvement of the major College operational processes, and for dissemination of the results.

1   # Information and Discussion Items:
2
3   **Program Review is open**
4   - Background on change in program review cycle. We are now on a 2-year cycle. This year is an update year to
5   update the goals from last year.
6   - P. Quinones sent out an email with a revised training manual.
7   - A handout was provided with a timeline of workshops. OIE can schedule additional sessions around the schedules
8   of faculty/staff's availability.
9   - There were some minor changes to the TracDat forms. Resource Requests now appear under Planned Actions.
10   o This was to address the problem of program reviews submitted in some cases with goal and resource
11   requests without any clear planned actions. From a logic model perspective, it makes more sense to
12   specify a goal, related planned actions, and then related resource requests to achieved those planned
13   actions.
14   o All data from prior years was downloaded. The 2017-18 plan of action is saved is the Document
15   Repository in TracDat.
16   o Any resource requests being rolled over need to be re-entered. Please make sure that the active cycle
17   says 2018-19.
18   - The due date for Program Review cycle 2018-19 is March 22.
19
20   **Discussion about whether to instruct submitters to specify an active cycle of 2018-19 for resource requests**
21   - Should the cycle be 2019-20 since all purchase requests for 2018-19 have already been made. The approval
22   process timeline means that any new requests would not meet the 2018-19 deadline for purchase of June.
23   Otherwise requestors only have 2 months to submit their purchase requests.
24   - In the past resource requests were made 2 years ahead.
25   - Nowhere was the need to set the cycle to 2019-20 and not 2018-19 for purchase requests documented.
26   - The resources approved for 2018-19 were submitted recently and will be expiring in June 2019.
27   - Questions were raised about program review is conducted in the Spring.
28   o WLAC used to do program review in the Fall. There were too many things to do in the Fall like tenure track
29   evaluations, hiring. The work piled up for the Vision Chairs in the Fall. It was decided it would easier to
30   spread the workload. But that was also when we were doing intensive program review annually.
31   - Suggestions were made to move program review back to Fall now that the task has been reduced to an annual
32   request based on needs and follow through. It may not be as time intensive, and turnaround could be quicker.
33   o There was clarification that the suggestion was not to change this impending program review which will
34   be conducted in Spring.
35   o Suggestion was raised to bring this issue of moving Program Review back to Fall to the Vision Council since
36   that is where the problems about workload surfaced.
37   - Request for general funds worksheet was already submitted to all the VPs. If dept wants to request through 10-100
38   you should indicate that in the budget then turn it back by the end of this week. But that is for next year 2019-20.
39   - A decisions was reached to keep the instructions as is and set the active cycle to 2018-19 with the understanding
40   that the requests are being made in this cycle (for purchases either this year or next year). This would avoid
41   needing to switch the whole system and portal. Resource requests approved in the 2018-19 cycle will be for next
42   year.
43   o There is already a way in the system to specify if a request is one-time, recurring, or a combination of
44   both.
45
46   **Questions and concerns about the steps in the budgeting process**
47   - There were questions about the mechanics of how salary line items are handled. Regular salaries do not need to
48   be added to the request. Adjuncts also don't have a request because there is a whole pot to cover that expense

49	which is distributed monthly. If a dept is running negative for employees and benefits, the business office will
50	cover.
51	○ There was acknowledgement that this topic is a budget committee question but for clarification the line
52	item for all adjunct assignments is 1 dollar because it is not a fixed expense. Adjuncts are considered a
53	flexible expense.
54	○ The only fixed expenses are full time faculty salary and benefits, in some cases supplies (bodies, rats,
55	models), and fees for accreditation. The 10-100 budget is a mechanism for what the college is obligated to
56	pay for. All adjunct are considered temporary and as such become a flexible fund. There is no financial
57	commitment to adjuncts; adjunct employment is based only on demand and how many FTES the college
58	generates. In 2010-11 the college slashed adjunct hiring.

- In program 100, whatever was spent last year becomes the budget.
- PIE is important because it is the only opportunity units have to get things like computers.
- There was discussion about the sense that requestors need to put all their requests through program review even dry erasers vs. the spirit of program review which is to capture one-time requests. Some of the workarounds have been to purchase a large quantity of dry erasers.
  - There was discussion about whether requestors should be told to put all their requests in program review or not.
  - There was clarification that this directive to put all requests into program review did not come from PIE; it originated from the Business Office. They will delete line items if they are not also in program review.
- There was a question about whether most units have operating budgets. The answer was no.
  - The supply budget was eliminated years ago and never reinstated.
    - This is a problem because if an instructor finds out they need a dry eraser, under this system they would need to wait until April for program review for approval to purchase that supply.
    - Units have been obtaining supplies through the VP of Academic Affairs. It would be preferable for each chair to be responsible for order supplies so that the supply orders can be more flexible to their needs. This is an issue for the budget committee.
  - There was a suggestion that each division set a budget of $1000 to cover supplies. This is not ideal because not every unit is the same size.
- Every budget in the organization has two main parts. One is mandatory or fixed expenses, then you have your discretionary budget. For accreditation purposes planning must drive the budget and not the other way around. There was a sense that at WLAC, new administrators are driving all decisions including educational choices.
- Change to that comes by acting and not just complaining. This PIE committee needs to be stronger in making recommendations towards collective action.
  - Suggest that the budget committee produce a flow chart that is friendly to everyone to see what the budget process is
  - Propose an operational budget for each of the units. We are not recreating the units every semester. We know what is costs. Even through adjunct assignments can change, there are some adjuncts who have been here 10-20 years so we know those expenses. It takes something like the financial crash of 2008 for us to slash deep in that budget.
- Currently each unit has an operational budget but in name only. The budget is $1 as a placeholder.
- Program review should not be a paperwork exercise, but are we growing and we need this, or we're not growing and we don't.
- Almost 90% of the program 100 funds from Sacramento are already spend on mandatory expenses. What happens to the remaining 8% in discretionary funds?
  - It used to be 2 or 3 years ago we had substantial funds from grants. We had VPs over those grants.
  - Questions about what happens to funds from parking lots, movie shoots etc. That goes into the enterprise fund. Right now one person is making decisions about what to do with those funds. There is a lack of transparency of where that other money goes and who decides how it is going to be used. That is a major failing and gap between the planning process and the budget process for PIE to address. There is a need

98	to patch up pipelines that flow between planning and budget and that is why it is in the purview of this
99	committee.
100	• PIE also needs to address at what point does a unit need to modify their operational budget and put that into
101	program review? There was recommendation that modifications should not need to be captured in program
102	review to be approved. It should instead be a part of a budgeting process.
103	• There was concern about a lack of feedback. Although units specified increase in mandatory expenses (like an
104	increase in accreditation fees) those increases were denied without explanation. This required units to find other
105	contingency funding to pay for the difference in accreditation expenses. Other funds like Perkins, Block Grant, and
106	Program 100 cannot be used to cover those types of expenses.
107	• If a resource request is approved and recurring it should become a Program 100 expense.
108	o There was support for the idea of putting Program 100 requests into Program Review submissions.
109	• Block Grant has shrunk from 500K to 100K. There is a perception that no one is pursuing major grants.
110	
111	
112	**PIE will put forth a recommendation to change the budgeting process**
113	• The PIE committee requests that each planning unit is allocated an annual operational budget based on prior
114	actuals, and that any changes to this budget must be communicated in writing to the appropriate VP by [date].
115	
116	**Revamping the comprehensive cycle**
117	• PIE will take up in March whether we want to pilot a 2,3 or 4 year cycle
118	
119	**Role in the Educational Master Plan**
120	• The EMP expires in 2020
121	• Does the committee want to take charge of this?
122	• P. Quinones will request current EMP is extended a year to 2021
123	• Who determines these questions around the EMP? PIE should consult academic senate.
124	• PIE should take the lead as it is representative of senate faculty.
125	• In the past the former Dean of OIE worked with the Academic Senate President on the EMP. PIE will review the
126	past Senate minutes
127	
128	**Scheduling of Prioritization Retreat**
129	• P. Quinones will send out a doodle poll but target date is Friday April 26th
130	• Last year the committee was not able to meet
131	• The goal will be to have a 2 hour meeting. Work could be done in advance individually, as a group, or with
132	prescreening by VPs
133	• There was agreement for the need for prescreening so PIE is working with a final list
134	• There were questions about whether PIE could continually offload technology requests to the technology
135	committee. The technology committee has not met with a quorum and minutes on record for a year. PIE will check
136	with the co-chair of the technology committee for more information on the faculty representation in the
137	committee
138	
139	**Local Vision Targets**
140	• P. Quinones provided background on the task of providing local targets related to the Chancellor's vision for
141	success targets. This year we will provide targets for 2021-22 using 2016-17 numbers as a baseline. Next year we
142	will need to provide a rationale for our targets.
143	• Because the district has an April deadline and the Chancellor has a May 31st deadline the college/PIE must set our
144	targets now.
145	• The district has already set targets msotly in line with the Chancellor's targets
146	• The targets are not punitive and are meant to be an aspirational framework

147 • There were questions about the connection between the targets and the EMP. The EMP does not need to
148   wholesale adopt the Vision for Success targets, however they will likely need to be incorporated in areas of shared
149   goals
150 • There was disagreement with targets
151   o With a trend of lowered enrollment will be judged on the number of students or the proportion of
152   students achieving each metric
153   o Disagreement with the presumption that fewer units is better when there are cases that students obtain
154   value from taking more classes, particularly in their major or if pursuing another interest
155   o How can we expect to increase transfers to CSU/UC's when particularly at the CSU level they are reducing
156   their admissions?
157   ▪ There was clarification that CSU's are reducing their freshmen enrollment based on the finding
158   that community college transfers perform better
159   o We can provide this feedback to the Chancellors
160   ▪ There was skepticism the Chancellor would act on this feedback
161 • There was clarification around metrics
162   o The state now provides tracking of transfers out of state and to private schools
163   o The state is also beginning to report metrics in the Student Success Metric Dashboard based on
164   disaggregated student populations (e.g., intends to transfer, lifelong learning, short-term skills) and not
165   just using all students who enrolled as the denominator
166   o The state will provide data in the workforce section in the future. It has not been released yet. It needs to
167   be matched with an EDD system.
168 • How do we account for students who do not share the same goals as measured by the metrics (lifelong learning,
169   transferring out-of-state, transferring without an AA)
170   o We can encourage use of West Extension for lifelong learners
171   o We can encourage stackable degrees
172   o We can promote AA degrees for transfers, even for students who are not interested in the AA
173   o We can promote advisement
174   ▪ Many students do not utilize advisement
175   ▪ It is difficult for students to obtain counseling appointments. There is a backlog
176   ▪ Students are only required to meet counselors in some circumstances (athletes, applying for
177   financial aid)
178   • The Athletics program is a model intervention in requiring students to obtain an ed plan,
179   maintain a minimum GPA, enroll full-time. It also provides a cohort experience for
180   students. Aside from being athletes the students are general population students. But
181   the general population does not need to meet with a counselor
182 • We should have an online degree audit function. Currently students are doing this on paper
183   o This function is coming back, over the objections of some counselors
184   o Online degree audits are not an either or choice with ed plans