



# West Los Angeles College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

## COMMITTEE

- Patricia Quiñones, Co-Chair
- Meric Keskinel, Faculty Co-Chair

## Academic Senate (4)

- Holly Bailey-Hoffman
- Marguet Miller
- Laura Peterson
- Leslie Tejada

## AFT Guild (4)

- Bonnie Blustein
- Ricardo Hooper
- Raquel Medina
- Olga Shewfelt

## Vice Presidents (3)

- Aracely Aguiar
- Silvia Barajas
- Roberto Gonzalez

## AFT Classified (2)

- Allison Castillo
- Dionne Morrissette

## Other Classified

### Bargaining Unit (1)

- Helen Lin

### Teamsters (1)

- Carmen Dones

### Student Services Rep.

- Celena Burkhardt

### ASO (1)

- Vacant

## EX OFFICIO

### President

- James Limbaugh

### College Council, Chair

- Carlos Sermeño

## RESOURCE

### Accreditation Rep.

- Aimee Preziosi

### SLO Rep.

- Mary-Jo Apigo

### Budget Manager

- Rasel Menendez

## Researchers

- Michelle Charles
- Lydia Dong
- Moon Ko

## MEETING SCHEDULE 2019-20

4th Wed of the Month

## A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

Through innovative programs and responsive community services, West Los Angeles College empowers students to succeed.

## Minutes

Wednesday, February 26, 2020

1:00-3:00pm – Winlock

Meeting called to order: 1:06pm

## Meeting Logistics:

### Review Agenda and Minutes

Meeting minutes approved with the following corrections

- Date on agenda needs correction
- Templates need correction to members

### Committee Rules

- How is quorum determined?
  - It appears that 10 voting members are needed to reach quorum
  - Resource members do not count towards quorum
- No quorum reached
  - Can't make decisions but can still discuss
- Is ASO vacancy for the ASO president only? ASO vacancy can be assigned to someone other than ASO president.
- PIE is Roberts Rules but not Brown Rules
- Some committees (District Math Committee) allow decisions to be made with less than half of members if the decision is unanimous.

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.



**West Los Angeles College  
Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee**

**Information and Discussion Items:**

**Program Review**

- All other LACCD colleges have cycles less frequent than annual (range of 3 to 7 years)

Cycle Duration	PROS	CONS
Shorter Cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matches CTE accreditation timeline (2 years)</li> <li>More opportunities to capture new programs</li> <li>More opportunities to assess programs that should be closed if it is determined they are not working.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More work</li> <li>Burdensome frequency</li> <li>Reduced bandwidth of staff tasked with this and other overlapping work cycles</li> </ul>
Longer Cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less frequent and burdensome</li> <li>Allows college to stagger programs completing comprehensive program review</li> <li>Staggered program review creates a more reasonable workload for dept chairs</li> <li>Staggered program review increases the likelihood that validators can complete validation and act as a first check before resource requests are presented to PIE for ranking</li> <li>Need to account for new programs can be easily addressed with staggering of programs completing comprehensive program review (for instance: 1/3 of programs in year 2, 1/3 of programs in year 4, and 1/3 of programs in year 6). New programs will join next staggered group.</li> <li>Makes a fall start possible. Burden on dept chairs is infrequent, and of a much smaller volume with staggered rotation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programs come and go within the cycle</li> <li>Need a way to document and account for programs that are created within 6 year cycle so that they don't need to wait several years to be a part of the program review process</li> </ul>

**CTE within Program Review Cycle**

- CTE programs would need to keep to a 2 year cycle for other purposes than the campus conducts program review. That document could be included in the campus program review as addendum or attachment
- CTE programs in larger divisions should have their own program review
- CTE programs are different in many aspects from each other and the divisions that house them
- In the health sciences individual CTE programs have their own program review

Why is the annual update needed?



## West Los Angeles College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

- To allow for resource requests. You can also provide any additional information you would like. Since we will be doing an annual update it is not necessary to have a short program review cycle. West previously was on an annual comprehensive program review cycle.
- Annual updates are mostly needed so that you don't need to wait 6 years or even 2 years to request something if you need it.

### Determining who completes program review

- There needs to be a consistent definition of what counts as a program
- For ex:
  - Only 10-100 funded programs?
  - All academic programs?
  - Exclude committees like student success committee?
- No changes should be implemented for the current program review. Any changes to the list of programs should go into effect for the upcoming program review in the Fall.
- Senior staff should discuss among themselves and their programs who needs to complete program review. Non-academic programs may have reasons for wanting to complete program review. Senior staff should return to PIE with recommendations.

### Considerations for establishing the staggered comprehensive review cycle

- This should occur after the list of programs is determined. CTE programs should be assigned first to the rotation since they need to undergo program review every 2 years. Once CTE is slotted in then add other academic units and student services based on the manager's workload. This list should be published as far in advance as possible so that people can prepare, and OIE is not bombarded with data requests.
- Take into account the SLO cycle so that it is not coinciding with program review

### What is the process of prioritizing the requests

- As soon as program review is done PIE compiles all the requests
- PIE summarizes and categorizes the requests: facilities, technology, FPIP. The rest are prioritized by PIE and Budget committee joint retreat in April.
- Resource requests need to be completed by the summer. Requests are funded the following fiscal year starting in July/August.
- From PIE the resource requests need to go to college council
- President and VPAS determine funding availability/sources
- President makes final approval
- Notifications of funding go out in Sept/Oct
- Some of the committees do not meet in the summer, that is why there is a rush to accomplish this phase of program review before summer.
- Fiscal year ends in June. Purchase deadline is in March
- Programs can adjust the amount by a small amount. For instance if the price of the item changed by a small amount between the time the request was made and funds made available. A large change in price would not be allowed.
- Programs need to improve their spending of approved funds before the purchasing deadline.

### What requires a resource request?

- We need more clarity. There are different answers from different sources.
- There is frustration around the past requirement to make resource requests for office supplies. Programs should have a budget to purchase these items.
- PIE needs to make a clear definition for what is an operating expense.
- Is "tech refresh" still in effect?



## West Los Angeles College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

- 66 Changing the program review rubric
- 67
- 68 • Not comfortable changing the rules once program review is already open
  - 69 • Updated rubric should be disseminated before next cycle
  - 70 • Feels like PIE needs more information on requests. For ex: a program asks for an expensive machine or equipment but doesn't do a good job writing why it is needed, or why it is essential for students to have. Program should have opportunity to explain why it is needed in-person. Maybe reviewers would approve with greater understanding.
  - 71 Validators should also be playing a more prominent role in catching the need to explain the request before the
  - 72 requests reach PIE.
  - 73
  - 74 • Presentations would make it easier for individuals to use the rubric
  - 75 • High priority section of rubric applies to requests that are essential for program to operation/maintain
  - 76 accreditation. It does not mean 10-100 funded
  - 77 • Requests are made without reference to funding source. President and VPAS go down ranking list to determine
  - 78 what funds can be used to fund requests. Some requests may be able to be covered by specific funding sources.
  - 79 Also state may make one-time funds available (i.e., lottery, block grant). That is why requestors do not specify
  - 80 funding source. Determining the funding is presumed to be an administrative and not shared governance function.

- 81
- 82 Determining if programs have an opportunity to present
- 83 • Other colleges provide an opportunity to present. Helps with clarifying the requests for funding and resources. This
  - 84 would help since programs are not adequately being provided feedback through the validation process.
  - 85 • Example of other campuses:
    - 86 ○ Campus A: programs completing comprehensive program review are scheduled to present to program
    - 87 review committee through the year using lottery system. Programs know if they are presenting in
    - 88 October, November etc. They have 15-20 minutes. It is assumed the committee has read the program
    - 89 review. If committee has any questions they have the opportunity to present. Summary of the
    - 90 presentation is shared with the entire system. This is just one example and not necessarily invoked as a
    - 91 model for how WLAC should plan.
    - 92 ○ Campus B: Program review happens in September. It is reviewed by different committees and ranked. The
    - 93 committees will call in programs to talk about their project if they need more info. Ranking happens in the
    - 94 fall. By February the rankings are presented to the president for his approval on which requests are
    - 95 funded based on input from the different committees.
  - 96 • More feasible to asks programs to present because WLAC tends to produce fewer resource requests (less than a
  - 97 100) than other colleges (up to 1000). Lot of factors why but some include facilities bond -> buildings in better
  - 98 condition -> fewer requests needed for fixes to buildings
  - 99 • Validators should be present at prioritization retreat to explain the resource requests if more information is
  - 100 needed

101

102 **Timing the Program Review Cycle**

	PROS	CONS
Fall Start	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• October start has much less conflict with other dept chair workload</li> <li>• Gives most flexibility for programs to present to different committees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was previously conducted in Fall but changed; one of the main reasons was to reduce the workload experienced by dept chairs who needed to complete SLO cycle and tenure cycle among other tasks in the Fall</li> <li>• Do not start in September.</li> </ul>
Spring Start	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No time for presentations</li> <li>• Large workload for validators; less than ideal validation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides too short of a timeframe for programs to present their requests</li> <li>• Provides too short of a timeframe for validators to review feedback</li> </ul>



**West Los Angeles College**  
**Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spring is also very busy with events like graduation</li> </ul>
Summer Start	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short gap between completion of program review and disbursement of funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not enough time to complete requests to sync with budget cycle</li> <li>Not enough time to present requests to college council and committees before they adjourn for summer</li> <li>Provides too short of a timeframe for programs to purchase items before March purchase deadline</li> </ul>

103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128

- No months are specified in the final recommendation from PIE about changes to the program review cycle. College Council should make determination of details of timing in the program review cycle. Consensus in PIE appeared to be a mid-October to December submission for resource requests to be approved in the spring.
- Validators are mostly d-basis and can do the work in January.
- Anticipate confusion in first year for switching to Fall.
  - Some programs will submit updates this Spring, and then again submit requests in Fall
  - Programs assigned to complete program review this Fall will likely be confused what money they are requesting/receiving between their Spring 2020 requests and Fall 2020 requests

**Action Steps**

- PIE will make a recommendation to College Council about new program review cycle. "PIE recommends that the program review operates on a 6 year comprehensive cycle, except for every 2 years for CTE programs, with annual updates in both cases. PIE recommends program review be moved from Spring to the Fall."
- PIE requests senior staff return to PIE at May meeting with recommendations on which programs should participate in program review. June is too late because not everyone is d basis. PIE co-chairs should agendize this for May meeting, and similar process for College Council.
- PIE needs to establish the comprehensive review cycle rotation to start in Fall 2020.
- In the new cycle, PIE would like programs to be invited to present to PIE before April prioritization retreat

129

ACTION	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	START MONTH	STATUS	NOTES
<b>Committee Vacancies</b>				
None				
<b>Changes to Program Review / Prioritization Process</b>				
Work with Budget to schedule a time for them to present these recommended changes to PIE	<i>Patty Quiñones; Olga Shewfelt</i>	Nov. 2018	Initiated	Requested at February 2019 Budget Meeting
Encourage creation of Budget flowchart re: hierarchy of who to ask about allocations questions	<i>Olga Shewfelt</i>	Nov. 2018	Initiated	
<b>Wish List for OIE</b>				
% of students enrolled by major or program (ex. % of students enrolled in all Health Sciences classes? Or % of enrollments that are Health Sciences?)	<i>OIE</i>	Nov. 2018	Completed	Requested by C. Dones



West Los Angeles College  
**Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee**

Research on existing committee structures (Would need to ask M. Apigo for list of new faculty committee roles and H. Bailey-Hofmann for list of committee members and officers).	<i>Senate</i>	Nov. 2018	Initiated	Requested by B. Blustein
Meet with FPIP Committee members and Academic Affairs re: data creation process	<i>Patty Quiñones; Bonnie Blustein; Ara Aguiar, Etc.</i>	Nov. 2018	Initiated	Scheduled to meet 4/17/2019
<b>Future PIE Considerations</b>				
Discussion of how to avoid meeting overlap and promote shorter, more streamlined meetings	<i>PIE Committee</i>	Nov. 2018	In Progress	Suggested by B. Blustein

130