



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
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 Doerr
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, March 27, 2019

1:00-2:00pm – Winlock

Attendees: Patricia Quinones, Leticia Sanchez-Perez, Lydia Dong, Bonnie Blustein, Carlos Sermeno, Carmen Dones, Meric Keskinel, Raquel Medina, Mary-Jo Apigo, Dionne Morrissette, Laura Peterson, Iris Ingram, Olga Shewfelt

Meeting called to order: 1:03pm

Meeting Logistics:

- Most recent meeting minutes: Minutes were reviewed and approved.
- Committee discussed whether to use informal or formal consensus. Committee agreed to informal consensus and put items to vote when necessary.

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:

1:03 PM Meeting called to order

Decision making procedures

- Should PIE use consensus or majority
 - Consensus can be informal or formal
 - Formal consensus can be complicated
 - Absolute consensus can drag out until only a few diehards decide
 - Individuals can “stand aside” and indicate they disagree but choose not to block a decision
- We’ve basically done thing here as if there are no objections, then we are all agreed. Are we ok with that?
- Sometimes taking a vote is a way to move things on instead of just engaging in a back and forth.

Introductions

- There is a new faculty co-chair, Meric Keskinial from Economics
- The faculty co-chair is technically an academic senate appointee

Program Review updates

- Program Review is technically closed, a few units are still wrapping up
- Reminder to complete the final step of Program Review.
 - The Nuventive dashboard only indicates 30% of units have indicated they are ready for validation; however, we know that units are done. It could be that units have omitted the last step which is indicating they are ready for validation. This step is crucial for deans to be able to validate. P. Quinones will reach out to deans to check if their units have done this step or if they are behind on completing Program Review
- OIE will send an update on how many resource requests roughly have been made; can only estimate because units are still trickling in with their final Program Review submissions
- P. Quinones offered if anyone is unsure if they did Program Review correctly she is happy to go in and check
 - There is some question of how to handle Program Review for Kinesiology and Athletics. OIE met with representatives from both, and can continue to assist offline.
- The validation deadline is 4/12, but we can push it further back. It depends on how we want to structure the prioritization retreat and if we want the ability to do pre-ranking.

ACCJC Reporting

- M. Apigo is working on the ACCJC annual reporting. The reporting is asking for stretch goals for the first time. This is just an information item that we will work on defining the stretch goals.
 - Institutional set standards are the floor of what we will aim to achieve. Stretch goals are aspirational goals.
 - Some suggest going 3% higher than institutional set standard
 - Stretch goals will be defined for a few areas like course completion, degrees and certificate awards, and transfer
 - OIE will bring data for last 3 years to inform stretch goals

Local Vision Goals Summary

- At the last meeting we looked at the local vision goals summary action items we looked at these numbers for local vision goals summary last meeting
 - As explained previously the Chancellor’s office put out Vision for Success goals and every campus needs to set these local goals. Nothing has changed on the handout from last time P. Quinones brought it. What



West Los Angeles College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

- 49 might be changing from the present point are the Student Equity goals. The state is still working on their
50 Student Equity numbers. These numbers are changing almost daily.
- 51 • P. Quinones request is we can agree to recommend that the college align with the Chancellor's percentages and
52 apply that to our equity goals
 - 53 ○ There is agreement only to do the minimum number of goals, so if the instructions are to set 1 goal for a
54 section we should only set 1 goal.
 - 55 ○ There is discussion about the merits and pitfalls of adopting the chancellor's goals.
 - 56 ○ There is discussion that if disproportionate impact groups only increase the same percentage as the rest
57 of the students, then we haven't reduced inequity
 - 58 ○ All the other colleges in the district are aligning with the state. If we choose not to align we will need to
59 provide rationale to the district.
 - 60 ○ We can submit local goals and also set internal goals for our educational master plan.
 - 61 ○ The local goals are not aligned fully to the student centered funding formula. The SCFF for example counts
62 each degree earned by the same student. The local goals look at headcounts. The state is scrambling to
63 align everything.
 - 64 • Vote to adopt chancellor's goals. 6 in favor and 1 no.
 - 65 • Clarification about what we will be working on
 - 66 ○ We will only do Goal 1A, 2A, Goal 3 (only 1 goal) and Goal 4.
 - 67 ○ The counts are mostly CTE students
 - 68 • Questions about how the local goal requirement was rolled out. Did the Chancellor seek input?
 - 69 ○ Yes, they had a workgroup with input from the community, town halls. But we did not discuss this at our
70 college. We knew of the Vision for Success in 17/18 but we only were told to address the local goals in
71 December 2018.

72 73 **Prioritization Retreat**

- 74 • PIE meeting will be cancelled in April.
- 75 • Questions about desired format of prioritization retreat
 - 76 ○ It has been half day or all day
 - 77 ■ The length is a function of the prioritization process chosen whether to rank all items (1 to 300
78 for example) or to rate items (1 to 5 for example) in order to derive a ranking. Doing a rating to
79 reach a ranking was much quicker. The committee prefers to use the rating method. Doing a
80 ranking of all items took all day.
 - 81 ○ PIE only prioritizes items that are not classified staff, faculty, technology or facilities.
 - 82 ○ PIE should only be looking at the requests and not the funding sources. I. Ingram makes the determination
83 of what funds are appropriate. People should leave the source of funds alone because there are situations
84 where she can use things like state funds to pay for software licenses.
 - 85 ○ Ongoing items versus new requests. Just because an item was new it doesn't mean in the following year it
86 will be included in the budget for ongoing expenses. That has to be pointed out.
 - 87 ■ There needs to be clarification on what can be a continuing expense
 - 88 ■ I. Ingram stated that if for example someone got a new piece of equipment that requires new
89 software there might not be enough money to manage ongoing software costs beyond the initial
90 purchase. Hopefully the ongoing costs were budgeted at the initial prioritization
- 91 • The committee would like to have materials ahead of item. Last year there was no preparation. The retreat can be
92 shorter if materials are provided in advance.
 - 93 ○ P. Quinones will send out an excel file with all requests excluding facilities, technology, faculty and staff. P.
94 Quinones will send out spreadsheets by 23rd.
- 95 • What happens to items that are in a grey area
 - 96 ○ In terms of software, it is not always technology. I. Ingram will meet with P. Quinones to discuss. I. Ingram
97 provided language to clarify in the past but this still led to many questions. The problem is that almost
98 everything now is technology.



West Los Angeles College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

- 99
100
101
102
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
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
- Positions are certainly off the table for PIE, but what about training? What about stipends for faculty to do work
 - That has typically been handled through the ISA process which doesn't get ranked. It typically comes to Deans, VPs, President that work needs to be done and then an ISA process occurs which is like posting for applications to a part-time job.
 - How are ISA requests handled? Does a VP just decide on their own? If it's in Program Review it should be a question for PIE and Budget. Pulling out those requests with faculty positions is not appropriate because FPIP exists for full-time.
 - Some people are putting these requests in Program Review, but this hasn't been clear so this is not consistent. There can be requests made outside of Program Review, for example, because of a particular grant we need to have someone do the following which requires ISA. Or if the district says here is some money for pathways, then it will also not go through Program Review or Shared Governance.
 - Although the practice of ISA has been to push off, these decisions to administration to desired, PIE a shared governance committee should not be doing that. We should figure out what role we have in making those decisions when it is not clear how those items like ISA or any others that come up should be handled. What we have now is not responsible shared governance.
 - What we could do is invite the VP for more info instead of kicking the decision to the VP and they decide. In the end the president will make the decision. But the role of this committee is to do its homework of shared governance which is not completed by sending the decision to administration to handle.
 - What has happened in the past is that when we encountered stuff we did not know what to do with we made a list. PIE came together and made a recommendation about what to do with those parking list items.
 - Part of the issue with last year was there was a turnover and it was not clear what the original intention was. People retired, there were different people at the end of the year. No one could remember what they meant. A list of recommendations for these process questions were written but it was not as specific as it could or should have been.
 - Article 43 of the contract talks about the ability of the college to train part-time faculty and have them do jobs that are listed in the contract that are purely academic that need to be done. For ex: reviews of all the course outlines. That is a job for full-time faculty but if there are not enough full-time faculty then that can be an ancillary job. Those should be in Program Review.
 - PIE should notify the Budget Committee early of the prioritization retreat date
 - I. Ingram and P. Quinones will email in coordination with their work to prepare for the retreat (booking room, preparing spreadsheets, loading budget info)
 - The notification will occur first week of April
 - Who attends and how do they participate?
 - Which VPs attend? I. Ingram and Ara attends. Don't remember if Roberto is there.
 - The prioritization retreat is a combination of PIE and the Budget Committee. There is overlap in the membership. Each individual has 1 vote even if they are a part of both committees. Other individuals are invited so that they can explain their program plan if there is a question, for example deans. Those individuals are welcome to attend but they do not participate in the ranking.
 - Retreat set for Friday April 26th, 9am-12pm. Breakfast and lunch will be provided. The aim is to end before lunch. But lunch will be provided.

Educational Master Plan Extension

- 146
147
148
149
- The EMP expires in 2020, do we want to recommend extending it to 2021
 - This would give more time for faculty input and have a comprehensive workgroup
 - H. Baily-Hoffman has agreed to senate participation, but P. Quinones did not ask about 2021 extension



West Los Angeles College
Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

- 150 ○ P. Quinones submitted a letter of intent to apply for an IEPI grant for assistance with revision of Program
- 151 Review Process and Educational Master Plan. They will provide up to 200K which can be used for stipends.
- 152 ○ What would happen if IEPI would assemble a team of colleagues from across the state, they would meet
- 153 with the college to understand what is being worked on, and then work with the college to develop a
- 154 plan. As part of the plan a budget will be developed. Anything in the budget can be spent.
- 155 ▪ There is a question raised about what shared governance process this was approved
- 156 ▪ This action originated from the Accreditation Committee from discussions about the Educational
- 157 Master Plan.
- 158 ○ P. Quinones advised to reach out to H. Bailey-Hofmann on how Academic Senate would like to proceed since EMP
- 159 is an Academic Senate matter. In the past OIE Dean has had a key role in the development of the EMP and
- 160 President Limbaugh has indicated that he would like that to continue.

162 **1:55pm Meeting adjourned**

167

ACTION	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	START MONTH	STATUS	NOTES
Committee Vacancies				
None				
Changes to Program Review / Prioritization Process				
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	
Wish List for OIE				
% 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
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	Completed	P.Quinones attended FPIF 4/17 meeting to discuss data needs
Future PIE Considerations				
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

168