



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, May 27, 2020
1:00-2:00pm via Zoom

Meeting called to order: 1:05pm

Meeting Logistics:

Review Agenda and Minutes

- No corrections
- Approved by consensus

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

1 **Information and Discussion Items:**

2
3 Attendance: Angie Abraham also in attendance

4
5
6 Meeting starts: 1:05pm

7
8 **Review agenda**

- 9 • Add budget priorities as discussion item

10
11 **Review meeting minutes**

- 12 • Approved by consensus

13
14 **Resource Request Prioritization**

- 15 • As of today only 8 individuals sent back ratings.
- 16 • Deadline extended to next week
- 17 • P. Quinones will resend email
- 18 • Decision on June 15 whether there will be a football season. Raters need this information to rate KIN ATH resource requests.

19
20
21 **Action Steps:**

- 22 • P. Quinones will resend prioritization list
- 23 • Raters will complete within 1 week

24
25 **Planning Program Review Cycle**

- 26 • P. Quinones shared a draft timeline if the college adopted a rotation among units for comprehensive program review within a 6-year cycle.
- 27 • P. Quinones will work with VPs to see if they want to add or remove units. Currently there are 76 units.
- 28 • If we were to rotate 76 units within 6 years that would work out to 13 units completing comprehensive program review each year.
- 29 • The other option is to keep program review as is and have all 76 units complete program review at the same time and then have every subsequent year in the 6-year cycle be an annual update.
- 30 • The rotated schedule was brought up to give more flexibility for units to present. Some members liked that idea.
- 31 • There would be advantage for validators.
- 32 • We should consider whether validators would prefer to have all their units complete comprehensive program review at once, or if they want that spread out. We would predict that they would want it spread out so that they have more time to engage with the programs they are validating.
- 33 • Each discipline should have their own program review to complete. There is no way for a chair to have expertise on each of the programs. What usually happens is that programs host advisory board meetings to trigger needs like resource requests.
- 34 • The draft rotation doesn't yet take into account that CTE programs need comprehensive program review every 2 years. First we'll figure out the broader question on whether to have a rotation or not and then address those details.
- 35 • No one opposes adopting a rotation.
- 36 • In terms of validation student services deans used to complete it together with VPs in one or several meetings. At other times deans were paired up to complete validation.
- 37 • There was past consideration of involving faculty in validation.
- 38 • We are inventing annual update so our college can decide if it will involve validation. It makes sense to because it involves budget requests and we want more eyes on that.



West Los Angeles College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

- 50 • P. Quinones will review annual update process at colleges represented in PERT team. Some have only 4 or 5
51 questions. We can streamline our annual update. When we get back in the fall P. Quinones will present a draft
52 annual update form and we can decide then whether we need validation.
- 53 • We should not group units alphabetically for rotation. Think about what would be reasonable to group together
54 from the point of view of validators.
- 55 • Some faculty at college council were advocating for keeping program review in the Spring. I understand it was
56 moved from fall to spring because there was a lot going on in the fall. Any strong opinions about it? No.
- 57 • We talked about presentations being helpful. When would these happen? Would it be during the resource request
58 prioritization retreat or before then such as at a PIE meeting to give feedback? Some members felt this should be
59 after the ranking was completed to address questions that arose. Others felt it should be before in order to
60 address the broader purposes of program review not related to the budget. It was suggested that presentations
61 might be helpful at Senate or College Council so everyone has an overview of what is going on.

62 63 Action Steps:

- 64 • Move forward with the recommendation to adopt a rotation. Draft a rotation with CTE programs
- 65 • Confirm which units will complete program review
- 66 • Collect more feedback on whether validators would like their units grouped together or distributed
- 67 • Decide whether faculty should be involved in validation.
- 68 • Keep program review in the spring
- 69 • P. Quinones will review PERT examples of annual update
- 70 • Decide whether annual update needs validation
- 71 • Decide how units will be grouped within the rotation.
- 72 • Decide where presentations for program review would occur.

73 74 75 HOPE Survey

- 76 • CCCO partnered with Temple University and one of their centers to implement HOPE survey. This is a basic needs
77 survey. We implemented it in Fall 2018. In partnership with RP group, which is an independent research and
78 planning group that works with CCCs, they are going to survey employees and students about the transition to
79 remote instruction.
- 80 • P. Quinones sought feedback if faculty response rates would be improved by sending the survey from the Senate
81 or Office of President rather than the research office.
- 82 • Members brought up concerns with confidentiality and the purpose of the survey. How will the information be
83 used? It could address how do we better support faculty and staff, what are PD needs, how do we streamline
84 needs. We're not sure since we have not yet seen the survey.
- 85 • The question faculty will have is what will the survey do? If we ask about financial security and know adjuncts are
86 experiencing that from the survey what will we do about it? Nothing. Interested in research, but the point of
87 research is to be acted on. Having not been consulted about the survey or who is organizing. There are obvious
88 benefits for Temple University and RP group but it's not clear what we stand to gain locally. We've already sent out
89 local surveys. Faculty are more likely to give feedback to our local PD coordinator than to some RP group survey.
- 90 • P. Quinones said that we could work to suppress information to keep the results as anonymous as possible.
- 91 • People will give a more honest response if they feel like something will come out of it. Then the survey can identify
92 what we want revved up to go to another level in the fall.
- 93 • Employees and students can opt not to complete the survey.
- 94 • Should this survey be sent out by College Council as the only body that represents the campus as a whole. We
95 don't know what is being asked on the survey so that it hard to determine.
- 96 • It seems like based on the survey email language the survey should be sent out by research offices.

97 98 Action Steps:

- 99 • Survey will be sent out by research office.



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

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

Budget Priorities Discussion

- Document sent by O. Shewfelt with principles. None of these items have been agreed to or decided. It was recommended to bring this to PIE as well.
- Expected state deficit is now \$53 billion. The document has already been updated and sent to Budget committee.
- PIE is not voting on this. PIE is providing feedback.
- The purpose of the document is to provide recommendations to the president to act on.
- Feedback:
 - Does hiring freeze include adjuncts for all who haven't been offered fall classes yet?
 - Does a fall class that is unstaffed need to be cancelled? Probably not if it fills. Needs to be clarified on the document.
 - The language of "all" is too expansive. If the president retires we wouldn't rehire? What is someone is highly necessary we don't want to shoot ourselves in the foot. Change to intensified scrutiny for all new hires to keep the door open.
 - What is a core student service?
 - What is a core admin service?
 - All courses for certificates equally protected for any kind of certificate?
 - If programs have mandates and their own funding are they included in the hiring freeze? We don't want to jeopardize a program for not delivering mandated services.
 - What is meant by maximize all income? There should be constraints around that.
 - How is maximize income different than identify difference sources of income?
 - Can the document include examples.
 - Size of college depends on FTES. Is the goal of the college to seek to become a medium size college? College council will need to discuss.
 - What will the metric be for determining what is a successful program to expand? Who will decide that?
 - Some programs have their own money like federal grants and should be excluded from the hiring freeze. Add "meets grant requirements" to first bullet point.
- C. Burkhardt acting as director over several programs and program coordinator. Needs to fill program coordinator position.
- College Council is holding a special June meeting for the purposes of addressing issues around the budget.
- DSPS is paid for from an allocation from the state for a dean or admin over that area.

Action Steps:

- P. Quinones will send out O. Shewfelt document to PIE. PIE members will send any additional comments. P. Quinones will compile and send out comments to Budget, College Council, and O. Shewfelt.
- Budget Committee will review document.
- College Council will review and vote on document.
- Recommendations will go to president.

PIE adjourns

- This is last meeting for Spring. Not meeting again until Fall.

Meeting adjourned: 2:04pm

ACTION	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	START MONTH	STATUS	NOTES
Committee Vacancies				
None				
Changes to Program Review / Prioritization Process				



West Los Angeles College
Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

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	Initiated	Scheduled to meet 4/17/2019
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