



West Los Angeles College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

COMMITTEE

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

Academic Senate (4)

- Marguet Miller
- Laura Peterson
- Leslie Tejada
- Vacant

AFT Guild (4)

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

Vice Presidents (3)

- Aracely Aguiar
- Roberto Gonzalez
- VPAS

AFT Classified (2)

- Allison Castillo
- Dionne Morrisette

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.

- Aimee Preziosi

SLO Rep.

- Mary-Jo Apigo

Budget Manager

- Rasel Menendez

Student Services Rep.

- Celena Burkhardt

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, October 30, 2019

1:00-3:00pm – Winlock

Meeting called to order: 1:02 p.m.

Meeting Logistics:

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:

Review Minutes

Meeting minutes approved with the following corrections

Corrections:

- Need to add Raquel Medina to side bar
- Remove names unless speaker asks to be named
- Minutes should synthesize main ideas and not verbatim dialogue

ACCJC Stretch Goals

Recap

- Need to set stretch goals for new reporting for ACCJC as of last spring
- PQ fixed error identified at last PIE meeting
- Question of how transfer is defined and who is captured. Transfer includes CSU, UC, Private, and Out of State
How it works: Chancellor's office has agreement with National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). About 92% of IHE's in US report their data to NSC. Chancellor's office has a contract which allows them to match SSN to the NSC. Students who do not receive financial aid can opt out. But very likely they are not aware of this option. As a result the data will capture most all of our actual transfer student outcomes.

Setting Stretch Goals

- No indication that stretch goals will be used punitively. Purpose of stretch goals is to assess ourselves and where we are
- Currently, the 15 BA programs in community colleges are not counted as transfer. This will might be remedied in the future by the Chancellors office.
- Question of whether certificates include noncredit certificates. They don't. The numbers would be much higher if they included noncredit.
- Award counts can include students more than once because these are accounts of awards and not students. But ACCJC can sometimes ask for counts of students.
- Proposed methodology: Derive SD for metric for last 5 years. ISS: Multiple the SD by 1.96 then subtract it from most current year. SD: Multiple the SD by 1.96 then add it to the most current year to get Stretch Goal.
- Exceptions: BA will not be changed from 50 because there are specific factors like cohort size. Transfer we don't have 1819 data yet so SD derived from 3 years.
- Action steps: agreement to use proposed methodology

Methodology for setting stretch goals APPROVED by consensus.

Revising Institutional Set Standards (ISS)

- ISS for transfer are low
- In the ACCJC there will be opportunity to explain the rationale and approach for revising ISS
- Revision will be for 1819. Reporting for the previous year.

Program Review

- What level should program review occur at? Program review occurs for some at the program level and some not at the program level. For ex: biological sciences combines many disciplines
- WHY:



West Los Angeles College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

- 49 ○ This came up because we're upgrading our Nuventive Software. We want to link SLO and Program
50 Review. SLO is definitely at the program level. If we are going to try to synthesize everything at Program
51 Review there's a disconnect because SLO will be for anatomy and not Biological Sciences.
52 ○ Not sure how this came about. It could have been combined to reduce the amount of work chairs face.
53 Chairs straddled with 8 program reviews.
- 54 ● Considerations
- 55 ○ What is the intent of program review?
- 56 ○ In the past it was more for resource requests.
- 57 ○ True program review is about evaluating the instructional program at its core: student success,
58 completions etc. So what goals do we want from an academic standpoint? See trends and comparisons
59 and see how the rest of the state is doing. We can compare ourselves to every school in the entire state.
60 We know we are the worst in math. That should be in program review. How are we doing in terms of
61 AB705? Or Skyline College is doing amazing in this, what are they doing? That's why I think program
62 review has to be on the program level.
- 63 ○ Grants should not have to complete program review. They have their own set of resources and own
64 reporting. Unless a grant is institutionalized they should not do program review. Program review should
65 only be for programs funded by 10100. Grants can go away at any time. Categoricals should be included in
66 program review.
- 67 ○ Each college has a different program review protocol. For example LASC has a 6 year cycle. A past survey
68 showed WLAC was the only college doing program review every year. The other colleges did a cycle on 4
69 or 6 years and annual resource requests. The momentum of a program is slower so it takes much more
70 time to make changes and see the impact and that's why the program review cycle is every 4 years or
71 more. CTE has to do program review every 2 years. That's a federal requirement. Some campuses will
72 have block scheduling with half of the programs completing program review in one year and the rest in
73 the next year. This helps to manage the load for everyone.
- 74 ○ We should consider establishing a process to present program review.
- 75 ○ According to the bylaws of Perkins and Title 5, CTE programs need to report to the board of trustees the
76 outcomes of every CTE program every 2 years to reapprove the CTE program. We are not very consistent.
- 77 ○ Grants should have a parallel process to program review.
- 78 ○ The college should revitalize the Resource Development Committee. This ended when the staff with the
79 knowledge of the process and who conducted the work of the process left. This committee had strong
80 faculty representation. We got info as to what grants we were applying for and for what reasons.
81 Developed a process with an application that clearly linked the grant to the mission of the college and
82 what was being targeted. There was a report out from the committee to Academic Senate and College
83 Council.
- 84 ○ We need program level because some divisions have many diverse disciplines. Division structure is
85 artificial and has changed before and can change again.
- 86 ○ Perception that without program level program review, whoever writes the program review skews their
87 reporting to favor their discipline. Program review should be completed at the program level by lead
88 faculty who know their outcomes because they are very close to it.
- 89 ○ Readers of program review have the difficult task of trying to parse the combined narrative for a division
90 to understand the trends in a specific program. Can't assess a program by looking at a program review for
91 10 programs.
- 92 ○ Operational costs should be excluded from program review.
- 93 ○ FPIP and CPIP should be a process outside of program review. Program review can be supplemental data
94 to inform the FPIP and CPIP applications. Classified position requests are not well addressed through
95 program review.
- 96 ○ Because the cycle was too frequent there was a lot of copying and pasting instead of really looking at the
97 trends.
- 98 ○ Program review should be structured to allow the college to examine program viability. As resources are
99 depleting we need a mechanism to identify programs that are shrinking and we can evaluate and look into



West Los Angeles College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

- 100 trying to support them before it gets into crisis mode. Ventura College has a process that if your program
101 shrinks under 10 degrees it automatically triggers a viability study. We would have a lot of programs
102 under review.
- 103 ○ Many of these issues are complex and need cooperation of other committees. PIE reps will work with
104 budget to improve
 - 105 ● Action Steps
 - 106 ○ How do we define programs? Not all disciplines offer a degree.
 - 107 ○ Bring in divisional council to help define programs.
 - 108 ○ Explicitly define what requests belong in program review. For example comb past program reviews for
109 good and bad examples.

112 Educational Master Plan

- 113 ● Action steps
- 114 ● Add EMP to EPSC agenda item

116 Partnership Resource Team (PRT) visits

- 117 ● Last week was the first PRT meeting
- 118 ● PIE is invited to attend next PRT
- 119 ● PRT will produce a menu of options for updating the EMP and revising the program review process. PIE can review
120 and discuss options presented.

122 PIE Charge

- 123 ● Many committees are revisiting their charge
- 124 ● Action Steps:
 - 125 ○ Will be on the agenda for next PIE meeting
 - 126 ○ Agreement to remove the word “discretionary” from the charge. Accreditation encompasses the entire
127 college. PIE should speak to more than discretionary budget (5% of the total budget).

129 Master Calendar

- 130 ● Example of exemplary master calendar
- 131 ● Desired features:
 - 132 ○ Layers for different audiences (Students, standing committees, shared governance, employees/faculty)
 - 133 ○ Click to know what is happening on any given day
 - 134 ○ Have something room schedulers can refer to
 - 135 ○ Have something visible to many people
 - 136 ○ Something placed on website, that is easy to access
 - 137 ○ Something that is more complete that week by week
- 138 ● Recap
 - 139 ○ Improve faculty ability to attend meetings
 - 140 ○ Avoid schedule conflicts with pre-planned/reserved meetings
- 141 ● PROS of LATTTC Master Calendar Demo:
 - 142 ○ Can click for more info (like links and location)
 - 143 ○ Options to add to calendar
 - 144 ○ Option to email requests to add event with click of button
 - 145 ○ Tabs for different calendars
 - 146 ○ Quick view of what is happening on that day
- 147 ● Action steps: P. Quinones will email Tak to see if he can reach out to LATTTC about their master calendar (who
148 maintains/updates, how it was created).

149



West Los Angeles College
Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156

- OneDrive PIE Folder**
- OneDrive with meeting documents created
- Meeting end: 2:20pm

157

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	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

158