

PIE COMMITTEE

Rebecca Tillberg, Co-Chair
Carmen, Dones, Co-Chair

Academic Senate (4)

Adrienne Foster (alternate)
Carmen Dones
Judy Chow
Norma Jacinto
Joyce Sweeney

AFT Guild (4)

Olga Shewfelt
Bonnie Blustein
Alice Taylor

Vice Presidents (3)

Ken Takeda
Phyllis Braxton
Bob Sprague

AFT Classified (2)

Dionne Morrisette
Ashanti Lyles

Other Classified

Bargaining Unit (1)

Teamsters (1)

Ara Aguiar

ASO (1)

EX OFFICIO

President

Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh

College Council, Chair

Fran Leonard

RESOURCE

Stu Serv/ Admin Serv
Program Review Rep.

SLO Rep.

Mary Jo Apigo

Budget Manager

Researcher

Agyeman Boateng

A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

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

MINUTES

Meeting of Wednesday, April 2, 2014

12:45 pm-2:45 pm

SSB-414

Title/Role	Name	Present
Academic Senate, Faculty Co-Chair	Carmen Dones	X
Academic Senate	Norma Jacinto	
Academic Senate	Judy Chow	X
Academic Senate	Joyce Sweeney	X
Academic Senate (alternate)	Adrienne Foster	X
AFT Guild	Olga Shewfelt	
AFT Guild	Bonnie Blustein	
AFT Guild	Alice Taylor	X
AFT Guild		
VP, Academic Affairs	Bob Sprague	X
VP, Administrative Services	Ken Takeda	X
VP, Student Services (Interim)	Phyllis Braxton	X
Dean, Research and Planning, Administrative Co-Chair	Rebecca Tillberg	X
AFT Classified	Dionne Morrisette	X
AFT Classified	Ashanti Lyles	
Other Classified Bargaining Unit		
Teamsters Representative	Ara Aguiar	
ASO Representative		
Ex Officio		
President	Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh	X
Chair, College Council	Fran Leonard	X
Faculty Chair, Educational Master Plan Workgroup	Holly Bailey-Hofmann	
Resource		
Division Chair Representative		
Student Services Representative	Celena Alcala	
SLO Representative	Mary-Jo Apigo	X
Budget Manager	Maureen O'Brien	
Research Analyst	Agyeman Boateng	X
Guest		
Michael Goltermann, Laura Peterson		

Meeting called to order at 12:56pm by Carmen Dones

Previous Meeting Minutes

- February 5th – PIE meeting
 - Correction: Add Mary-Jo Apigo to list of those present
 - Action: Approved as amended
- March 5th – PIE meeting
 - Correction: Clarify language – “every institution has to indicate the standards it has set”
 - Action: Approved as amended
- March 6th – Joint meeting with budget
 - Correction: Date at header- Thursday March 6, 2014
 - Action: Approved as amended

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meetings 2013-2014

First Wednesday of each month; 12:45 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.

9/4/13; 10/2/13; 11/6/13; 12/4/13; 01/8/14; 02/05/14; 03/05/14; 04/02/14;
05/07/14; 06/04/14; 07/02/14; 08/06/14

Prioritization Retreat: Friday, March 7, 2014

Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Effectiveness Evaluation: Thursday, February 27, 2014

Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Process Evaluation: Thursday, April 24, 2014



PIE COMMITTEE

Rebecca Tillberg, Co-Chair
Carmen, Dones, Co-Chair

Academic Senate (4)

Adrienne Foster (alternate)
Carmen Dones
Judy Chow
Norma Jacinto
Joyce Sweeney

AFT Guild (4)

Olga Shewfelt
Bonnie Blustein
Alice Taylor

Vice Presidents (3)

Ken Takeda
Phyllis Braxton
Bob Sprague

AFT Classified (2)

Dionne Morrisette
Ashanti Lyles

Other Classified Bargaining Unit (1)

Teamsters (1)

Ara Aguiar

ASO (1)

EX OFFICIO

President

Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh

College Council, Chair

Fran Leonard

RESOURCE

Stu Serv/ Admin Serv
Program Review Rep.

SLO Rep.

Mary Jo Apigo

Budget Manager

Researcher

Agyeman Boateng

A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

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

Follow-up on Previous PIE Recommendations

R. Tillberg presented the president's responses to two College Council recommendations originated in this committee.

One was the recommendation for institution set standards which the president approved. In his note approving this recommendation, he also, "urge[d] all involved constituencies to discuss developing aspirational standards developed by aggregating individual program projected standards tied to each program's initiatives and educational plan." Discussion about this revealed that while programs are not currently required to develop their own standards, some have or have been planning to on their own. There was also discussion of how to incorporate departmental or divisional standards in program review.

One specific standard area discussed was degree completers, especially concern that various stakeholders see degree completion numbers through different lenses which makes setting goals difficult for individual divisions. Specifically, there was mention that the board is looking at degrees with zero completers. Even if there are zero completers in a program, if a college offers the courses for such a degree anyway (as requirements for other degrees) it is arguably better to continue offering such a degree for the sake of student opportunity to pursue unique interests (since the degree costs no more to offer). Conversely, programs that are offered but in which it is practicality not possible to complete because required courses have not or are not offered in a manner enabling students to complete must be addressed to preserve the integrity of the institution's communications and promises to students.

There was also concern about whether these standards were meant to represent minimum or aspirational standards. In particular, a committee member who attended a recent accreditation training recalled that the commission's Vice President for of Team Operations and Communication (Mr. Pond) said that institutions should not set the standards so low just so that they can be met. This committee member felt a disconnect between what he heard in college discussions and what he heard at the training. One other member who attended the training interpreted Mr. Pond's remarks to mean that colleges did not set their standards so low that they would not have to look at them again. The point was also made that in West's process of setting standards, the college currently falls below two of the standards (which would suggest that we are not setting standards so low as to always meet them). Another training attendee felt Mr. Pond was saying that while some institutions were setting their standards as aspirational standards, the commission was not requiring institutions to do that; however, the commission will look at colleges' standards to see if they are reasonable.

The concerned PIE member also recalled Mr. Pond suggesting that ensuring reasonableness might involve comparing our standards with peer institutions' standards. In response to this the point was made that at the moment, we do not know other institutions' standards and generating a list of peer institutions was not trivial. The most readily available peer comparisons are the ARCC peer comparisons in which West historically has fared poorly (below average for the peer group). It was also argued that it would not be reasonable to set a standard at a level the institution has never achieved.

The discussion concluded with recognition by conversants on both sides of the issue that: i) the institution can revisit the methodology for setting the standards going forward, and ii) at least West has heard what the commission has said and is having the appropriate discussion. After this resolution, the president also weighed in on the matter, stating that ultimately the college needs to discuss and focus

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meetings 2013-2014

First Wednesday of each month; 12:45 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.

9/4/13; 10/2/13; 11/6/13; 12/4/13; 01/8/14; 02/05/14; 03/05/14; 04/02/14;
05/07/14; 06/04/14; 07/02/14; 08/06/14

Prioritization Retreat: Friday, March 7, 2014

Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Effectiveness Evaluation: Thursday, February 27, 2014

Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Process Evaluation: Thursday, April 24, 2014



PIE COMMITTEE

Rebecca Tillberg, Co-Chair
Carmen Dones, Co-Chair

Academic Senate (4)

Adrienne Foster (alternate)
Carmen Dones
Judy Chow
Norma Jacinto
Joyce Sweeney

AFT Guild (4)

Olga Shewfelt
Bonnie Blustein
Alice Taylor

Vice Presidents (3)

Ken Takeda
Phyllis Braxton
Bob Sprague

AFT Classified (2)

Dionne Morrisette
Ashanti Lyles

Other Classified Bargaining Unit (1)

Teamsters (1)
Ara Aguiar

ASO (1)

EX OFFICIO

President
Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh

College Council, Chair
Fran Leonard

RESOURCE

Stu Serv/ Admin Serv
Program Review Rep.

SLO Rep.
Mary Jo Apigo

Budget Manager

Researcher
Agyeman Boateng

A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

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

on what is behind the standard. He argued that the commission does not want to drive us toward mediocrity but toward quality, not toward compliance, but toward student success. He tied this in with the Educational Master Plan and the idea that students have a “right to success,” urging that the areas of the plan that were less ambitious could be pushed further.

The other recommendation regarded consulting the priority list throughout the year. In a letter responding to this, he wrote that the recommendation was, “logical and reasonable.” In the letter he identified numerous additional considerations and unresolved issues with regard to the resource allocation process. The president commented on the practice of responding to recommendations in writing saying the point of doing so is mutual accountability—given the development of our process over time the governance bodies can point to written feedback not only to understand the reasons for particular decisions, but to hold the president to his stated values and suggestions.

Program Review

R. Tillberg recapped the results of the prioritization retreat, providing a list of non-permanent personnel prioritized requests (this list was a corrected version of a previously distributed list) and noting that the permanent personnel positions were not prioritized.

She also commented on some aspects of the process to arrive at the list. The potential sources of funding and estimated cost for items were not considered. Also ignored was the criteria of meeting health and safety requirements since it would not have been possible to definitively determine the veracity of such claims at the retreat. The president and vice presidents are in a better position to determine if requests meet this threshold. *The prioritized list was accepted by the committee.*

There was discussion following the prioritized list’s approval. One early point made was that it should be documented how college processes are being used to allocate resources when new funds come available. Questions about how new resources are allocated, or other resource allocation questions regarding categorical funds, grants, gifts, etc. should be able to be answered if asked about by a visiting team, even if the answer is “we’re not following the process for this reason.”

There was also discussion about how programs fared in the prioritization process. In this cycle, the rubric was applied with more careful attention to the contents of program review responses. Programs that were better able to demonstrate the rubric criteria in their program review (e.g. linking their requests with their goals and actions, student learning objectives, or the goals of other institutional plans) received more points and thus rose above the other requests. While some committee members were concerned if programs with more writing talent or resources therefore wound up overly benefitting from the process, others argued that the point was to get programs to think in a more systematic way about how what they ask for relates to their own plans and larger college goals. Several members voiced the need that, in the next cycle, the program review training and handbook do a better job of preparing programs to think in this systematic way, and to write and construct their program review responses, plans and requests with these connections and alignments in mind.

Another topic of discussion was that the personnel prioritization did not occur at the retreat. The committee discussed the prospect and possible logistics of prioritizing the personnel requests but decided against it for practical reasons. Many committee members were concerned that the logistics and volume of work it would require to prioritize even a portion of the list were too harrowing especially given the possibility of no new personnel hires for the coming year. Some PIE members

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meetings 2013-2014

First Wednesday of each month; 12:45 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.

9/4/13; 10/2/13; 11/6/13; 12/4/13; 01/8/14; 02/05/14; 03/05/14; 04/02/14;
05/07/14; 06/04/14; 07/02/14; 08/06/14

Prioritization Retreat: Friday, March 7, 2014

Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Effectiveness Evaluation: Thursday, February 27, 2014

Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Process Evaluation: Thursday, April 24, 2014



PIE COMMITTEE

Rebecca Tillberg, Co-Chair
Carmen, Dones, Co-Chair

Academic Senate (4)

Adrienne Foster (alternate)
Carmen Dones
Judy Chow
Norma Jacinto
Joyce Sweeney

AFT Guild (4)

Olga Shewfelt
Bonnie Blustein
Alice Taylor

Vice Presidents (3)

Ken Takeda
Phyllis Braxton
Bob Sprague

AFT Classified (2)

Dionne Morrisette
Ashanti Lyles

Other Classified Bargaining Unit (1)

Teamsters (1)

Ara Aguiar

ASO (1)

EX OFFICIO

President
Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh

College Council, Chair

Fran Leonard

RESOURCE

Stu Serv/ Admin Serv
Program Review Rep.

SLO Rep.

Mary Jo Apigo

Budget Manager

Researcher

Agyeman Boateng

expressed disappointment with this news, and concern that not hiring classified employees could have the effect of having higher paid employees doing work that could be done for less money by someone else while not doing the high-value work correspondent with their salary. The policy of filling a classified vacancy in the same year was clarified: the position *may* be filled, but it is not guaranteed. The president added that any classified hiring in the coming year will be tied to emergent issues. K. Takeda suggested that to increase the strategic value of the list and to preserve the work put into prioritizing, perhaps have the list be valid for longer than just one year.

Moving on, R. Tillberg announced she has developed two new reports focusing on Program Review elements that correspond with a particular area, in this case, technology and student learning outcomes. The report on technology related action plans prompted discussion about facilities requests. A concern was raised about technology and facilities requests and whether these were properly requested in program review or using certain forms, and if the usage of forms presented a way to bypass the institutional integrated planning process. It was suggested that next time all facilities and technology requests be compiled and brought to the facilities and technologies committees for their recommendations to be then brought back into the process. *The conversation ended with the committee voting to approve a recommendation for senior staff to look at both the 2013 and 2014 prioritized lists when allocating instructional support funds.*

Finally, R. Tillberg asked for volunteers for the program review workgroup to review and implement any changes and plan for the coming cycle. Joyce Sweeney, Alice Taylor, Rebecca Tillberg and Agyeman Boateng volunteered to serve on this group.

Joint Budget/PIE Committee Meeting Follow-Up

R. Tillberg drew the group's attention to a handout indicating the recommendations the committees needed to follow up on. She noted that while additional issues came up after the meeting they did not appear on the sheet so as to accurately represent the issues that were discussed at the meeting.

While many of the items were accomplished, there were also many that were continued over from the prior year. One committee member suggested that we celebrate our successes and publish or somehow make known the recommendations the committees did accomplish.

A few more of the recommendations were briefly highlighted, for example, following up on the status of unfunded resource requests was highlighted as important. Program viability was also discussed. The conversation raised interesting questions. In their conversation, participants interpreted (or imagined the possibility of) program viability as expansive and robust tool for determining the direction of or strengthening programs, starting new programs, or potentially ending programs. Some unanswered questions for further exploration regarded the bounds of the Senate's role and the need to identify other agents and stakeholders in such a vision of viability, especially when the decisions of the process affect (and the process itself may rely upon) multiple constituencies some of which may reside beyond the campus borders. The question of "how do we start new programs" intrigued the group, and the meeting drew to a close with an exchange of ideas about this. The idea the committee ended with was to refer the question to the program review workgroup since program review seemed to the conversants the proper venue for proposing new programs.

Meeting adjourned at 2:37 pm.

A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

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

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meetings 2013-2014

First Wednesday of each month; 12:45 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.

9/4/13; 10/2/13; 11/6/13; 12/4/13; 01/8/14; 02/05/14; 03/05/14; 04/02/14;
05/07/14; 06/04/14; 07/02/14; 08/06/14

Prioritization Retreat: Friday, March 7, 2014

Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Effectiveness Evaluation: Thursday, February 27, 2014

Joint Budget-PIE Meeting on Process Evaluation: Thursday, April 24, 2014

