MINUTES

Jan. 15, 2013
1-3 PM, Winlock

Present: Alice Taylor (chair), Rebecca Tillberg, Fran Leonard, Bob Sprague, Celena Alcala, Ken Takeda, Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh, Adrienne Foster, Mary-Jo Apigo
Kathy Walton, Judy Chow

I. Minutes of Nov. 20 accepted

II. Timeline for report production (items added in discussion boldfaced):

Jan. 17 Draft goes to Academic Senate Executive Committee.
Jan. 22 Academic Senate Executive Committee reviews the draft.

Further development of report in this interval. Documentation prepared and placed on web.

Feb. 1 Full report goes to Yasmin Delahoussaye and Deborah Kaye for review, and is published to the West community.

If needed, changes could be made in this interval.

Feb. 7 College Council review, but approval would wait to occur after Academic Senate approval.
Feb. 11 Full report goes to Board Institutional Effectiveness Committee.
Feb. 12 Academic Senate meeting: approval of the Report.
Feb. 14 ASO Council
Feb. 19 Accreditation Steering Committee
Feb. 20 Board Institutional Effectiveness Committee considers the report and indicates its recommendation to the Board.

If needed, changes could be made in this interval. Formatting and preparation for printing.

Feb. 26 Academic Senate meeting: approval of any changes requested by IEC.
Feb. 28 Special meeting of College Council to approve report.

Printing.

March 6 Board receives the report.

Meetings for 2012-13, in Winlock, 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM: Nov 20, Dec 18, Jan 15, Feb 19, Mar 19

West Los Angeles College provides a transformative educational experience.
West fosters a diverse learning community dedicated to student success.
In reviewing the timeline, Alice noted the need to finish Program Review and validation. Rebecca reported that a few program reviews are still outstanding, and will be submitted this week. All validations will be finished next week.

The committee discussed the integration of program review with preparation for the construction master plan. Ken Takeda expressed concerned about the different time horizons for program review (up to 5 years) and construction planning (10 years). Nabil stated that he had tasked Peter Mitsakos with using program review in preparing the space needs assessment. Adrienne Foster requested that the facilities report generated out of the 2012 program review be included in the Facilities Committee discussion of the space needs assessment. The next meeting of the Facilities Committee is Jan. 28. Nabil stressed the need to consider all the data we systematically gather, but that decisions are made by people using data. Once the assessment is complete, we will need strategic planning to guide our growth. Decisions will be made as to which programs grow, and by how much. The result is a construction master plan, a component of an updated facilities master plan.

As we move towards a district-wide 2015 Self-Study, we should expect to produce progress reports for the ACCJC.

III. Current draft

Alice asked individuals to take the lead in filling out the responses to the recommendations.

Rec. 1, measurable goal setting: for the Student Services Plan, Celena; for the facilities plan, Ken.

Rec. 2, systematic evaluation and planning: for our history of planning, Fran; for current program review practices, Rebecca.

Rec. 3, course SLOs: Mary-Jo

Rec. 4, student services and administrative services SLOs and SAOs: Mary-Jo volunteered to coordinate with Celena and Ken.

Rec. 5, college catalogue: Kathy will provide more specific dates, and describe the group developing procedures for updating the catalog online between editions.

Rec. 6, Kathy will validate the library program review. Bob suggested that it include some consideration of the role of technology in meeting student needs. Nabil noted that the program review should be convincing in its identification of needs from across the institution, and that the resource allocation for the library will flow out of the established planning process. He also suggested that the response focus on the collection’s weaknesses and on how we use our processes to address them. Ken
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noted that the TTIP would not have been used for book purchases, and the probably source was identified as the IELM. Judy will review the draft for accuracy.

Rec. 7, financial resources: Ken will review this, and joint meetings of the Budget and PIE Committees will be scheduled soon.

Rec 13 of 2006, participation: Adrienne will add to this, including more detail on the semester kickoff and faculty reactions to it captured in the survey. She will work with Mary-Jo to describe the efforts to help new tenure-track faculty participate broadly across the campus, through mentoring and the West Connect program. Rebecca will provide her the results of the Leadership Retreat survey.

Noting that the URLs listed as evidence after paragraphs are distracting, Rebecca and Mary-Jo suggested we use the endnote feature of Word to gather evidence, pending a reformatting of the final report along the lines of the 2012 Self-Study.

The due date for this homework is Jan. 22.

IV. Other business
Nabil noted that the executive summary of the report should stress our respect for our processes.
After Feb. 1, we will need to focus on educating the entire campus on our processes.