Minutes

Monday, April 23, 2012
1:30 pm-3:00 pm
Winlock Lounge

Present: Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh, Adrienne Foster, Fran Leonard, Maureen O’Brien, Betsy Regalado, Olga Shewfelt, Bob Sprague, Ken Takeda, Rebecca Tillberg

3. College Council Chair Selection Policy. Fran presented the draft College Council Chair document regarding the establishment of the new policy. This item is an informational item for Planning Committee. The Planning Committee agreed to take a brief recess and to reconvene as the College Council Exec to more fully discuss the draft policy.
4. Presentation to Board Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Rebecca shared the PowerPoint that West will present to the Board Institutional Effectiveness Committee on April 25, along with the two other ‘seaside’ colleges. The annual presentation this year includes a summary of accreditation draft commendations and recommendations, goal alignment of district and college strategic goals, quantitative measures of achievement of each of the four major district goals (access, success, accountability, and resources/partnerships), actions and activities directed at achieving the goals. Adrienne emphasized that these goals and achievement measures need to be shared with and connected with the Transfer Committee. There was extended discussion about college foundation revenue and scholarships; Maureen will double-check some of the data.
5. Program Review Committee Report. Fran reported that at the College Council Exec meeting of April 16, the advisability of moving program review updates from spring 2012 to fall 2012 was discussed, and agreed to. The reasons for the move include the substantial revision to the form that is anticipated with adoption of the new IES online program review software in the fall as well as the need to carefully articulate the integration of program viability review with program review.
There was discussion about the notification to campus about the outcome of funding of the last prioritization list to come from the President. It was pointed out that the president did say that the list was put on hold. The college is scheduling a town hall meeting in May to focus on the budget. This point could be addressed at the town hall.

Adrienne emphasized the importance of carefully and thoughtfully incorporating program viability with program review. Rebecca stated that to the extent that there is an integration, it will be simply to check for indicators of possible need for a program viability study; it will still be the responsibility of other groups such as the Academic Senate to request a viability study. The current program viability policy addresses only academic programs. Viability indicators for Student Services and Administrative Services need to be developed.

The impact of the compressed schedule necessitated by moving program review to the fall was discussed, and the importance of having a realistic calendar that connects with the budget preparation calendar was emphasized. In the past, program review training was done at the first Divisional Council meeting. The compressed calendar will require a focused effort to finish in time for budget preparation. The Program Review Committee is to propose a calendar at its meeting on May 9, for adoption by the Planning Committee at its May meeting. The tentative calendar is as follows:

Aug – training for Chairs
Sept – Dec. 10 – do the reviews
Jan. – validation process / prioritization

The process for request prioritization was briefly discussed. There is some sense that the prioritization process needs to be more transparent and the results communicated more broadly. One approach that was briefly discussed is a blended process with the Program Review Committee and the Planning Committee involved in the prioritization list, which is then presented to the Budget Committee, and then to the president.

Motion: Move program review to fall 2012 instead of spring 2012, and develop an appropriate calendar by the end of May 2012 to reflect the integration of Budget and Planning processes. Motion was seconded and passed.

6. **Review of policy and procedure related to institutional effectiveness.** Rebecca described the need to review and evaluate West’s policies, processes,
procedures and practices related to planning and budgeting in a deep and systematic way. This review would be designed ultimately to improve student outcomes through more effective planning on campus. It is responsive to one of the accreditation planning agenda items the college included in its self study, and will also be responsive to an anticipated recommendation.

The review will begin with a survey of colleges that recently went through accreditation without sanctions, plus other model colleges. Rebecca prepared a grid which includes major components of institutional effectiveness. Each Planning Committee member volunteered to locate and evaluate institutional effectiveness documents for one college, to be summarized on the grid. Materials related to these components were distributed, and additional research on the web will be needed. Through reviewing what other model colleges have done, we will identify best practices that could be adapted for use at West.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Anza</td>
<td>Fran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>Adrienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>Bob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. San Jacinto</td>
<td>Maureen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills Coalinga</td>
<td>Ken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Desert</td>
<td>Betsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Mary-Jo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We plan to conduct the review during the summer, with a proposal for modified policy and procedure prepared to present for adoption through shared governance in September.

There was discussion about the Educational Master Plans at other colleges. One is data driven and the other is vision driven, and both are necessary.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.