

PIE Committee

Rebecca Tillberg, Chair

Academic Senate (4)

Adrienne Foster
Carmen Dones
Joyce Sweeney

AFT Guild (4)

Olga Shewfelt
Bonnie Blustein
Alice Taylor

Vice Presidents (3)

Ken Takeda, VP
Shalamon Duke, Actg. VP
Bob Sprague, VP

AFT Classified (2)

Dionne Morrisette
Ashanti Lyles

Other Classified Bargaining Unit (1)

Teamsters (1)

Judith-Ann Friedman

ASO (1)

Ex Officio President

Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh

College Council, Chair

Fran Leonard

Resource

Division Chair Rep.

Stu Serv/ Admin Serv Program Review Rep.

Celena Alcalá

SLO Rep.

Mary Jo Apigo

Budget Manager

Maureen O'Brien

Researcher

Agyeman Boateng

A Vision for the Future

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

Minutes

Wednesday, February 13, 2013

1:00 pm-3:00 pm

Winlock

Title/Role	Name	Present
Academic Senate	Adrienne Foster	
Academic Senate	Carmen Dones	X
Academic Senate	Joyce Sweeney	X
Academic Senate	...	
AFT Guild	Olga Shewfelt	
AFT Guild	Bonnie Blustein	
AFT Guild	Alice Taylor	X
AFT Guild	...	
VP, Academic Affairs	Bob Sprague	
VP, Administrative Services	Ken Takeda	
VP, Student Services	Shalamon Duke	X
Dean, Research and Planning, Chair	Rebecca Tillberg	X
Teamsters Representative	Judith-Ann Friedman	
AFT Classified	Dionne Morrisette	
AFT Classified	Ashanti Lyles	X
Other Classified Bargaining Unit	...	
ASO Representative		
Ex Officio		
President	Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh	
Chair, College Council	Fran Leonard	
Resource		
Student Services Representative	Celena Alcalá for Shalamon Duke	X
SLO Representative	Mary-Jo Apigo	
Budget Manager	Maureen O'Brien	
Research Analyst	Agyeman Boateng	X

Committee Membership and Approval of Minutes:

Joyce Sweeney was introduced as a new member and Carmen Dones as a semi-new member (now officially a member who had been attending as a guest). Committee membership has been settled by the College Council. The council directed the committee to have the same representation as the college council. SEIU is now "other classified bargaining unit." A. Taylor clarified that she was a guest, not representing the guild. Taking Alice's correction, the minutes were approved as amended.

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meetings 2012-2013
First Wednesday of each month; 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
9/5/12; 10/3/12; 11/7/12; 12/5/12; 01/9/13; 02/13/13; 03/06/13; 04/10/13;
05/01/14; 06/05/13



PIE Committee
Rebecca Tillberg, Chair

Academic Senate (4)
Adrienne Foster
Carmen Dones
Joyce Sweeney

AFT Guild (4)
Olga Shewfelt
Bonnie Blustein
Alice Taylor

Vice Presidents (3)
Ken Takeda, VP
Shalomon Duke, Actg. VP
Bob Sprague, VP

AFT Classified (2)
Dionne Morrisette
Ashanti Lyles

Other Classified Bargaining Unit (1)

Teamsters (1)
Judith-Ann Friedman

ASO (1)

Ex Officio President
Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh

College Council, Chair
Fran Leonard

Resource Division Chair Rep.

Stu Serv/ Admin Serv Program Review Rep.
Celena Alcalá

SLO Rep.
Mary Jo Apigo

Budget Manager
Maureen O'Brien

Researcher
Agyeman Boateng

A Vision for the Future
Through innovative programs and responsive community services,
West Los Angeles College empowers students to succeed

Accreditation Update

Draft Report

A. Taylor provided a document highlighting the “Done” and “To do” items concerning each recommendation. The draft report has been sent to the Senate with copies to the entire community; however, she expected to send a revision to faculty within days.

ACCJC Annual Report

R. Tillberg drew attention to another document, a memo from Barbara Beno highlighting new guidelines for how accreditation site visit teams have been trained and what they will be looking for, keeping the practice of ACCJC aligned with the federal government. One key sentence R. Tillberg noted stated that institutions set standards for student achievement (i-as opposed to student learning; ii- student achievement is completion, graduation rate, etc.). West will need to set student achievement targets and assess progress to those targets periodically, a process that should begin at the joint Budget/PIE meeting. While most of this West already does, the setting of targets will be new.

Evaluation Responsibilities

R. Tillberg highlighted the bottom of the 3rd paragraph which stipulates that college annual reports shall be submitted to the commission. A. Taylor attended the recent accreditation institute and provided some perspective. There is a law or regulation limiting the Department of Education’s involvement over student learning outcomes; so in lieu of this, DOE will require institutions to report on student achievement. But there is nothing stopping an institution to declare that student learning outcomes are among the measures of student achievement.

Returning to the document at hand, R. Tillberg walked through some of the items to be evaluated, including: curriculum and the assignment of credit hours; program length and intended outcome of degrees and certificates; student complaints and grievances; distance education; fiscal stability.

Rubric for Resource Request Prioritization

R. Tillberg started off by clarifying the purpose of the upcoming activities of PIE. *The Joint meeting with Budget* was planned to look at how the college is doing (outcome measures, student achievement measures) and try to assess the effective utilization of financial resources (alluded to in the Beno Evaluation Responsibilities document). *The Prioritization meeting* is not a joint meeting – only PIE will be in attendance.

R. Tillberg drew the group’s attention to several documents regarding the prioritization meeting. The principles for prioritization were approved by College Council. The prioritization rubric, updated since the last PIE meeting, is what the group attending the prioritization meeting will be using as a guide. R. Tillberg went through the rubric, stating her hope that the PIE committee can approve it at the present meeting. Some discussion ensued. A. Taylor identified two interpretations of the term “risk”: while risk of a fire (something you insure against) is huge and less open to interpretation than risk of not having X department or offering Y courses (consequences to the college or program).

There was also a question regarding the difference between “enhance alternative revenue opportunities” (item six on Principles II) and “strive to maintain a balanced budget” (item two on Principles III). After some discussion, the committee decided to change the wording for item 2, principles III:

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meetings 2012-2013
First Wednesday of each month; 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
9/5/12; 10/3/12; 11/7/12; 12/5/12; 01/9/13; 02/13/13; 03/06/13; 04/10/13;
05/01/14; 06/05/13



PIE Committee

Rebecca Tillberg, Chair

Academic Senate (4)

Adrienne Foster
Carmen Dones
Joyce Sweeney

AFT Guild (4)

Olga Shewfelt
Bonnie Blustein
Alice Taylor

Vice Presidents (3)

Ken Takeda, VP
Shalomon Duke, Actg. VP
Bob Sprague, VP

AFT Classified (2)

Dionne Morrissette
Ashanti Lyles

Other Classified Bargaining Unit (1)

Teamsters (1)

Judith-Ann Friedman

ASO (1)

Ex Officio President

Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh

College Council, Chair

Fran Leonard

Resource Division Chair Rep.

Stu Serv/ Admin Serv Program Review Rep.

Celena Alcalá

SLO Rep.

Mary Jo Apigo

Budget Manager

Maureen O'Brien

Researcher

Agyeman Boateng

A Vision for the Future

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

		0 points	1 point	2 points
Change From:	Strive to maintain a balanced budget.	The requested resource is NOT likely to increase revenue or reduce costs in the long run, or the effect is unknown	The requested resource is likely to increase revenue to reduce costs in the long run	(blank)
To:	Strive to maintain a balanced budget.	The requested resource is not likely to be part of a cost effective solution	The requested resource is a cost-effective solution to a need	The requested resource is a cost-effective solution to a major need.

This change changes the maximum number of the points in the rubric from 27 to 28.

MSP to approve the prioritization rubric as edited.

R. Tillberg turned the agenda toward planning the prioritization meeting, drawing attention to an outline “Planning for Resource Request Prioritization Meeting” she had, prepared as well as to the current list of resource requests. R. Tillberg noted that while she has organized the current list of resource requests into categories, she did not want to sway how the committee considers things by doing so. The Vice Presidents will be sending R. Tillberg their priorities by February 22.

There were several components to the ensuing discussion. One of the critical issues was whether to prioritize over several meetings or to have one long meeting. The committee agreed on the idea of a “retreat” to preserve the continuity of the process. Another was setting a date, time and location: March 8th was decided upon as the most accommodating day, from 9am to 3pm, food provided (ideally in SSB 414).

Another issue was how to tackle the large number of requests. A. Taylor suggested that the group warm up on the lowest cost items to feel out the process, then tackle the more expensive next. This approach was agreed to by the committee. There was some concern voiced that 1) cost estimates can sometimes be arbitrary if a unit is not sure of the cost, and 2) low cost items are not necessarily low stakes. The pros and cons of having those who submitted requests speak to elucidate or defend their requests were discussed. F. Leonard argued strongly from experience that this was not the road to take. The committee agreed to allow requesting units to send additional written explanations of the request, but there was not initial agreement on whether to explicitly provide a word or page limit. Most agreed to send an email out providing the principles of prioritization (not the rubric) allowing units to provide additional explanation or justification for the request in no more than 1-2 pages. The committee understood that it would prioritize requests for part-time faculty, but requests for full-time faculty would be handled in FPIP.

New Planning Diagram

R. Tillberg unveiled the work she and M. Long-Coffee had done on the new planning diagram for the College. There was some discomfort with the puzzle metaphor (replacing the bubble chart in the previous diagram. After a period of discussion and critique, the committee asked for more work to be done. There was some support for incorporating a “dimensions” or “parallel plane” aspect to indicate the connected but not cohesive domains at which planning activities occur.

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meetings 2012-2013
First Wednesday of each month; 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
9/5/12; 10/3/12; 11/7/12; 12/5/12; 01/9/13; 02/13/13; 03/06/13; 04/10/13;
05/01/14; 06/05/13

