Minutes

Monday, October 24, 2011
1:30 pm-3:30 pm
Winlock Lounge

Present: Bonnie Blustein, Adrienne Foster, Fran Leonard, Mark Pracher, Betsy Regalado, Bob Sprague, Rebecca Tillberg

1. Program Review Update. Rebecca Tillberg presented the new online program review system, IES. This system has been in development over the last 2 years by a group of colleges in collaboration with IT in the district office. Phase 1 of IES, program review, is complete and Rebecca has begun configuring that part for West. Phase 2 focuses on unit planning and resource request. Phase 2 is nearly complete following a detailed ‘user acceptance testing’ session where representatives from 7 colleges tested the new screens, attempting to find bugs and request improvements. IT programmers in the district office are fixing those bugs and making the improvements, and will be ready for follow-up testing in a few weeks. When IES Phase 2 is complete, West’s Program Review Committee will make a recommendation to the Planning Committee, Academic Senate, and College Council about adopting the new software.

There was extensive discussion about IES, including process questions, suggestions to improve user-friendliness, and technical questions about software capabilities:

- How can changes be requested to the software?
  - The Program Review Committee will coordinate these requests.
  - A question can be added to the end of the program review document to ask about problems and suggestions for improvement.

- Suggestions for left menu column:
  - When a question is answered, there should be some indication in the left menu column (possibly changing color)
  - When the user screen initially opens, the Categories should not be expanded to show all the questions. The list of questions is so long that it is overwhelming.
  - Hide the SLO section for Phase 3 at the bottom of the menu until it is available. Also, this is confusing since there is also a set of questions for Student Learning Outcomes in the first section.

- Can answers be completed with cut-and-paste from another document?
- Process for sign-off by team members and unit manager raised concerns about the manager’s ability to change information that team members had previously signed off on. Several possible ways to handle this concern were discussed.

There was discussion about Phase 3 of IES, which will focus on the detail level of SLO student assessment data. At some colleges there is concern among the faculty that this kind of data could be used for faculty evaluation and so they do not want a system
that would collect this data. This will be an issue for further discussion in the future at West.

Fran Leonard reported from the Program Review Committee that the college will do the annual unit plan/resource request update in spring 2012. If the new IES is ready to go and approved by the college, that software will be used in spring.

Bob Sprague reported that he has spoken with CTE representatives. He found out that the CTE program review is unrelated to the college program review, and so the program review system does not need to be configured to suit the needs of the biennial CTE review.

Bob commented that it would be helpful if either the Planning Committee or the Program Review Committee could meet with the SLO group. Fran said that the Program Review Committee could invite the SLO group to the next Program Review Committee meeting in November.

There was extensive discussion about the program review process. Adrienne Foster asked about how the Planning Committee and the college as a whole hear back on the outcomes of program review: which resource requests were funded, which were not, and why. The program review process from Fall 2010 has not yet been completed with the prioritization of resource requests. It was pointed out that the FPIP and Classified Hiring processes were completed in 2009, and that there was good understanding about how those processes worked. It was pointed out that even in an environment where there are not Program 100 funds available, the prioritized list of resource requests can be given to the grants office to explore other funding sources. In years past, the Planning Committee prioritized requests college-wide, but the process was too unwieldy and not very functional. One suggestion was that the Planning Committee could review the resource requests to get an understanding of the types of requests being made, but leaving the actual prioritization with the Vice Presidents.

2. Integrated College Master Plan. Mark Pracher has been asked to draft a new integrated master plan for the college. He guided a discussion about a college master plan around several questions: What is the purpose of a master plan? What is a master plan for West? How do we deal with the problem of vocabulary – we have a number of different ‘master plans’? Should the master plan be aspirational? How detailed should the master plan be? What is the connection between the master plan and program review?

An aspirational master plan might aim at what we want the college to be like at age 50, the half-century mark. Comments included that we would want to build on the current plans the college already has in place. In the past when a consultant was used to develop the integrated master plan, the process did not work in the long run because there was no college buy-in. The master plan needs to serve to stabilize the college through the many changes we will probably continue to experience. One of the difficulties in developing a master plan is that the college does not seem to have a clear identity. Development could begin with the Vision/Mission, identify connections among the current plans, and focus on operationalizing the
Vision/Mission/Values. We could have a short term master plan, followed by a longer term master plan.

3. **Student Services Plan Update.** Betsy Regalado provided the update. She described the current Student Services Plan, 2007-2011 is coming to an end. In November, Student Services will compile an official summary of accomplishments and areas in need of additional follow-up. The Student Services Plan has been updated over time to incorporate new initiatives priorities including accreditation recommendations, program review reports, the Educational Master Plan, the Foundation Skills Plan, and the Technology Plan. The new plan will draw from the most recent program reviews, in addition to the updated goals of the Educational Master Plan and the new Achieving the Dream goals. The new goals may not change very much, but the strategies will probably change.

4. **LACCD Strategic Plan Update and Focus Groups.** Adrienne Foster, who is a member of the LACCD Strategic Plan committee, reported on the most recent meeting. The committee has received much information over recent months, including internal and external scans, SWOT analysis, focus groups outcomes. Soon they will begin looking at District Vision/Mission/Values; there is a desire to make the statements shorter. The committee will begin working on goals and strategies.

5. **Accreditation Standard I Planning Agenda Items.** Rebecca shared the three Planning Agenda items for Standard I:

   **IB2**
   The Planning Committee together with the Student Success Committee will improve usability of data through participation in the Achieving the Dream project.

   The Planning Committee will lead the development of a new college master plan to reflect the components of the integrated master plan

   **IB3**
   The college will develop, propose and implement modified procedures to further strengthen the linkage between program review, planning and budget that will address the identified concerns.

   The items were supported with the modification of adding a very short description of the ‘identified concerns’ in Standard I.B.3.