Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

September 9, 2016
10:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m., Rm. L-108
Co-chairs: Daniel Miramontez and Naomi Grisham

<u>MINUTES</u>

<u>Present</u>: P. Hopkins, B. Bell, G. Ramsey, D. Miramontez, D. Kapitzke (B. Bell proxy), S. Quis, X. Zhang, N. Grisham, G. Choe, J. Calanog, M. Hart, M. Lopez, D. Sheean, L. Murphy
<u>Absent</u>: J. Allen, D. Gutowski
<u>Guest</u>: K.A. Jun
<u>Call to Order</u>: Called to order at 10:34 a.m. by D. Miramontez.

1. <u>Approval of Agenda</u>. Agenda was moved by B. Bell, seconded by G. Ramsey and carried to approve the agenda of September 9, 2016.

2. <u>Review of Minutes from May 13, 2016</u>. Minutes were moved by G. Ramsey, seconded by B. Bell and carried to approve.

<u>New Business</u>:   **[*Strategic Goals](#)
                                                     1-4**

1. <u>Finalize PIEC Meeting Schedule.</u> Dates were established for most meetings, with an exception for the month of November. Upon review of holiday, joint District VPI/VPSS meetings, and BRDS meeting schedule, a PSWg meeting will be scheduled on Nov. 4, 2016 and Nov. 18, 8:30 to 10:00am, will be scheduled as a PIEC Meeting.

2. <u>Review Updated Membership and Goals for 2016-17 Academic Year</u>. Goals and Procedures were reviewed (changes were updated during the spring semester and final approval was made by CEC in May 2016). Membership was previewed with most changes within the PIE Steering Committee portion. Committee Procedures and Calendar was questioned regarding the word "procedures". This will be addressed in the college governance evaluation along within the Quality Focus Essay in the college's SER.

3. <u>Showcase New Interactive Planning Website</u>. New Planning website was developed over the summer (previewed during convocation). Features include shortcuts to other institutional effectiveness matters (i.e., Accreditation, Research, IEPI, Outcomes Assessment, etc.). Also previewed and discussed the interactive Planning framework on website with links to topics shown on the framework. Information embedded into the schematic, shows a "one-stop-shop" approach. Suggestion was made to make Annual Planning Cycle/Calendar located at the bottom of framework more prominent, to make as a "click here", as an attention grabber in bigger blue font rather than a footnote. Centralized location for Program Review process on website was discussed along with the type of information to be used and how it should be presented. Suggestion was made that Budget Resource Review is a formal process and needs to be re-

worded (where is the formal process?). Links to BRDS page suggest to change wording. For Program Review, have a webpage that describes what program review is, with links to individual divisions that would go to the subpage that contains program review summaries for that division. This will be a simple flowchart for the main landing page that describes the process, but will require a discussion on what level of program review information will be made public. Program reviews written are to be made public, based on the Accreditation standards. However, there are no program specific results in terms of student learning outcomes in the program reviews. Concerns were that Program Reviews should be an internal evaluation process and that making information public will make it an external evaluation process. Individual evaluation may be confused with program evaluation. The question is what level of information will be provided. As a summary, suggestion is to develop flowchart that links to framework (addressing process) and discussion will need to be disseminated to respective SLOAC committee for what level of information will go onto landing page (either live links or a spreadsheet summary). Division and department program review will be no problem to put on webpage. Respective divisional program reviews for 2015-16 can be released immediately. To close discussion, will move forward with building landing page with flowchart that describes process and information from the three division's program review. Discussion will be made in PR/SLOAC as of level of information to be released. Consensus was reached. Recommendation for a landing page that describes how data is used for informing decision making, and then go directly to links, making more accessible for all individuals. For Resource Allocation (on the collegewide annual budget document), process will show that BRDS allocates new resources via an approved form. Final form with reallocation of new resources needs to be described/shown.

4. <u>Update to 2016-17 Annual Planning Calendar/Cycle</u>. CEC approved, end product was presented which includes Annual Planning Cycle. Date was discussed for the Annual Planning Summit. Focus will be on planning framework, preparing for the Accreditation visit.

5. <u>Update to Strategic Plan.</u> Tabled, updates are being made.

6. <u>Fall 2016 Convocation Update.</u> Challenge issued for Planning Summit 2017. Take home message was to "Focus on Access to Academic Support for Student Success". Implementation strategy is to have collaboration across divisions. Information to be discussed amongst Chairs, department meeting, school meetings, and feed back to Division and Operational Plans. To build culture of action, will need entire college. The planning summit will preview the best practices that are taking place or being planned to express academic support – an opportunity to highlight, show case, and incorporate ideas in one's department. This will be a learning/momentum building summit, hearing from internal college experts. To focus topic and showcase process using research and planning in preparation for the Accreditation visit. Big picture was showcased at convocation, will now condense down, taking out levels of detail, to take presentation to department level. Challenge was to move away from the anecdotal and use what is in place to produce measurable outcomes. Make presentation general and standardized packet, down to 20 minutes. Suggestion was made to first talk to the Chairs, and

have a collaboration with Public Safety, MBEPS, BTCWI, Student Services, and PRIELT. Presentation will be condensed and standardized by PIESC, brought back to PIEC for feedback, and will be sent out to the leads. Thereafter, VPs to inform in Dean's council. Leads are: M. Lopez for Liberal Arts, N. Grisham for student services, D. Sheean for Public Safety, J. Calanog and/or L. Murphy for MBEPS, G. Choe for BTCWI, and B. Bell and D. Kaptizke for Administrative Services.

7. Update to Educational Master Plan and Division Plans. It is now our Mid-cycle review for our Educational Master Plan and three Division Plans. Mid-cycle review to be streamlined so that mission statement is driving planning, it needs to be stated in the planning documents. Planning should be based on the college's mission statement which is part of the review.

8. Update to Operational Plans (Tech Plan 2.0 Example). Updates to the operation plans of Tech Plan 2.0 were previewed. Timeline details along with CTE Plan updates will be discussed next meeting. CTE Plan and Tech Plan 2.0 will show commonalities for other operational plans to use. PIEC to set parameters and determine what the commonalities are based on the CTE Plan and Tech Plan – to see what applies to other plans and which don't. Suggestion was for PIESC to look at commonalities and bring to PIEC.

Old Business:

1. Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Taskforce Update. Finished draft on the Innovations and Effectiveness Plan. Since then, other areas of the plan were developed. Will move back to Deans Council and Academic Affairs as an FYI. Taskforce will collect/provide input for draft will be sent to PRT members for comment, comments will be incorporated into draft, then finalized by CEC. Draft plan will go to constituency groups as an FYI. Monies in enrollment management were discussed in Academic affairs, Chairs, and Deans. Taskforce will provide input. Constituency groups will receive as information, but will be able to provide feedback through their taskforce representative.

2. PIEC and Standard I.B. (Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness). There are still a portion of the SER revision to be updated and written. District timeline and college timeline for approval are not in alignment. There is still no feedback from District. Pieces of the SER may be different due to additions from District (discussed at CEC).

Reports/Other:

1. Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee (BRDS).   **1.2-2.3**
    In last meeting, dates for the year were discussed, mapped and prioritized goals to the strategic plan and included mapping to accreditation standards of these goals, asked membership updates from constituency groups, and developed/approved a timeline for RFF process. Instructions for distribution of RFFs will be sent next week, with data going back to BRDS on October 5th with final ranking, going back to CEC on November 29th. Approved IELM budget allocation (five-year rolling plan). This year's

allocation was $586K, with $469 going to Technology Resources, and $117 going towards Library Resources. Reviewed and approved BRDS Unrestricted Funds, with $34K going to Athletics Reserves, $136K to Fitness Center Equipment Services, $44K to Technology Replacements and Bulbs, $15K to Staff Development, and $28 towards Other Campus Wide Equipment. Approved total allocation for BRDS RFF, $78K for Unrestricted, $278 for 1x Lottery/Instructional Materials (purchases through RFF that are less than $200, instructional in nature). There are $20K set aside as reserve for lottery encumbrances and $80K between Lottery and IELM. Total RFF funding this year is $330, 810. Documents will be taken to CEC. Question was raised regarding Program review deadline on BRDS RFF Timeline for Fall 2016. Confusing to Faculty, deadline needs to be communicated more clearly (Instruction's deadline in April, and then October 3). Suggestion made for Deans and Chairs to clarify.

2. <u>Research Subcommittee (RSC)</u>.   **1.1, 2.1, & 4.1**
   Will be holding first meeting to discuss Research Request Forms (RRF), Guidelines for Protecting Data Sensitivity (GPDS, formerly GIRPA), goals, and research needs.

3. <u>Informational Items</u>.
   None.

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 12:11 p.m.