Planning Committee
MINUTES
May 7, 2015   2:00 – 4:00 pm
CO-420

Planning Committee Chair: Kiran Kamath

Recorder: BethAnn Robertson

Committee Members Present: Bob Kratochvil, Ruth Goodin, Ryan Pedersen, Tara Dale Sanders (alternate), Jesse Michael Rosalez, Catherine Fonseca, Gail Newman, Paula Gunder, Leetha Robertson

Planning Committee Members Not Present: Cecil Nasworthy, George Mills

Guests: Nancy Ybarra, Dave Wahl, Brenton Wirth (POLSC – Milton Clarke Student)

CURRENT ITEMS						
Item #	*Topic/Activity*	*Desired Outcome*	*Information Discussion Action*	*Lead*	*Time (mins)*	*Meeting Notes:*
1.	Welcome			Kamath		• Kiran welcomed the Committee and there were brief introductions of guests.
2.	Public Comment	Listen to our college community	I	Kamath	5	• No public comment(s) were made.
3.	Agenda Minutes from April 9, 2015	Review and approval Review and approval	A A	Kamath	5	• The agenda was reviewed and approved ***(Paula Gunder motioned, Jesse Michael Rosalez seconded; approved 6-0-0)*** • The minutes from the April 9, 2015 meeting were reviewed and approved, with the correction to Tara Dale Sanders who was not present at the April 9th meeting ***(Bob Kratochvil motioned, Ryan Pedersen seconded; approved 4-0-4; abstentions: Gail Newman, Tara Dale Sanders, Paula Gunder and Leetha Robertson)***
	OLD BUSINESS					
4.	Program Review Validation Process	Discuss potential models and how it fits with integrated planning model.	I, D	Newman, Pedersen, Nasworthy, Rosalez, Moore	30	• The team included Gail Newman, Ryan Pedersen, Cecil Nasworthy, Jesse Michael Rosalez and A'kilah Moore. • Handouts were provided by the team and reviewed by Committee: ***Draft-Program Review Rubric Instructional, Draft-Program Review Rubric Student Services, Draft-Program Review Validation Process.*** • The recommended process: The deans would meet with their department chairs/program leads to review the *Program Review Rubric* prior to the Program Review submission deadline. The programs/units would receive a written copy of the completed rubric at the end of the meeting. Then the programs/units would make the desired or necessary changes from the rubric feedback. Lastly, after the Program Reviews are submitted, the deans would then confirm the satisfactory completion of each element of the Program Review process by checking off various

LOS MEDANOS
COLLEGE

Planning Committee
MINUTES
May 7, 2015   2:00 – 4:00 pm
CO-420

					items. The *Draft Program Review Rubrics* were piloted this semester, to receive feedback.
					• **The Program Review Validation Team will come back to the Planning Committee with a second draft of the process early in fall 2015.**
					• The instructional deans noted that this rubric has been helpful as a coaching tool, but it has been sensitive. Some faculty members said they really liked meeting with their deans on their Program Reviews. It is about dialogue not just validation.
					• How do you distinguish between this as a "coaching tool" and "Program Review Validation"? How is the team defining "Validation"?
					o The team looked at the ACCJC rubric, the validation processes at CCC and DVC and other sample models, but did not research models of other models extensively. The team did not discuss a definition of validation.
					• CCC and DVC have cross-unit groups/committees that review the Program Reviews and validate that their Program Reviews are meeting the goals and objectives.
					o The team stated that they had discussions about that model and was deliberate about not having other groups/committees reviewing the Program Reviews. They felt it would not work for our culture.
					• There was discussion about culture.
					o We need to sustain, build and maintain the culture that we have.
					o We don't want to be constrained to not change either. (i.e. this is what we have always done, so this is how we are going to continue doing it).
					• **The team had not yet discussed how to close the loop on reporting out the results of the validation process.**
					• The Program Review Validation Process is one of our Actionable Improvement Plans (AIPs) from our Self-Evaluation Report. The Program Review Validation Process needs to be written up formally as it must be included in our Midterm Report. The important piece is the reporting out of the Program Review Validation results and getting that information out through the governance process in order to close the loop.
					o There needs to be a "next step" to report-out or share the Program Review Validation results.

Planning Committee
MINUTES
May 7, 2015   2:00 – 4:00 pm
CO-420

					• A suggestion is to add on to the "Program Review Summary" template a column where deans can input their programs' plans to move forward.
					• The *Draft-Program Review Rubric Student Services* should have a data section like the instruction rubric.
					  ○ Since all Student Services' units don't have detailed data reports add an "if applicable" data section for those that do have data to report on it.
					  ○ Need to do regular surveys across programs and units to develop our own benchmarks within the program/unit/service and document improvements.

5.	Integrated Planning *(Handouts emailed with agenda – College Plans Leads, PR Synthesizing-Manager Responsibilities, Progress on Strategic Directions-Program Review 2014-15)*	Finalize methodology to gather "Bottom Up" and "Lateral Input"
		
		Finalize plan for summer retreat for "Blue Wall" exercise
		
		Adopt the DRAFT as the final Committee draft to vet with the rest of the College
			I, D, A	Goodin, Robertson,L Sanders Kamath	30	• The team included Kiran Kamath, Ruth Goodin, Leetha Robertson and Tara Dale Sanders. The handouts were included in the e-mail sent to the Committee with the agenda.
						• It is hoped that the Committee is comfortable with the Integrated Planning Model so it can be shared with the campus. This is an action item today.
						• The Committee reviewed the Integrated Planning Model minor changes:
						  ○ The green box was relabeled to "Implement & Assess Plans".
						  ○ The purple box was relabeled to "Evaluate Progress (who?)".
						• The Committee reviewed the draft template (handout), *Progress on Strategic Directions-Program Review 2014-15*. This template was developed following the format used for the Strategic Directions in the *LMC Strategic Plan 2014-19*.
						  ○ A "Planning for 2014-15" timeline table is included at the top of the first page.
						  ○ Instructions and examples are all included on the first page to guide the reader on how to complete the grid.
						  ○ There was discussion in the team on "outputs and outcomes". "Output" is the activity and the "outcome" is the result or what has changed and how do we know (i.e. Example objective 1.3). What happened in your program to improve student success and engagement?
						  ○ There were some Program Review samples in which they don't know what the outcome is.
						  ○ As we evaluate progress, we may be able to see correlations and not causality, as there could be many variables that result in change.

o The *Progress on Strategic Directions from Program Review* (template) seems like it could be a continuation of the "Program Review Summary" grid and not a separate document. The goals in Program Review do not include everything, conversations with the deans would lead to recognizing additional activities. We could use an indicator (i.e. *, bold/italicized font, etc.) in this template to show what information was not included in the program/department's Program Review. Include a reminder to the deans/managers not to lose activities/objectives that are not in Program Review.

• It was determined at the last Planning Committee meeting (and discussed in President's Council in April 2015) that the manager responsible for the program/unit would review the information from the PRST (Excel Spreadsheet Summary) and develop a summary by strategic goal in bullet form. This summary by strategic goal is the template handout, *Progress on Strategic Directions from Program Review*. Per the last Committee meeting, this process was set to be finalized at this meeting.

• This template can be used to develop benchmarks and metrics. It would be helpful in writing the Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report.

• When asked if this template would work for other plans (i.e. Workforce Development), Dave Wahl commented that it would work for Workforce Development. However, we would need to define the terms in the template and develop a glossary. Dave stated that he currently uses the "Strategic Directions" grid and he added columns to include activities, metrics, etc.

• It is also commented that the Workforce Development Plan and the Distance Education Strategic Plan are developing their objectives and/or activities to align with the *LMC Strategic Directions* (2014-19).

• There was discussion in President's Cabinet about scheduling the "blue-wall" activity during summer. If we can assume that other plans would be able to use this grid template, we could send it out to the College Plans' Leads for completion over summer and still do a "blue-wall" exercise in fall 2015 to capture the dialogue. **The Committee needs to finalize and approve the template (*Progress on Strategic Directions from Program Review)* prior to sending it out for completion.**

• We have not yet completed the first full year of the *LMC Strategic Plan 2014-2019* as we are still in 2014-15. We are unable to see any progress

Planning Committee
MINUTES
May 7, 2015   2:00 – 4:00 pm
CO-420

					for 2014-15 because the progress has not yet been recorded as the year has not ended. • **The Committee decided to use the grid template (*Progress on Strategic Directions from Program Review)* after the 2014-15 year is completed so that programs/units and College Plans can report on the whole year. The Committee also decided to proceed with gathering the information from all the College Plans and the deans/managers can work on arranging the "blue-wall" activity for fall. The Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report for the first year of the five-year plan will be completed in summer 2016.**

6.	Logic Model	Understand the process as a potential method to establish Benchmarks to implement the Strategic Plan	I, D	Gunder Ybarra Rosalez	20	• The team members are: Nancy Ybarra, Paula Gunder and Jesse Michael Rosalez. The team provided handouts to the Committee of the *Program Action Logic Model* along with an example of Strategic Direction #1, Objective 1.3 using the Logic Model.
						• "Outcomes" have a larger range of results with the ultimate "impact" being, our students and the college. For example, our students should possess all six (6) student success factors (identified by the RP Group as Directed, Focused, Nurtured, Engaged, Connected and Valued). The range of outcomes can be identified as short term, medium term and long term.
						• "Outputs" are items that you can count (i.e. activities, participation).
						• The "inputs" in the example handed out are the "experiences" (i.e. cohort programs, courses, funding sources).
						• The "situation & priorities" are the data that indicates the need for the intervention.
						• The logic model enables us to be intentional about the values that go into reaching the end result. It may allow us to create a culture of appreciative inquiry.
						  • The logic model is a whole different way of thinking. There is value in it, but who will do it?
						  • The members of the Planning Committee tried to understand how the Logic Model would enable us to operationalize the Strategic Plan and develop a baseline of metrics.
						
						It seems like the template discussed earlier is looking at the past (i.e. trying to capture what has been done and what we are doing) whereas, the logic model is looking forward.

						Conclusion of the three discussions above
						• There appears to be three (3) components in this discussion.
						o The first being Program Review Validation (Program Review Validation Process and the Program Review Summaries/Synthesizing);
						o the second, the template or *Progress on Strategic Directions from Program Review* which would be capturing the first year of our Strategic Plan (2014-15) and will be the template provided to the deans for completion;
						o the third, is potentially the logic model to develop strategies and metrics. This would be looking forward to determine what we will be doing and then gathering results of each year.
						• **At the conclusion of this meeting, it was decided that since we have not yet completed implementing the first full year of the *LMC Strategic Plan 2014-2019*, the Committee would finalize the templates and the process early in fall 2015 to capture information from program review documenting progress in addressing the strategic directions.**
						• **The "blue wall" activity would take place in fall 2015 to capture information from all the other college plans.**
						• **There would be further discussion on the Logic Model to understand it better and determine if it will address the need to implement the strategic plan we adopted in fall 2014 and enable us to establish metrics.**
						• **The Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report for Year #1 of the five year plan would be produced in summer 2016 after year #1 is completed and reported on in the PRST.**
7.	Announcements			All	5	• Planning Committee members were again asked to e-mail BethAnn with the date they began their current term on the Planning Committee. We will be developing a committee roster.
8.	Building Future Agendas: • Codify a sustainable Program/Unit Review Validation or Review Process	Gather Committee comments and suggestions regarding these and additional agenda items	I, D	All	5	None, due to lack of time.

	• Discuss strategies to implement Integrated Planning • Regular Cycles for Surveys and Reviewing the College Mission • Develop familiarity with Standard I • Discuss Administrative Unit Outcomes				
9.	Adjournment				• Meeting adjourned at 4:11 p.m.
	Fall 2015 meeting dates: September 3, October 1, November 5 and December 3				