

LOS MEDANOS
COLLEGE

**Planning Committee
MINUTES**

November 3, 2016 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Core Conference Room CO-420

Committee Chair: Bob Kratochvil
Recorder: Taped for Transcription by BethAnn Robertson (who is absent)
Committee Members Present: Nancy Ybarra, Gail Newman, Cecil Nasworthy, Tue Rust (for Silvester Henderson), Mary Oleson, Leetha Robertson
Committee Members Not Present: Ruth Goodin, Tabitha Romero
Guests: POLSC student

CURRENT ITEMS						
<i>Item #</i>	<i>Topic/Activity</i>	<i>Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Information Discussion Action</i>	<i>Lead</i>	<i>Time (mins)</i>	<i>Meeting Notes:</i>
1.	Welcome			Kratochvil		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bob welcomed the Committee to our November meeting and provided introductions for our guest (a student from Milton Clarke’s Political Science class).
2.	Public Comment	Listen to our college community	I	Kratochvil	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cecil mentioned that they are in the process of developing a contextualized Math Program. Most if not all of his time in spring semester will be planning and preparing for implementation of a session for this program. Therefore, Cecil will most likely not be able to continue as an Academic Senate representative for Planning Committee. Cecil will speak with Silvester regarding resigning from the Committee so a new representative can be appointed in spring. There are new programs that are currently being planned for, do we have any funds in the future to build more buildings other than what is already paid for? We only have some money that has been given to us through bonds, which was included in our Facilities Master Plan (i.e. the PE Complex, Student Union and the Banquet Center). There are a lot of CTE Programs specifically that need more space (i.e. ETEC, Welding, Auto Tech, etc.). When we compose our Educational Master Plan next year an important component of that is to understand educationally and academically where we want to be and where we want to head to. Following that we will need to update our Facilities Master Plan. After those two (2) plan have been approved we would then to find out if there’s any savings left in the bond or if we need to go and get new money, possibly from corporate sponsors/partners. Natalie is researching the different tiers in some grants which might allow for funds to be used for the purchase of equipment or structures for expansion. Local area car dealerships may be able to be leased by LMC to move the Auto Tech

LOS MEDANOS
COLLEGE

Planning Committee
MINUTES

November 3, 2016 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Core Conference Room CO-420

						department offsite. However, these offsite learning spaces which will house students will need specific approvals beforehand.
3.	Agenda Minutes from October 6, 2016	Review and approval Review and approval	A A	Kratochvil	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda was reviewed and approved (<i>Leetha R. motioned, Mary O. seconded; 5-0-0</i>). • Minutes were reviewed and approved <i>Nany Y. motioned, Cecil N. seconded; 3-0-2 – abstentions: Mary O. and Leetha R.</i>)
<u>OLD BUSINESS</u>						
4.	Research and Data	Discuss LMC data and/or research requests and a college-wide presentation on data	I, D	Kratochvil/ Sargent/ Stoup	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was mentioned that approximately five (5) years ago the District Research department compiled data on freshmen students' persistence rates and a significant drop was seen in this study amongst first year students. Since then LMC has implemented new changes in Math and English (i.e. accelerated track courses). It may be a good idea to develop a benchmark or baseline and conduct the research in a year or two to see if our persistence rate has changed amongst first year students. It would also be interesting to see if it can be categorized by department. • It was also mentioned that there have been discussions regarding receiving the same data for students who attend an adult education school and then continue to college, or the workforce or both. The conversations surrounding this research and the collection of data has been occurring and is continuing to occur in many different areas throughout the state. Bob will follow-up with Greg regarding the research being done to collect data on CTE Program graduates entering the workforce. • As this is a Program Assessment year, departments are requesting research and need to get their results back as soon as possible. The instructional deans are working with their departments on their Program Assessments. Nancy Y. will be talking to her department chairs and faculty about research requests and what data/research to request from District. Moving forward, we should develop an institutional process for requesting research/data in preparation for Program Assessment year. Bob will contact Greg to inquire if he or Marilyn is available to attend the department chair meeting on December 6th from 12:30-1:50 to talk about how the District Research Office can support LMC department in collecting program level data. • The results from the Professional Development District-wide Survey will be coming out soon. However, a gap analysis was requested and the two (2) issues that "rose to the top" were: a.) personnel feel extremely under-prepared for responding to an emergency situation and b.) technology. • District-wide Professional Development has set aside \$8,000-\$12,000 for an Integrated Planning Workshop provided by SCUP. There are 40 slots

LOS MEDANOS
COLLEGE

**Planning Committee
MINUTES**

November 3, 2016 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Core Conference Room CO-420

						available at all campuses, splitting those we just need to decide who should be included in our 20 allotted slots. DVC is holding their own in December however, part of the agreement for the funds to pay for the workshop was that we hold a spot for them. Rick Robison with DVC is the person to contact regarding the SCUP training.
<u>NEW BUSINESS</u>						
5.	PRST Survey (See Handouts)	Review and discuss PRST/Program Review Survey	I, D	B. Robertson/ Kratochvil	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The handouts contain the questions and answers from the survey the last time it was conducted. The Committee should review the questions and see if they are still pertinent or if they require revision(s). After reviewing the responses from last time it was noted that the number of responses were low. This could be for a number of reasons including a lack of interest, the survey was too long and/or there was an abundance of surveys during that time period. The questions posed to the Committee are: do we want to conduct the survey again and if so do the questions need revision or need to be condensed? • Some departments feel the tool worked well last year and the small improvements being made are well received by some departments. The lack of response may be due to people not having enough time to respond to a survey. • The main issue with the PRST was not being able to access the SQL data off campus. It is believed the reason for no off-campus access is it is an IT or Technology issue. • The requested updates to the Professional Development tab were not implemented this year as requested. Therefore, the Professional Development questions appear as though they can remain the same. • The Committee discussed the suggestion to redesign the survey to ask more about the process and not the tool. Although the tool is imperfect, it is good enough. It would be more useful to know if the Program Review (PR) process is working for them, the amount of input or collaboration from their department on PR, whether they feel it is necessary or helpful to do it annually, what are the barriers they incur during the process, etc. Or is PR something departments just get through for example, a box they have to check off every year? • Some feel that their department puts the time and energy in to PR, and that it's a way to record what they have been doing and how they have worked towards achieving their objectives. Because of PR it has sparked up conversations about different endeavors, changes and learning experiences that have occurred over the past year. PR and the PRST

**Planning Committee
MINUTES**

November 3, 2016 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Core Conference Room CO-420

						<p>provide an avenue for recording those conversations and provide an opportunity for us to be intentional about how we want people to look at learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some departments on campus may feel that way and others may feel that PR is just a necessary item (i.e. a box that has to be checked). This is why feedback on the process itself is necessary. The question can even be posed as open-ended. For example, “Is the Program Review process working you? Why? Why Not? What change would you suggest?” • The Committee discusses the PRST open and close dates, why does the tool close? It has to close for RAP however, the tool is open all year. The only stipulation is you can’t enter any new objectives however, you can upload your assessments, upload Professional Development and Department Successes information. I think it would be more useful for the PRST to be open all the time and then every 2 ½ years or mid-cycle a report on your program is due. • We can incorporate one or two open-ended questions about the PRST. For example, “Is there anything you liked or disliked about the PRST this year? Do you have any suggestions for improvement to the PRST?” • A suggestion is to invite Eng to the Planning Committee meetings in which the PRST is discussed. As Eng is the individual who is responsible for the programming of the tool and implementing the changes/updates as approved by this Committee, it may be beneficial to have his feedback and for him to participate in the discussions involving the tool. • A suggestion is if the survey is made mandatory in the PRST (i.e. your PR is not complete until you submit a response to the survey), the responses may increase this year. • It is recommended that all Committee members communicate with their departments, programs, areas, etc. and based on the feedback received develop survey questions on the Program Review process. These questions could be frequency of PR, promoting dialogue within the program due to PR, alignment with RAP, etc. • <i>In conclusion, all Committee members will bring questions for the survey on the Program Review Process to the next meeting for review and approval. The survey will be conducted through Survey Monkey and will contain between four to six questions. One of these questions will be open-ended and about the PRST. The survey will be sent out shortly after Program Review closes on January 30th.</i>
6.	Announcements			All	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bob announced that the first level interviews for the Senior Dean of Planning & Institutional Effectiveness are currently taking place and will conclude today. Second level interviews are scheduled for next Thursday

LOS MEDANOS
COLLEGE

Planning Committee
MINUTES

November 3, 2016 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Core Conference Room CO-420

						and it is hopeful by Thanksgiving we should be able to announce who has been selected. This individual will also be the ALO for the College and Assessment will fall under their purview as well. In addition, next year this Senior Dean will need to begin on our ACCJC Midterm Report, our Educational Master Plan, develop IEPI Goals and Integrated Planning. As chair of this Committee, we will need to have talk about the Program Review Process and its affiliation with RAP including an evaluation of that. From a process standpoint it is great however, when you don't have money and everyone is completing a Program Review with budget requests included it leaves some people with the sentiment that the whole process should be abandoned. When the requests total \$2 million and we are only able to allocate \$150,000 (or less as in years past). The Governor's budget comes out in January however, we do not know until well into June what the permanent dollars are. This past year we received no COLA or marginal dollars. While LMC did receive some equity funds, 3SP funds and other restricted dollars; there are specific categories for the usage of these funds. In addition, while we may have funds one year, we may not get them the next year. The ongoing RAP requests are more difficult to fund then the one-time requests.
7.	<p>Building Future Agendas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of Program Review Cycle • Discuss strategies to implement Integrated Planning • Regular Cycles for Surveys and Reviewing the College Mission • Discuss Administrative Unit Outcomes • Development of IEPI Goals 	Gather Committee comments and suggestions re these and additional agenda items	I, D	All	5	
8.	Adjournment					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m. (<i>Cecil N.. motioned, Mary O. seconded; 6-0-0</i>).
Spring 2017 Meeting Dates: February 2 nd , March 2 nd , April 6 th and May 4 th						