Committee Chair: Bob Kratochvil  
Recorder: BethAnn Robertson (not present)

Committee Members Present: Ruth Goodin, Nancy Ybarra, Paula Gunder, Cecil Nasworthy, Gail Newman, Silvester Henderson, Tara Dale Sanders, Mary Oleson (alternate)
Committee Members Not Present: Catherine Fonseca, Silvester Henderson, Leetha Robertson

### CURRENT ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Topic/Activity</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
<th>Information Discussion Action</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Time (mins)</th>
<th>Meeting Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kratochvil</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bob welcomed the Committee and new Classified alternate member Mary Oleson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Listen to our college community</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Kratochvil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>• No Public Comment at this time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.     | Agenda Minutes from October 8, 2015 | Review and approval of | Review and approval | Newman | 40 | • Agenda was reviewed and approved  
• Minutes were reviewed and approved with one (1) correction to item #2, the second bullet revise to read “November 6, 2015 there will be a similar event for ETEC.” (Nancy Ybarra motioned, Ruth Goodin seconded; 5-0-3 abstentions: Mary Oleson, Gail Newman, Paula Gunder) |

### OLD BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Topic/Activity</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
<th>Information Discussion Action</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Time (mins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.     | Program Review Validation Process | Review and discuss Student Services Validation Rubric (See Handouts) | I, D | Newman | 40 | • Handouts of the Draft-Student Services Program Review Validation Process and the Draft-Student Services Program Review Rubric were provided to the Committee for review. The Students Services’ Deans have been meeting with the Instructional Deans regarding their process and their rubric. As a result, the handouts were formed and revised for Student Services.  
• The rubric addresses the completeness of the Program Review (i.e. Profile, College priorities, mission, etc.).  
  o The first section addresses the completion of the Profile, College Priorities, Mission, Unit Members and a section to include any notes.  
  o The second section addresses the Data Repository which currently does not have much information for Student Services. The Student Services’ Deans would like to see some changes to this section next year. They are working on developing a list of data needed automatically every |

Handouts of the Draft-Student Services Program Review Validation Process and the Draft-Student Services Program Review Rubric were provided to the Committee for review. The Students Services’ Deans have been meeting with the Instructional Deans regarding their process and their rubric. As a result, the handouts were formed and revised for Student Services.

The rubric addresses the completeness of the Program Review (i.e. Profile, College priorities, mission, etc.).

- The first section addresses the completion of the Profile, College Priorities, Mission, Unit Members and a section to include any notes.
- The second section addresses the Data Repository which currently does not have much information for Student Services. The Student Services’ Deans would like to see some changes to this section next year. They are working on developing a list of data needed automatically every
year from the District Research Office for Program Review. The only data currently in the repository for Student Services Units is Assessment. Primarily for PSLOs however, Counseling and DSP&S do have Assessment data on CSLOs.

- The third section addresses Assessment. All the Student Services Units have PSLOs and are currently on the same five year cycle as the Instructional Programs. Counseling and DSP&S have CSLOs and are uploaded according to their cohort cycle.
- The fourth section addresses the status and progress of Past Objectives.
- The fifth section addresses New Objectives. The “Status Reason from Prior Year” and “Program Improvement” may need to be moved to the Past Objectives section unless it is an objective that is being “rolled over” to a new objective. Gail stated that she will update this page/section and e-mail the revised document.
- The last sections relate to the optional pieces of Program Review (i.e. Department Successes and Professional Development). Data pertaining to Department Successes can be included in the “Exemplary” column of that section.

- The Student Services’ Unit can include their progress on a Strategic Direction(s) in the meetings/discussions with the Dean during the Program Review Validation Process and it can be included in the completed rubric.
- It is noted that the rubric for the Instructional Programs included sections for “Program Improvements Noted” and “Program Needs”. The Deans would take information from the “Department Successes” area in the Annual Program Review and from the “Objectives” in the Comprehensive Program Review and then place it with the Strategic Direction in which the improvement or need aligns with. Gail will discuss the addition of this information to the rubric with the Student Services’ Deans.
- It is also noted that the PRST template for Student Services does not encourage a full reflection and is limited. The Student Services’ Deans have developed a list of changes to the PRST for Student Services to make it more robust. Gail will bring the list of recommended changes to the Committee for review and approval.
- There was a recommendation to look into how we can integrate Student Services with Instruction. Student Services does not have access to view any of the data or information in Instructional Program Reviews which
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would be very useful. We need to look at how our processes limit us in integrating these two areas. Instruction has data on the disproportionate impact in the classroom however, it is not just Instruction that affects it. It would be a step to integration if Student Services could also receive this data so as to integrate Instruction and Student Services with the effects on the disproportionate impact.
- It is noted that the Committee had previously discussed when Program Review and the rubrics are completed that all the units (Instruction, Student Services and Administrative) would be compiled and reviewed to look for patterns and gaps, as part of the “Institutional Effectiveness Report”.
- A suggestion for modifying the PRST Template is to include a field titled “Campus Partnerships” or “Collaborative Initiatives”. This could serve as a prompt to who a department/program should be working with on their objectives.
- President’s Cabinet has discussed having a retreat and reading all the Program Reviews to find patterns, disconnects/gaps and common themes. It is a very labor intensive task to read and pull information from all Program Reviews and would require the assistance of more than one person. There is a suggestion to utilize coding software such as Atlas TI that can thematically code them.
- The General Education SLOs are used as ISLOs. There is currently no ISLOs for Student Services. As a College we need to form ISLOs for all areas including Student Services. Those Committee members on TLC would like to begin discussions on forming ISLOs for Instruction and Student Services.

Conclusion:
- Gail will discuss the suggested recommendations to the rubric with the Student Services’ Deans (i.e. Program Improvements Noted, Program Needs) and the discrepancy in location of the “Status from Prior Year” section. Gail will report back to the Committee after they have met with the outcome.
- President Kratochvil also noted that work will begin in Cabinet with developing a rubric for Administrative Units (modeled after the Student Services’ rubric template).
- The Committee will discuss adding to our 2015-16 charges the development of ISLOs for Instruction and Student Services.
### Educational Master Plan 2006-2016
- **Review and discuss next steps**

**I, D**
- **Kratochvil**
- **15**

- **The Integrated Planning sub-committee (Paula G., Leetha R., Tara S. and Bob K.) will meet to coordinate the “blue-wall” exercise to include committees for all College plans, grants and initiatives.**

### NEW BUSINESS

#### 6. Planning Committee Charges 2015-16
- **Review and update charges for SGC approval**

**I, D, A**
- **Kratochvil**
- **20**

- **The Committee reviewed the 2014-15 charges.**
  - The first charge to develop a Strategic Plan to align with the District Strategic Plan has been completed and can be removed for 2015-16 charges.
  - A suggestion as a step towards the completion of charge #2 this year is for the Committee to compile and review the patterns, linkages and collaborations for all the existing Program Reviews and the results would form a baseline for the development of the Comprehensive Program Review template.
  - There is a recommendation to change the verbiage on charge #3 to delete the word “codify” and include the word “evaluate”.
  - There is a question pertaining to “working collaboratively with shared governance committees” and whether it should still be included in this charge.
  - The Accreditation Standard #1 should be threaded in our Committee work throughout not just when the self-evaluation report/visit approach. President Kratochvil will review the ACCJC guidelines regarding Standard #1.
  - The addition of a new charge related to the Educational Master Plan. For example, “The development of a process and timeline for creation of the Educational Master Plan 2017-2027”.

- **If Committee members have any further suggestions please e-mail President Kratochvil. The suggested revisions will be brought to the next Committee Meeting for review and approval.**

#### 7. SSSP Plan and Equity Plan
- **Update Planning Committee on new plans**

**I, D**
- **Newman Goodin**
- **10**

- **The goal of the Planning Committee is to integrate all College plans. What is the role of the Planning Committee in the development of these plans and other College Plans?**
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Accreditation Follow-Up Report Site Visit Update</td>
<td>Update Planning Committee on results of Accreditation Follow-Up Visit</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>Kratochvil 5</td>
<td>• We should be planning now for the funding of the activities we are not doing that we want to do to meet our objectives/directions/goals for College plans. • There was a report-out from Carla Rosas of the SSSP Plan to the Governing Board last night and it was submitted October 23rd to the State. The Equity Plan will be presented at the December Governing Board meeting and is due to the State on December 18th. • A suggestion is to include an additional charge for the Planning Committee to review new College Plans to be implemented and how we can best support these committees in their process for approval and implementation. Could we develop a structure for College Plans to be provided appropriate time on shared governance committees for report-outs, approval, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Planning Committee Student Representative</td>
<td>Brainstorm ideas on recruiting student representation on the Committee</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>Kratochvil 5</td>
<td>• The ACCJC Follow-Up Report Site Visit Exit Interview went very well and we have confidence that we have successfully responded to all the recommendations. • The Student Representative needs to be approved for appointment from the LMCAS however, they do not need to be a member of the LMCAS. • It is noted that the representative should be interested in planning as part of their studies and/or educational goal. • It is recommended that Milton Clarke or another Political Science instructor recommend one of their students. • President Kratochvil will meet and discuss student representative recommendations from the LMCAS and Milton Clarke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>District Research needs for LMC</td>
<td>Discuss types of data we need and interpretation for a visit from Greg Stoup</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>Kratochvil 5</td>
<td>• This item is tabled to the next agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>• No announcements at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Building Future Agendas: • Codifying a sustainable Program/Unit Review Validation or Review Process</td>
<td>Gather Committee comments and suggestions re these and additional agenda items</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>All 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Discuss strategies to implement Integrated Planning  
- Regular Cycles for Surveys and Reviewing the College Mission  
- Developing familiarity with Standard I  
- Discuss Administrative Unit Outcomes

| 13. | Adjournment | Meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m. |

Fall 2015 meeting dates: December 3