Planning Committee
MINUTES
March 5, 2015   2:00 – 4:00 pm
CO-420

Planning Committee Chair: Kiran Kamath

Recorder: BethAnn Robertson

Committee Members Present: Bob Kratochvil, Gail Newman, Cecil Nasworthy, Paula Gunder, Ryan Pedersen, Leetha Robertson, Tara Dale Sanders (alternate), Jesse Rosalez

Planning Committee Members Not Present: Ruth Goodin, George Mills, Catherine Fonseca

Guests: Natalie Hannum, Nancy Ybarra, A'kilah Moore, Guo Sum Kim (Milton Clarke POLSC Student)

CURRENT ITEMS

Item #	Topic/Activity	Desired Outcome	Information Discussion Action	Lead	Time (mins)	Meeting Notes:
1.	Welcome			Kamath		• Kiran welcomed the POLSC student and guests to the meeting. Jesse Rosalez is the new LMCAS Representative to the Committee. Leetha Robertson is the new Classified Senate Representative and Tara Dale Sanders is the new Classified Senate Alternate Representative.
2.	Public Comment	Listen to our college community	I	Kamath	5	• Cecil attended a Workforce Development and Economic Trends Task Force Workshop on Friday February 27, 2015. Cecil will share more details about the workshop with the Committee at the next meeting.
3.	Agenda Minutes from February 5, 2015	Review and approval Review and approval	A A	Kamath	5	• The agenda was reviewed and approved *(Ryan Pedersen motioned, Cecil Nasworthy seconded; all approved 7-0-0)* • The minutes from the February 5, 2015 meeting were reviewed and approved *(Ryan Pedersen motioned, Paula Gunder seconded; all approved 7-0-0)*
	OLD BUSINESS					
4.	Committee Organization *(Handout-8 Keys to Improving Task Forces and Committees in Higher Education – emailed after last meeting)*	Determine how best to organize ourselves and operate in order to accomplish committee charges efficiently and expeditiously	I, D	Kamath, Gunder	10	• The document *8 Keys to Improving Task Forces and Committees in Higher Education* was e-mailed to members of the Committee after the last meeting following a discussion on how to organize ourselves in terms of representing and reporting out to our respective constituencies, forming work teams, and length of terms for members. • Members again commented that the most efficient way to complete the work of the Committee is to work in teams and present drafts to the Committee as a whole for review and approval. • The *Integrated Planning Team* has met and will be reporting out today (item #6). The Instructional Deans have been invited to the meeting today with the expectation that one Dean will join the *Program Review Validation/Review Team* as it begins its work. See "Actionable Improvement Plan #1" regarding the Planning Committee developing a program review validation process in collaboration with the Office of Instruction.

						• Committee members commented on their reading of the handout:
						  ○ A sentiment across most community colleges is "Committees have no real influence". This document dispels that sentiment.
						  ○ Members should not be on too many Committees as the work load of each Committee can be extensive to avoid "burnt out".
						  ○ Committee members should keep track of how much time is spent on work teams and Committee work outside of meetings, so potential new members can be made aware of the workload and time involved as a Committee member.
						• A suggestion is to develop a Q&A list to help guide new members on time commitment, role and responsibilities.
						• What does it mean to "report-out" to your constituency? If you are not a Senator, you may not regularly attend Senate meetings. It has been recommended that at least one (1) of the three (3) constituency representatives be a Senator and have time reserved on the agenda for their report on Committee work to the Senate.
						• Kiran will e-mail Silvester Henderson to suggest that the Academic Senate also appoint an "alternate" to the Committee.
						• The Committee is considering developing operating guidelines. This would include issues such as when to seek appointments for an upcoming term; length of term; and rotation. A three (3) year term may work best as it takes a year to learn the work of the Committee. Whatever the term length decided, it was suggested that SGC determine the standard length of term of all shared governance committees.
						• **It was suggested that all members e-mail BethAnn with the year they joined the Planning Committee to develop a detailed committee roster.**

5.	Program Review Participation Survey *(Handout – form emailed after last meeting)*	Review and finalize survey instrument	D, A	Pedersen, Mills	10	• The Committee reviewed the final draft of the Program Review Participation Survey. After the last Committee meeting, a few recommended changes were made (the addition of an introduction, addition of PRST interaction questions and the wording on question #4 was changed). • The survey will be a random sampling from all constituencies of the College. George and Ryan will develop a key so participants are anonymous. The survey will be copied on three (3) different colors of paper to represent the three constituencies (i.e. Managers, Faculty and Classified). • Following some discussion, it was recommended that a good sampling size be 10-15% of each constituency and include Adjunct Faculty. *(Ryan Pedersen motioned, Leetha Robertson seconded; all approved 7-0-0).*

Planning Committee
MINUTES
March 5, 2015   2:00 – 4:00 pm
CO-420

| 6. | Strategic and Operational Plans; Integrated Planning **(Read Chaffey Model of Integrated Planning – emailed after last meeting)** (Review diagrams on pages 5 and 11) | Discuss integrated planning model to operationalize the LMC strategic plan | I,D | Kamath, Gunder, Goodin | 50 | The *Chaffey Model of Integrated Planning* was shared as reading material at the last Committee meeting. What is integrated planning and how should we do it at LMC? It is both the cycle of planning and assessment as well as the integration of other plans and initiatives with our strategic plan. The "Integrated Planning Team" (Paula, Ruth, Kiran and Tara) formed at the last meeting, met and discussed the Chaffey model. They shared a PowerPoint of a draft LMC model based on the Chaffey model for discussion. It is important that whatever model we finally decide on, that the Planning Committee needs *to own* the model. How do we go from 'Strategic' to 'Operational' Plans? Included in the "LMC Strategic Plan 2014-2019" document are the four (4) Strategic Directions and the diagram "Implementation: Strategic Activities" at the end of the document. To fill in the activities in the diagram, the Committee has been discussing the following approach for the last two months: "Bottom Up" activities will be summarized from program review. It is hoped that the Excel spreadsheet that Mike Becker will send the Office of P&IE will provide the information needed i.e. activities and improvements for each of the four strategic directions. "Lateral activities" will be gathered from College Plans (i.e. EM, Technology); CA Community College Plans (i.e. BSI, 3SP); and Grants (i.e. HSI, STEM) during a retreat and a blue-wall activity. The gaps will need to be addressed from "top-down" as portrayed in the diagram. It is yet to be determined who will do this. The Planning Committee, the Cabinet, or a combination of both? " The Committee had the following comments on the *Draft Integrated Planning Model:* It should include the District's Strategic Directions that the LMC Strategic Directions align with. How do each of these plans get prioritized? We have to look at retrenchment? How would the plan address elimination due to lack of funding? When we see gaps and/or implement new ideas/plans then we may need to stop "doing" other ideas/plans. How do we gather information from the plans? At the last two (2) meetings we discussed conducting a retreat with all the leaders of the plans. As preparation for the retreat, we would send them questions and information to read beforehand. Then we would participate in a blue-wall exercise to determine what each plan contributed towards the strategic directions. Each |

						plan will have its objectives and goals. The blue-wall exercise would facilitate communication between plans.
						o Resource Allocation is part of the model, and assessing the effectiveness of the implementation of the resources in furthering the mission and strategic directions of the college.

plan will have its objectives and goals. The blue-wall exercise would facilitate communication between plans.
- o Resource Allocation is part of the model, and assessing the effectiveness of the implementation of the resources in furthering the mission and strategic directions of the college.
- o A component of the model is Program Review and the process to validate it and connect it with the strategic directions and resource allocation. Program Review is more than a process to complete in order to request resources. It should be the program/unit's assessment of its own effectiveness. This would be helpful for new employees too.
- o A box for Student Success and Institutional Effectiveness should be added at the top, above Mission in the model.
- The "Cycle of Planning & Assessing" applies to different boxes in the draft integrated planning model diagram. It is the cycle of planning, allocating resources, implementing and assessing.
- Each plan leader (i.e. College Plans, CA Community College Plans, and Grant Initiatives) would be planning, implementing, assessing and incorporating adjustments in the next cycle of planning.
- The Office of P&IE has reviewed the integrated planning models of many different community colleges. The *Chaffey Model of Integrated Planning* appears systematic and logical. It was also commended by the RP Group.
- We need to look at our governance structure (i.e. "top down" – who?). We need to determine what it will take to implement such a model (i.e. who would do what).
- The Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report would communicate to the community-at-large and the campus how effective LMC is (i.e. what we are doing and how we are doing). The format should be simple and should provide summaries and highlights.
- What consideration is being taken to the difference in timing on plans (i.e. not all plans are on the same timeline)? Which one takes precedence? The light blue area of the diagram would be the stock-taking (where we are now). The various plans' timelines would come out of that process for example, the blue-wall exercise. Any new plans or ideas would need to address the 2014-2019 Strategic Directions.
- The Strategic Directions do not yet have metrics. The Planning Committee attempted to develop metrics last fall. We soon learned that the metrics would need to be developed by the programs/units.

						• The Program Review for next year will have to align with the 2014-2019 Strategic Directions, the metrics would come from the Program Reviews, all plans and institution-set standards. • How in this Integrated Planning Model, would we know what "moved the needle" (i.e. Technology Plan, BSI, etc.)? Often times it is a combination of three to four variables. In any instructional endeavor you can never say what exactly caused your students to succeed. • A comment is made regarding page 2 of the *Chaffey Model of Integrated Planning* on "Completion Counts", an outline of the four (4) phases of a student's life on campus: entry-engage-support-completion. The *Chaffey strategic directions are* beautiful for its simplicity. These phases of a student's life are included in LMC's Strategic Direction #1. We could perhaps flesh it out better. • **Please think about the draft model (handout) further**. BethAnn will e-mail the Committee the PowerPoint of the draft model following the meeting. E-mail any ideas or suggestions you may have to the team working on this (Kiran, Ruth, Paula, Tara). • Once the Planning Committee determines how to proceed with integrated planning, we will share it with the college in a College Assembly.
	NEW BUSINESS					

7.	Program Review Submission Tool (PRST) Survey Results and other Feedback (Handout: Survey Results)	Modifications to be made for August 2015 roll-out of PRST	I, D, A	Kamath	15	• The Committee discussed the Program Review Submission Tool (PRST) Survey results. There were fewer (18) responses this year, and there were more positive than last year.
						 • Comments and suggestions offered for the next version are:
						   o A deadline for program Manager to sign-off on Program Review (i.e. similar to RAP) before it is due.
						   o There were many browser issues
						   o Complaints about SQL as there are no tips online. (Greg Stoup has been notified about this since the District handles SQL)
						   o Issues with the verification button (Kiran will be meeting with the Deans and Dave Belman)
						   o Clarify Professional Development. Kiran will be meeting with Ruth regarding the Professional Development tab that was piloted in the PRST this year.
						   o Some had difficulty finding and understanding the data in the PRST.
						   o The character limit should be expanded.

						o Concerns about the early RAP deadline this year (i.e. first level deadline of RAP was before the program review deadline) • The Committee reviewed the PRST Development Timeline (available on the Program Review webpage). This month the Planning Committee provides all suggested modifications to the PRST to Kiran which are discussed with Mike Becker in March and April. After May 1, 2015 Kiran cannot give Mike any new modifications to the PRST for next year. After August 1, 2015 the new Program Review Submission Tool (PRST) is released. We are working towards standardizing the open and close dates of the PRST - PRST closes February 15th and re-opens on August 1st for new objectives. • Can a button/option be developed to save the narrative at the end into a Word document? Currently the only option is to print and in order to save it I have to copy and paste in to a Word document. At this time unsure if this change is possible to program however, it will be added to the list of suggested future changes. • The Committee is asked to e-mail Kiran within 7-10 days with any suggested changes (from constituencies and/or a Committee member). Depending on the suggested change, it may be addressed for next year, or a future release of the PRST.
8.	SENSE and/or CCSSE Survey	Determine when next survey should be conducted	I, D	Kamath	5	• Rosa Armendariz contacted Kiran about SENSE and CCSSE Surveys. The EXITO Grant ends in October and funding is available for one or maybe both surveys. Greg Stoup is hoping coordinate a similar schedule for these surveys in all CCCCD Colleges. • The Committee commented that if we only enough funding for one survey, conduct the CCSSE. Greg will assist with comparing these results with previous results that will serve as the benchmark. It was commented, that we need help in learning how to use the data once we get it (a RAP has been submitted again this year for a Research Coach housed at LMC). • Kiran will communicate the Committee's interest to Rosa and will inquire about the grant extension and if there are enough funds for both surveys. Kiran will report back to the Committee.
9.	Program Review Validation Process	Discuss how it fits with integrated planning and expand membership of work team	I, D	Pederson	10	• What does Program Review Validation mean? How does it inform Planning? Program Review Validation is not just checking boxes to know if a program review is complete. The purpose is not to be punitive, but evaluative and to close the loop on the process. Program review is at "the heart" of Accreditation. It is one of the areas in the "Cycle of Planning and Assessing" and Integrated Planning. The instructional deans are working with Department Chairs to establish standards in completing Program Review. It would be very

Planning Committee
MINUTES
March 5, 2015   2:00 – 4:00 pm
CO-420

						beneficial and important for one of the three deans to join the *Program Review Validation Team.* Currently the members are Gail Newman, Ryan Pedersen, and Cecil Nasworthy. Jesse Rosalez has volunteered to join the Program Review Validation Work Team. Nancy Ybarra will check will A'kilah Moore about joining the team. • BethAnn will e-mail the team the DVC and CCC Program Review Validation handouts from last year. • BethAnn will e-mail the Committee the *BRIC Inquiry Guide*, the *ASCCC Program Review: Setting a Standard*, the *ACCJC Integrated Planning, Program Review and Institutional Quality*, and *What Accreditors Expect from Program Review.* • **The team will lead a discussion to present their pre-work at the next meeting for feedback.**
10.	Announcements			All	5	• No Announcements at this time
11.	Building Future Agendas: • Codify a sustainable Program/Unit Review Validation or Review Process • Discuss strategies to implement Integrated Planning • Regular Cycles for Surveys and Reviewing the College Mission • Develop familiarity with Standard I • Discuss Administrative Unit Outcomes	Gather Committee comments and suggestions regarding these and additional agenda items	I, D	All	5	• No additional agenda items at this time
12.	Adjournment					• Meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.
	Spring 2015 meetings dates: April 9, May 7					